

well understand that there is a difference in the party as to principles and policies, and that the platform will represent the views of those who control the convention. If a change has taken place in the views of democrats, then a change ought to take place in the general character of the platform, but Senator Rayner does not indicate that any change has taken place in the views of democrats. He asserts that the platforms written by the rank and file of the party and satisfactory to the rank and file were bad and indefensible and that we must have different platforms—platforms written from an opposite point of view. In other words, now that we have had three defeats on platforms with which the democrats were pleased, we must try to win a victory upon platforms that the democrats do not like but which will be satisfactory to "we," us and company, who are to "rise in our might."

It is a matter for the voters. Senator Rayner asks: "Will Mr. Bryan and his followers permit the democratic party to nominate a president of the United States and to send to the party a platform of its own construction?" That is not the only question that may be asked between now and the convention. Will Senator Rayner and his followers permit the democratic party to nominate a president of the United States and to send to the party a platform of its own construction? Or will he and his followers rise in their might and insist upon a platform entirely different from the platforms that we have had? Will they insist upon a candidate who did not support the ticket in 1896? Have we no men fit for the nomination among the six and a half millions who voted the ticket that year?

These and similar questions will be considered by the voters, and when they have acted we shall see whether the democrats who defeated the democratic party in its former campaigns will go out and defeat it again.

Practical Tariff Talks

The cotton hosiery schedule is another one wherein is illustrated the truth of the oft-repeated charge that the tariff bears heaviest upon the cheapest grades of goods, the kind the ordinary individual buys. Under the Dingley law cotton hosiery costing less than \$1 a dozen (wholesale) were taxed 67.11 per cent. Under the Payne-Aldrich law these bear a tariff duty of 87.95 per cent. Stockings costing \$1.50 per dozen were taxed under the old law at 58.32 per cent, and are now taxed at 76.37 per cent. Stockings costing from \$1.50 to \$2 a dozen taxed at 51.41 per cent; now they are taxed 61.81 per cent. These are the three grades most generally sold in the stores all over this country, retailing at 25, 35 and 50 cents a pair. There was no pretense of downward revision on this schedule. For a good many years the stocking industry had prospered in this country. Figures presented to congress listed a dozen or more factories that had more than doubled their net worth under the operations of the Dingley law. When the tariff-making was on last year these besieged congress for an increase, claiming that their principal competitors, the Germans, had developed to a point where their competition menaced the American industry. Turning to the figures, however, it will be seen that the importations amounted to only about 11 per cent of the total used in America.

The percentages given above mean this: That the ordinary stocking retailing at 25 cents a pair pays a duty of 7 cents, a raise in cost of about 2 cents a pair. The average foreign price for these is \$1.00 a dozen pairs. The duty and freight and insurance add 90 cents a dozen. If there was no duty the importer could lay these down in this country at 85 cents less a dozen than it now costs him. But here the republican doctrine of protection steps in. It says: "Let us give this 85 cents to the manufacturer so as to encourage him to go into the business. He can, if he so wills, divide part of it among his workmen in the shape of larger wages than foreign stocking makers get and the remainder he may keep to build himself up to a point where he can meet his competitors on an even footing." Under the Dingley law, which gave 65 cents a dozen protection, the business developed wonderfully, while the imports fell off. The government figures prove this. The domestic output in 1900 was \$27,000,000; in 1905, \$43,000,000; in 1908, about \$56,000,000. The

imports in 1908 were \$6,600,000, almost the same as twenty years ago, while in 1900 they were as low as \$4,000,000. Thus the business more than doubled in eight years while the proportion of importations decreased one-half in twenty years. This shows the ridiculous side again of the protectionist claim that a tariff can ever build an industry up to the point where it will stand on its own bottom. The larger the growth of the stocking industry, the more protection it has demanded. And it got it. The result is that where the price of stockings has not been advanced the quality has deteriorated.

One of the things they urged before congress was that a number of the mills in this country had been forced to close because of German competition. It was shown by the opposition a little later that the mills that closed were some that had run too close to the financial shore during the 1907 panic, while the major part of them were mills that were equipped to make special styles, such as fancy and embroidered hosiery, which had been displaced in the popular fancy by solid plain colors. It was also shown, apparently to the satisfaction of the senate, which reduced the hosiery schedule to the same figures as provided in the Dingley law, but later receded to the house demand for an increase, that the greater part of the pressure for an increase came from the manufacturers of seamless hosiery. All of the seamless or full-fashioned hosiery used in this country is made here, and the increase was asked to protect against any foreign makers of that class of goods getting a foothold here. C. Q. D.

"PAYNEFUL"

W. T. Gates, Flemington, W. Va.,— Dear Mr. Owen: It is Payneful to know the people do not rule, it is Payneful to know they do not get what they want. It is also Payneful to know they do not get what they are promised. Bill Nye once said he knew a family who were never known to be sick, because they were known by every one as Calledwells. If Bill was with us today I feel he could see signs of small Paynes in this well family.

