

to the general public as well as justice to employers and employees?

#### COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS OPENS HEARINGS ON PLATFORM PLANKS

San Francisco, June 30.—The second day of the convention is seldom exciting. The accumulated enthusiasm expends itself in the first demonstration. The noise comes when the bottle is uncorked, so to speak, and the second day is largely a matter of routine. Permanent Chairman Robinson gave in his own language, which is always well chosen, a review of the party's splendid economic record, following much the same line of Chairman Cumming's speech. His remarks about the senate elicited one of the most enthusiastic of the outbursts of applause. He disappointed the dries by not making any reference to the subject of prohibition, a matter the more surprising because he comes from a bone dry state and represents a constituency that has grown more and more firm in its opposition to intoxicants.

The session was entirely formal beyond the delivery of the speech, there being no volunteer or called out speeches. The second day is usually employed as a sort of gala day; prominent Democrats are called out to stir enthusiasm by a recital of the glorious deeds of the party and by prophecies as to what we are going to do to the enemy. There is no time in a politician's life when victory and the offices that come with it loom larger than they do on the second day of a convention. The set speeches being couched in language more or less cautious, the audience has to rely upon the extemporaneous speakers to wave the flag and pull the tail feathers out of the eagle with real abandon. Too bad that such a splendid opportunity is wasted, for it must be remembered that those present have been fighting for tickets for weeks. They have been writing to everybody they knew that had a push or a pull. The convention gives the man with influence a great opportunity to demonstrate to his friends how near he is to the throne. It isn't fair for a convention to have a short session on the second day with as many rhetorical flowers blooming in the prepared speeches that are already delivered extemporaneously.

While the convention was proceeding in the auditorium the resolutions committee was affording to quite a promiscuous group of petitioners an opportunity to lay before the committee in open session the subject on their hearts. Samuel Gompers, the veteran president of the American Federation of Labor, presented the claims of those for whom he has so long spoken. He spoke earnestly as he always does and made a very favorable impression on the committee. He will have more reason to rejoice here than he had in Chicago.

Prohibition was the second subject taken up and no one who was present will be beguiled any longer by those who have been predicting that the subject will be ignored. It was very apparent from the first moment that this is the question upon which there is most feeling. I had the honor of apportioning the time among those who spoke in favor of a dry plank and was satisfied with the showing made. Bishop Cannon of the Methodist Church South, a typical Virginia Democrat, dwelt upon the party's part in this great moral victory and appealed to the committee to gratify those who had made this long and successful fight by an assurance that there would be no return to alcoholic drinks. Mr. Hall spoke for the Presbyterians and other church boards. Mr. Silsby presented an appeal from the bone dry organization, and Mr. Needham presented a formidable package of petitions from the prohibition party. Mrs. Yost, the National Legislative representative of the Women's Christian Temperance Union spoke earnestly for nearly one million women in that organization. Ex-Congressman Hobson (Richmond Pearson) made an eloquent arraignment of alcohol and begged the Democratic party to do its duty to the nation and give hope to the world by a strong declaration in favor of the enforcement of the amendment. Honorable Wayne B. Wheeler, representing 22 national prohibition organizations, concluded the arguments for our side. As general counsel of the Anti-Saloon League he has defended prohibition legislation in all of the higher courts and, if a lawyer's reputation stands upon his success, he has no superior as a constitutional lawyer. He presented a terrific arraignment of the liquor traffic and marshalled such an array of facts to

prove the success of prohibition as to overwhelm the opposition.

The liquor side was in charge of Congressman Sabath of Chicago. He introduced as the first speaker on their side Honorable Theodore Bell who made the usual argument in favor of personal liberty. As his speech was directed against all prohibitory laws it weakened rather than strengthened the arguments of those who had been trying to make it appear that the wet side accepted the saloon issue as closed and urged only a modification of the law for the benefit of home drinkers. As the press dispatches will probably carry, the colloquy between him and myself I need not dwell upon it further than to express my satisfaction at having an opportunity to answer publicly a misrepresentation that has been circulated privately.

Mr. Gompers was called upon to deny a published report to the effect that the labor meeting at Montreal had turned down a wine and beer proposition. The committee was assured that the subject was not mentioned at Montreal.

New York's great orator, Bourke Cockran, closed the debate for the wets by inveighing his customary vehemence against any attempt to promote temperance by law. As did Mr. Bell he made his assault against the amendment, as well as against its enforcement and thus confirmed the opinion of those who insist that a question cannot be dismissed as settled so long as the opponents of the law assail it so vigorously. Taken all in all the hearing very much encouraged the dries and increases the probability of a dry plank in the platform. There are probably 300 delegates in the convention who would trade their views on every other question for a wet plank and go home happy in the belief that the Democratic party can carry the election by an appeal to the throats of the drinkers and the pockets of those who want to go into the business rather than by arguments that appeal to the heart and the conscience. But with woman suffrage in sight the delegates know that a wet plank would be suicidal. The real contest is between the dries and the dodgers.

