

the distinction of having the instructions of his state, having had no opponent, but only five of the sixteen delegates will vote for him from choice. The other eleven will either individually or through alternates vote for him because instructed to do so.

I cannot at this writing make any predictions regarding the platform. It is "In the lap of the Gods," as a prominent Democrat used to say of uncertain things. We are so far west that the time is against us and our reports have to be sent out considerably in advance of publication. I shall have an opportunity to discuss the platform later.

At this time the committee is divided into three factions on the liquor question, namely, the dries, who want an affirmative endorsement of the amendment and the enforcement code, the wets, who want a declaration in favor of wine and beer or a plank so worded as to suggest a modification of the enforcement law and the dodgers, who don't want to say anything at all. Of course the word "dodger" is an accusation and not an admission. Those who want to avoid any mention of the subject plea for harmony; they think that it will hurt the party to declare for or against prohibition. Men's opinions on this subject are likely to be colored by environment; those who live in wet cities argue that they can increase the Democratic vote by a wet plank; those who live in states where the sentiment is somewhat evenly divided want to avoid the subject, while those who live in dry territory feel that the party's chances will be improved by a dry plank. As there are 37 states dry by their own act, not to speak of dry congressional districts in wet states, the dries seem to have the best of the argument, both in principle and in policy.

FIGHT FOR DRY PLANK NOT IN VAIN

San Francisco, July 2.—It was a day of triumph for Senator Glass. Released from political obscurity by executive clemency, he sure was enjoying his parole. It's a great disadvantage to have come from up against such a personality. The issues sink into insignificance when delegates shrink from incurring his wrath. Secretary Colby seems to be more popular; his speech appeared to strike a more popular chord and the ovation which he received at the conclusion might delude those not acquainted with popular assemblies. But it was just seeming; his smile captures the groundlings and his politeness attracts what might easily be mistaken for respect, if not good will, but a real leader of the kind so perfectly typified by the Senator from Virginia does not rule by affability or even courtesy; he just dominates by his imperial will and by abject fear of what he may do to those who dared to think with any nullifying reservation.

The President was fortunate to find such a man to manage his convention campaign.

The fight on the dry and wet planks did not result in a victory for either side; my plank received something less than one-fifth of the votes and there was great joy among the followers of Mr. Glass when they found that the wet vote had given them such a preponderance; it must have distressed them to have been compelled to return so soon to the companionship of those who voted for my amendment. It is too early yet to gather up the explanations and analyze the vote. My resolution reads as follows:

"We heartily congratulate the Democratic party on its splendid leadership in the submission and ratification of the prohibition amendment to the federal constitution and we pledge the party to the effective enforcement of the present enforcement law, honestly and in good faith, without any increase in the alcoholic content of permitted beverages and without any weakening of any other of its provisions."

Some may have been unwilling to rejoice "heartily" for there were degrees in the joy felt by Democrats; and word "splendor" may have alienated some, for the splendor was not as dazzling to the wets as to the dries.

But the real trouble was that Mr. Glass and his co-laborers had carefully considered the situation and decided that silence would be the Napoleonic policy, on the theory that a wet has to be conciliated while a dry is not supposed to really feel such interest in the question anyhow. And he may be right. We have entered

upon a new era so different from the old that rules to which we have been accustomed may have been outgrown.

The fight for a dry plank was not in vain; it brought out the fact that the wets had only about one-third of the convention and that their votes came from a section which cannot possibly control a Democratic senate or house. The roll-call insures a dry congress.

The fight also disposed of a number of booms. Governor Edwards went onto the rocks; Governor Smith surrendered whatever chances he had; Governor Cox read the hand writing on the wall; Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, is the only wet candidate who suffered no loss. He has the sixteen votes from Nebraska, most of them voting for him because they have to, and two unexpectedly from the outside. If he can gain two votes on each ballot it would only take a few hundred ballots to carry him over.

PLATFORM AS ADOPTED EVADES MANY PROMINENT ISSUES

San Francisco, July 3.—The platform adopted by the Democratic convention, now before the country, is the most important subject for discussion. It is well written, covers many subjects, and is, except on a few controverted points, quite as good as could be expected. The writing of a platform is not an easy task. Straightforward statements of the party's position are always difficult to make on subjects that divide those within the party. The only easy thing to write is in denunciation of the opposition.

We have heard a great deal of the crusaders, and the very name stirs the heart and quickens the pulse. If those who control this convention are to be taken as the leaders of the party, Democrats will not be considered crusaders in this campaign. They are more likely to be branded as evaders. It may be worth while to note a few illustrations of the spirit of evasion that manifested itself.

First, the platform evades the liquor question; 155½ votes were cast for my resolution declaring positively in favor of the amendment and the enforcement law and opposing any increase in the alcoholic content or other weakening of the content. Three hundred and fifty-six voted for the Cockran amendment in favor of light wines and beer.

