ness element regarded him favorably while with the Independents, he became quite a favorite. The close analogy between the men Fillmore and Arthur, their political characters, careers and fortunes, has been noted.

It seems evident that by 1884, due to the lasting political effects of the war, reinforced by the fairly satisfactory administrations of Hayes and Arthur, the United States had become normally Republican in politics. To win the Democrats had to draw heavily from the liberal and independent elements ordinarily Republican. The Democratic Party was distinctly the minority party despite the Solid South. Yet it was the minority party only because the negro vote of the whole country was practically as solidly Republican as was the South Democratic. Still it was a powerful organization, strong in nearly every state, with many of the best and ablest men in the country among its leaders, and fully capable of victory. Its opponent was vulnerable, very vulnerable, despite its overwhelming strength. Both in and out of Congress party lines were wavering, extensive changes of party association were possible; the years 1880-4 was a period of flux, and the times ripe for a great leader in the Democratic Party. Such a man appeared, one of the greatest of Democratic leaders.

CHAPTER XXIV
HONESTY IN POLITICS AND IN GOVERNMENT UNDER CLEVELAND
1885-1889


The Fourteenth Democratic National Convention met at Chicago July 8, 1884, about one month after the Republicans had nominated Blaine. The call had been addressed to "all Democratic conservative citizens regardless of past political associations." Called to order by Chairman W. H. Barnum, Governor Richard H. Hubbard of Texas was made temporary chairman, William F. Vilas of Wisconsin permanent president.

The New York opposition to Grover Cleveland was aggressive from the first. When the routine motion to adopt the rules of the preceding convention came up, Grady of the Tammany forces, the whose reflection to the New York Senate Governor Cleveland had opposed, moved an amendment annulling the unit rule, the New York delegation, roughly estimated at 50, pro 22, anti-Cleveland, having been put under that rule by the state convention. Grady contended that the State convention could only instruct the delegates from the state at large, the district delegates being free to vote the sentiment of their districts. Bourke Cockran and Kelly supported his arguments while Fullon, supported by Bragg and Doolittle of Wisconsin, opposed. Their position was that by Democratic principles the state was the unit. The amendment was lost by a vote of 463 to 322. The vote seems to have been considerably influenced by the predilections of the delegates for or against Cleveland; Mississippi voted solidly aye, Louisiana nay, and several states tied.
The story of the Democratic party.

Building honesty under Cleveland