A number of other subjects were presented, among them agriculture, education and the Irish question. And I might add in this connection that here, as at Chicago, the women have surely justified their claim to equal consideration. Last night the League of Women Voters presented a battery of speakers that would be hard to match.

Senator Phelan and Mr. McClatchy of Sacramento appeared before the committee in behalf of more rigid Japanese exclusion, the latter with statistics and the former with a masterful digest of the situation. Those who have heard the senator before say that this is the most powerful address he has made on the subject. It showed him to be an effective speaker as well as acquainted with the subject.

The greatest personal victory yet won in this convention was scored by a young Filipino by the name of Jose T. Melencia. He has charge of the Philippine Publicity Bureau at Washington. He is only 26 years old and received his education in the public schools of the Philippines—under American teachers as he proudly boasted—and at Georgetown, (D. C.). He is a remarkably promising young man. Speaking with grace, using the best language and without a trace of embarrassment he presented the claim of the Filipinos to independence. The audience was astonished at the strength of his argument, the skill with which he marshalled his facts and the high tone of his speech. He captivated everyone and committeemen and visitors paid him the compliment of rising and cheering when he concluded his plea. When one of the committee asked him some question he returned to the platform and answered them with as much logic and precision as if he had taken weeks to prepare his answer. It was a remarkable triumph. As one who began 22 years ago to fight for the promise of independence I was proud of this illustration of what the Filipino is capable of.

One of the committeemen expressed some irritation at the amount of time that had been devoted to the hearings. I explained to him that we who were not on the subcommittee charged with the preparation, or at least with the reporting, or the formal draft of the platform, had nothing else to do for the present and could gather a good deal of information while awaiting the action of our superiors, adding that our position was illustrated by a story. An agricultural college instructor was enlight-

ening a rural audience as to scientific farming. In the course of his remarks he explained that corn, boiled before being fed, could be digested by the hog in half the time it took to digest raw corn. When this important fact had been made clear the professor was somewhat disconcerted by a question put to him by a farmer on the front row. "What's a hog's time worth, anyhow?"

#### NOMINATING DAY BRINGS ARRAY OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

San Francisco, July 1.—Yesterday was an interesting day for the spectators; in one respect nomination day takes the lead over all the others. There is more chance for speaking and the demonstrations are spectacular. The four big demonstrations were those that followed the presentation of the names of Palmer, Cox, Smith of New York, and McAdoo. A demonstration when properly staged, as most of the demonstrations for the leading candidates are, includes several features. The orator who presents the name reserves it for the last. Sometimes they have been known to forget the name, whereupon the audience demands his name. More frequently, however, the calls, "name him!" come earlier. In fact, the speaker is very likely to be reminded of the eagerness of the audience if he is either proxy or long, and he doesn't do his candidate any good by continuing after he has received such an admonition from the audience. I have known the contest between the audience and the speaker to continue for sometime, but I have never known the speaker to get the best of the controversy.

The Palmer demonstration came first and was very creditable. Next came the Cox demonstration. It seemed to be the best organized of any of them, but it was nearly all organization. His supporters attempted the usual parade. Encouraged by a splendid band the procession was formed with a beautiful Ohio banner at the front. The Ohio delegation followed with enthusiasm, but to the surprise of the audience only three other states joined in and it soon became apparent that the bulk of the marchers were drawn from the uniformed club that came from Ohio. Groups had been planted around through the galleries and they made all the noises that they possibly could, and the yell leader mounted the platform and gave an exhibition of the athletics which can be mingled with a college yell. There was no general participation either on the part of the delegates or the audience and it soon transformed itself from demonstration to general confusion.

The Smith demonstration was as surprising as the Cox demonstration was disappointing. Bourke Cockran presented the name of the New York governor with all the force at his command, and that is very considerable and the audience quite generally rose with New York and yelled as if they seemed to mean it. Soon the standards of the states began to fall in after New York and New Jersey—for New Jersey was scarcely less enthusiastic than the Empire State.—Soon practically every state standard was in line, and the delegates marched and sang until the aisles were so crowded that the marchers fell into the lock step and the line swayed to and fro as it moved its serpentine length along. I do not know how to explain the difference between the Smith demonstration and that given to Palmer and Cox unless it is that the latter being active candidates, the friends of other aspirants feared that a demonstration might be hurtful to their own choice whereas in the case of Governor Smith they thought it would compliment him without aiding his chances.

The McAdoo demonstration surpassed all the others in extent and heartiness. It was more general and was apparently spontaneous. There were no evidences of prearrangement. Mr. Jenkins of Kansas City made no speech in presenting him. He simply announced the intention of Mr. McAdoo's supporters to vote for him. This was a disappointment to the audience for they had been keyed up to a high pitch of expectation and were looking for a great speech.

Among the other names presented, with applause more local were Senator Owen of Oklahoma, Secretary Meredith of Iowa, Chairman Cummings of Connecticut and Senator Hitchcock of Nebraska, James W. Gerard, and Gov. Edwards of New Jersey. The last named has