have confused some of the dry states with the wet ones, for the moist area seemed to be quite extensive, but the vote on the wine and beer amendment showed that it was a mirage so to speak, that attracted them.

The west and south are so much opposed to any increase in the alcoholic content that Governor Cox's prospects are not quoted very high on the market.

Mrs. Peter Oleson who spoke for ten minutes in favor of the dry amendment made a hit with the audience. She is a womanly little woman —feminine in appearance and manner. When she speaks there is a ring of sincerity and she wins her hearers by a rare combination of heart power and lively intellect. She captured the audience and not only aided the cause, but gave to the wets a glimpse of what they must expect when the women enter politics in mass. It would be a very bold wet who would undertake to speak from the same platform with Mrs. Oleson.

Honorable Bourke Cockran of New York delighted his hearers as usual. Cockran is a great orator; he has a wonderful vocabulary and he impresses his audience with his sincerity, even when his logic limps and his statements are contradictory. I became acquainted with him in congress; we were on the Ways and Means committee together 26 years ago and led the fight on the income tax bill, he opposing the tax and I favoring it. He won out at the time but he is now paying ten or fifteen times the rate provided for in that bill. All his arguments in that fight are gone onto the dump.

It was interesting to hear him denounce prohibition as destructive of temperance and virtue and then read the resolution which he introduced declaring in favor of acceptance of the Eighteenth amendment. If prohibition is the evil that he claims, why accept it? The seeming inconsistency, however, was partially cleared up when he insisted that the amendment is not being enforced. Possibly he feels that temperance and virtue will still survive in the wet centers because the amendment is not enforced.

But a still stranger inconsistency appeared in his eulogy of the south. He gave the south a great deal of credit for having violated as he said the Fifteenth amendment in dealing with the blacks. It did not seem to occur to him that the intelligence of the south might be as worthy to be accepted as an authority on the prohibition question as on the race question. And isn't it strange that such a brain as Cockran's would overlook so striking a difference as that between what the whites did in the south and what the liquor interests do in the north? In the south the whites have given the blacks the benefit of the white man's civilization, while in the north those engaged in the liquor traffic have tried to drag civilization down to a beer level.

It will be interesting to note the reception given to the delegates from dry states when they return to their own neighborhood and explain why they voted against an expression of pride in the Democratic party's leadership in the fight against the saloon. It is the one great achievement of the party of which some of the leaders seem to be ashamed. But never mind, enough has been said and done here to make it certain that the Democratic party will not act as a bung starter for the wets or a door mat for the saloons. That's something even if we did not succeed in putting the dry standard in the party's hands during this campaign. The next National Convention will be very different from this; the mortality (political, of course) among the Democrats to this convention is likely to be great during the next four years.

DEMOCRACY'S WEALTH OF PRESIDENTIAL MATERIAL

San Francisco, July 4.—The political pot is boiling, and, as it boils, a little water is thrown out from time to time—it would seem to be thrown out if it were wine and beer instead of water. The favorite sons are being deserted. Senator Hitchcock released the sixteen delegates from Nebraska after the fifth ballot and they were left free to vote as they wished. The two additional votes that he gained from the other states were also released. Senator Glass's support continues steadfast. His state is standing by him like a Trojan at the battle's front. At times, when enthusiasm was at its height, as many as three delegates have rushed to his standard from other states, raising his total to twenty-seven. In all the twenty-two ballots his vote has never at any time fallen below twenty-five.

But what a libel the leaders are writing against the Democratic party when they give the impression that we have only a few men fit for the presidency! They seem to be patterning after the president who found but one man in the whole Democratic party worthy of his entire confidence—and he has gone to Europe just at this critical time.

Every state in the union could furnish a man, several of them, capable of discharging the duties of president. The Democratic party cannot afford to admit that any people's government is dependent or its success upon one or a few men. If a president's availability was measured by the size of his pocketbook we would be at a disadvantage compared with the Republicans; if a president's availability were measured by the number of rich friends the Republican party would have the best of us. If a string of college degrees were necessary to qualify a man for this high position, the Republicans might have an advantage over us, although we have quite a list to choose from. If, however, our president does not have to be tested by an income tax standard, or qualify for purely intellectual work; if the country needs a man with a heart behind the brain and broad sympathies as well as a string of diplomas, we can enter more candidates in the race than any other party in the world. Why not get down to business and select a Democrat who can win? He must be a man who believes in co-operation in government—a man who when he sees the word "we" in the constitution is not seized with an irresistible impulse to change it to "I". We need a candidate who will gather about him the best Democrats in the country and counsel with them—willing to listen before he decides. While the responsibility for decision falls upon the president and cannot be delegated in any matter where he is authorized to act alone, he must recognize all the provisions of the constitution—not merely those that confer power upon him.