ACUTE ON ONE SIDE

The World-Herald says that county option is not an acute issue, and in a labored editorial protests against its being brought into this state campaign. Strange how one-sided the acuteness is. Those who are opposed to county option tell us, in one breath, that nobody cares anything about the question and that it is highly improper for any democrat to suggest that it be discussed at the state convention, and in the next breath they tell us that the issue is so important that our party will be overwhelming defeated if it declares for county option. If it is not an important issue why should democrats leave the party because the party takes a position on the subject? If it is an immaterial matter we can not lose many votes, no matter which way the party declares. If a great many people leave the party in case the party adopts a county option platform it means that it is an important question and therefore it is important that the party's position shall be the correct one.

There is no doubt that the liquor interests regard the question as acute. Mr. Bryan has abundant evidence of that. One man, writing on the letter head of a distillery, says: "As you will note by the letter head I am in the employ of a distilling company and have been for the last fourteen years, therefore am in position to do my own thinking as to the best manner in which to handle the liquor traffic." Of course he has a right to do his own thinking, but one might question whether he is in a position to decide fairly and impartially. In the courts the man who has a pecuniary interest in the result of a suit is not allowed to serve on the jury. The distillery employe concludes: "I can not support you in this movement and if you persist in forcing a county option plank into the democratic platform when the hopes of victory are so brilliant I will never support you in the future."

Would he be less indignant about it if the chances of victory were less brilliant? Here is a difference of opinion. Is not the distillery employe trying to force county option OUT of the platform? Mr. Bryan, while not a distillery

employe, is also in a position to do his own thinking and he thinks county option ought to be endorsed. He is doing all he can on that side and the distillery employe is doubtless doing all he can to induce the party to take the distillery side. It remains to be seen which will have the satisfaction of being with the majority at the state convention.

FROM A REPUBLICAN PAPER

The Nebraska City (Neb.) Press offers this editorial: "William J. Bryan has placed himself on record as being unalterably opposed to the democratic party being the tail-end of a brewers' procession, a worthy stand on the part of any man, whether he be democrat or republican. Mr. Bryan knows far better than his most bitter enemies that the stand he has taken is one of the most unpopular moves a man in public life ever made. But it will soon be time for Mr. Bryan to laugh, even as at this present moment he has a perfect right to smile. The democratic party, in order to be saved from the rocks of party disruption, must cut loose from the domination of the liquor interests. The big leaders know it, the press is talking it, and there are plenty of signs in the air that eventually Bryan will have been proven correct in his statements. The day has passed when any intelligent body of men can be herded like sheep and be marched to the polls and vote for a continuation of a policy which has done so much to put politics in bad repute. Mr. Bryan has not lost any of his cunning; we do not know that he has espoused the temperance cause through any designing purpose—we do know that he is right, and in this instance, as in many others, right will finally prevail."

State of North Dakota, Supreme Court, Chambers of John Carmody, Associate Justice, Hillsboro, N. D., July 8, 1910.— The Commoner, Lincoln, Neb. Gentlemen: I will now, as I have in the past, do everything that I possibly can to elect good, real democrats to congress and not corporation democrats. In fact, I had rather see a republican elected than a corporation democrat. Will do everything I can to advance the interests of The Commoner. With best wishes, I remain. Sincerely yours, JOHN CARMODY.

SELF-INTEREST OR INTERFERENCE?

If a man tell you that he is opposed to county option, ask him why he objects to allowing the people of a county to vote on the liquor question. If he says he is afraid his own county will go dry ask him whether it is his own thirst or his sympathy for others who are thirsty that makes him willing to deny to the people the right to le. If a man opposes county option because he is afraid his county will go dry he confesses that he is interested in defeating the will of the majority of his county on this subject. But suppose he says he is not afraid of his county going dry? What is his attitude then? It is that he is not content to have saloons in his own county but insists upon forcing them upon counties that do not want them. Isn't this attempting too much? The man who wants a saloon near him—but not too near—merely that he may have a place to drink ought to be content with county option. The saloon is on the retreat; it has enough to do to get a license anywhere—it will overtax its strength if it tries to go everywhere.

The man who opposes county option will have to meet the question: Are you fighting for saloons because you want them in your county or because you want to compel counties to permit saloons against the will of the people? Is it self interest or interference—which?

THE COMMONPLACE

"A commonplace life," we say, and we sigh; But why should we sigh as we say? The commonplace sun in the commonplace sky Makes up the commonplace day. The moon and the stars are commonplace things, And the flower that blooms and the bird that sings; But dark were the world and sad our lot If the flowers failed and the sun shone not; And God, who studies each separate soul, Out of commonplace lives makes His beautiful whole. —Susan Coolidge.