If the dry vote is added to the wet vote and then the total subtracted from the total vote cast for and against the wet plank (the total vote on the wet proposition was 1,082½, whereas the vote cast on the dry proposition was only 1,075) we find that 571 delegates voted against the planks. That is, the evaders outnumbered those who voted either for a dry plank or a wet plank. No matter what the reason was more than half of the convention refused to commit the party to either side of the liquor question. A few of these may have been wets, but nearly all of them were from dry states. It is easy to understand why the wets would vote against a dry plank, but the average man and woman will have difficulty in understanding the attitude of those who, altho themselves the advocates of prohibition, were afraid to express satisfaction in the Democratic party's leading part in the bringing of national prohibition. In 1868, 1872 and 1876 the Democratic party wrote into its platform a plank declaring its acceptance of the slavery amendments. It took three campaigns to assure the country that slavery was dead and that the Democratic party was opposed to revising it, and yet there was not a state in the union urging a reopening of the question.

We nominated a New York Democrat to run in each of these years mentioned. This year we have 356 delegates—almost one-third of the convention—clamoring for a reopening of the question, and yet the evaders try to excuse themselves by saying that the question is dead, and even denounce the dries for wanting to mention the subject in the platform.

The convention evaded the profiteering question also. As there was no roll call on the profiteering plank I have no way of knowing the exact number of evaders on this subject. As the act number of evaders have before them both readers of these articles have before them both the platform plank and my plank on this subject, they can, if they like, make comparison. To make the comparison more intelligently it will be well to first compare the Democratic plank on profiteering with the Republican plank. While not identical, the same tone runs through both. There is no attempt to indict the profiteers in terms that fit this crime. My

plank points out specific remedies, so that officials elected on such a platform would be bound to something specific. The men in control made no effort to take a single specific remedy mentioned in my plank and add it to theirs. They had full charge of the sub-committee and the full committee, and they had a large majority of the full convention, and they used it to force through a plank on profiteering which will not be satisfactory to the general public, because it offers no real hope of relief.

The evaders also dodged the question of universal compulsory military training. They contended that it was not an issue, but the real reason, as frankly stated by the committee, was that the secretary of war, having recommended a system of universal compulsory military training, a plank opposing such a system might seem like a rebuke to the president, altho the president asked the Democrats in the house of representatives to leave the subject for the national convention to deal with. It will be remembered that the house caucused on this subject. Notwithstanding the fact that the action seemed necessary, the president asked for a postponement with a view to leaving this to the convention to define the party's position on these subjects. The Democrats in the caucus declined to accede to the president's request and declared against universal compulsory military training by a vote of 106 to 17 and by so doing defeated the Republican program on this subject in the house.

The Republican leaders of the house, knowing that the Democratic vote added to the Republican vote against it, made success impossible, put it over to the next session.

A Republican committee in the senate reported a bill providing for universal compulsory military training at an estimated cost of \$7,000,000,000 a year. A poll of the Democratic senators was taken, and it was found that they were nearly all against the bill, the Republican leaders dropped the compulsory idea and substituted a provision for a voluntary system.

This was dropped in the conference. Now, in view of the facts above recorded, who will believe that universal compulsory training is not an issue being taken into consideration. But the evaders evaded it, and we go before the country with a platform that offers no protest to the Republican efforts to secure this dangerous and expensive innovation.

The convention evaded also any specific remedy for political corruption. The fact brought before the investigation committee developed into a scandal that made two of the Republican candidates unavailable. It was found that Governor Lowden had spent about \$375,000 of his own money on his candidacy and that General Wood had spent something like a million and a half of money subscribed by friends.

Here surely, was an opportunity to take advantage of popular indignation already rising because of the Newberry scandal, but the convention contents itself with denunciation without presenting any effective remedy.

I presented a very simple plank, approved by Hon. Vance McCormick, chairman of the Democratic national committee, in 1896. He has full knowledge of the manner in which our party is handicapped by the impossibility of getting our side before the public.

My amendment proposing a national bulletin was defeated in the resolutions committee by only one majority, but it was shouted down by the convention after Chairman Glass and Secretary Colby had heaped scorn upon it.

In the committee my provision for an investigating commission patterned after our treaty plan and having in view publicity without binding the parties to accept the report, was voted down. We go before the country with a labor plank that does not suit Mr. Gompers and which does not contain any definite plan for the protection of the general public, who, while not directly interested in a strike or lockout, suffer from all strikes and lockouts.

Here again the evaders carried out their policy. But the greatest triumph of the evaders was won on what they call their paramount issue. They ask the country to endorse the party's position on ratification when they deliberately evade the real issue. The plank as originally proposed declares for ratification without surrendering any essential provisions. This, of course, is indefinite. The party is expected to make a fight for a thing which nobody