If we want such a president as our constitution contemplates and the American people desire, we need not waste any more time for the name of such men is legion. Our present president received his training for the white house when he was Governor of New Jersery, and a great many of our presidents have gone from governor to president. Why not take a Democratic governor or ex-governor? Governor Joseph W. Folk of Missouri—ex-governor—has been a reformer for 20 years and is today one of our leading international lawyers. Hon. Thomas M. Campbell of Texas has been governor of his state and a splendid governor, too, and Texas is larger than New Jersey. Governor Campbell is a delegate at large from his state, chosen by an overwhelming majority in his late state convention. He stands four-square on every great question before the people.

Governor Brough of Arkansas went from the presidency of the Arkansas State University into the governor's chair. He is a strong, vigorous young man, and is a leader in every great reform. Why not Brough? Either Campbell or Brough could poll more votes in any northern state than any candidate who stands for rum or Wall street.

If the convention insists on a candidate who has no record as an advocate of prohibition before the national amendment was submitted, but who can be trusted to keep his oath of office and enforce prohibition now that it is in the constitution and on the statute books, there is ex-Governor Glynn of New York, and what is the matter with Senator Walsh of Massachusetts? Governor Glynn made the hit of the convention at St. Louis four years ago, and Senator Walsh is one of the big progressive Democrats in the Senate.

If we want a great jurist, why not go to the Supreme Court of the United States and invite Justice Brandies to head the ticket? No American citizen is more idealistic, no constructive statesman more practical, and no one in the nation more passionately devoted to constitutional liberty.

Then there is Judge Seabury of New York, who was a few years ago honored with the Democratic nomination for governor of the empire state, and who had the courage to speak out against the recent Democratic state convention's declaration in favor of nullifying the Volstead law by state statute. The Supreme Court sustained his contention.

Honorable Samuel Untermeyer of New York has been a promising Democrat for a quarter of a century and is one of the ablest lawyers in the United States. Ex-Senator Shafroth of Colorado made a splendid record in congress and in the senate. He came into the Democratic party in 1896 when old Democrats were leaving us, and has been a tower of strength to our party ever since. If we could trade Democrats that left us in 1896 for Republicans like Shafroth who came to us, the party could well afford to make the exchange at the sacred ratio of 16 of such Democrats to one such Republican.

If we prefer to go to the house of representatives, Congressman H. T. Rainey of Central Illinois deserves consideration. He has a long congressional record and has been the people's champion for more than two decades. If he were our candidate, he would be a sufficient amendment to the anti-profiteering plank of our platform.

There are other governors and ex-governors, judges and ex-judges, lawyers, senators and ex-senators, congressmen and ex-congressmen. I only mention these to show how many we have —samples of an inexhaustible supply. But suppose we want to try the experiment of nominating a business man instead of a man in politics. Hon. L. B. Musgrove of Alabama came near defeating Senator Underwood a few weeks ago. He is a successful business man and had the support of the undeceived drys (those who knew that the wets were planning to capture if possible the national convention while they begged the drys to believe that the question was settled) and the wage earners. He reduced Mr. Underwood's plurality from something like 40,000 to considerably less than 10,000, and his majority to less than 1,000, notwithstanding Mr. Underwood's long legislative career and his present position as leader of the minority in the senate.

Col. P. H. Callahan of Kentucky is another prosperous business man who enjoys a national reputation without occupying a national office. He has been conspicuous for his leadership in co-operation with employes, and in profit-sharing.

Remember that these men do not exclude others; they are simply illustrations of our wealth of available men. I have already spoken of Senator Owen, whose name is before the convention. He is a Virginian by birth, a western man for a quarter of a century, and better acquainted with all financial questions than any Wall street authority. He led the fight in the senate for the currency law which was enacted over the opposition of the financiers and which has vindicated itself in operation. He has been a pioneer in prohibition and woman's suffrage and he is against all the schemes of Wall street —he would not deserve to be considered as a candidate if he was not.

If the leaders of this convention want someone closely connected with the administration, why don't they support Secretary Daniels, or Secretary Meredith? The former supertintended the transportation of the troops across the ocean with a minimum of loss, and the latter is in close contact with one of the largest of our industrial groups, the farmers. Both have prohibition records; both are supporters of woman suffrage; both are on the people's side against Wall street. Why not Honorable John Skelton Williams the best comptroller of the currency the country ever had?

If we need a man with special knowledge of our diplomatic needs, the names of Former Ambassador Gerard of New York and Former Ambassador Sharpe of Ohio occur to one. The former was at Berlin during the pre-war period, and the latter at Paris while the war raged. If all of the above names are challenged for cause and rejected, I shall be glad to furnish another list longer than this, although I cannot promise to name better men.

Will the leaders of the convention longer evade the issues of the campaign? Will they come out into the open and give the Democratic party a chance to appeal to the American people? It used to be said in criticism of barbarians that they carried women and children in front of the army to prevent attack. Is it less reprehensible for political warriors to shoot from behind a sick bed? They have no monopoly of sympathy for the President. The nation regardless of section or party mourns the President's affliction and their grief is increased because the President has been compelled to present his case through the substitutes upon which

Continued on Page 16