

fiar rules they had adopted for its guidance, and they could have defeated Mr. Bryan without one speech in reply to his. But that did not suit the purposes of the managers of that famous convention. There were a lot of little fellows who wanted to talk and who were anxious to strike at him now that a whole lot of others were holding him—a whole lot of little fellows who were not worthy to lace the shoes of the man they had the honor of assailing. As I saw Bryan after a hard day, a weary night and a long speech, totter down the aisle of that convention hall, as I listened to the unnecessary attacks made upon him and heard the ribald jests which greeted those attacks, they reminded me for all the world of the jabbering of a lot of jay-birds pecking at a wounded eagle.

SINCERITY ON BOTH SIDES

I do not believe that any considerable number of the men at that convention realized what they were doing. It is one thing to oppose prohibition or county option; it is quite another thing to be in favor of surrendering a party to the control of the liquor interests. I give to the rank and file of democrats whom we commonly call "wet" the same credit for sincerity, for honesty and for patriotism that I give to the democrats commonly called "dry." All I ask is that the respect I show to the opinions of others may be shown to my opinion. I do not believe these men are in favor of surrendering our party machinery and our party's fate into the merciless keeping of the most obnoxious of all the special interests, and when they know the truth I believe they will join with other democrats in relieving the party from that blight.

My old friend, Edgar Howard—I say my old friend, Edgar Howard—printed in his newspaper, the Columbus Telegram, an editorial from which I take the following extract:

"The remarkable personal popularity of Mr. Bryan in all sections of the nation—the acceptance of his principles by the legislatures of states and by the congress of the republic, the recent affirmation of those principles by the supreme court of the union—the paling and falling one by one of statesmen stars whose effulgence had but recently illumined the skies of Bryan opposition—all combine to make conspicuous the fact that if in this hour the democracy of his own home state should be called upon to choose delegates to the national convention, the delegates would be selected from the ranks of those who stand in open opposition to Mr. Bryan and his cause and such a delegation would spit upon progressive principle and do all possible to nominate for the presidency a stand-pat democrat at enmity with every progressive principle. This is a humiliating confession, but the situation warrants its making."

"WHERE'S THE FOLKS?"

If this is an accurate description of the situation, then the sooner the democrats of Nebraska understand it the better it will be. A Nebraska delegation to a national convention without Bryan, or a Nebraska platform without Bryanism, would not be nearly so humiliating to Mr. Bryan as to Nebraska. It is entirely certain that such a delegation would find itself without standing in a national convention.

The father of a family of a dozen children had such a high appreciation of the importance of the wife and mother of his home that whenever he entered the house and noted the absence of his fine helpmeet, although all the other members of the family were present, he invariably asked, "Where's the folks?" Some such question would very likely greet the thirty-two men who, as delegates and alternates, should undertake to represent the Nebraska democrats at a national convention with the greatest living democrat reclining in the shadows of Fairview.

Is it not a ridiculous picture? And being so, should not democrats who agree upon these great national questions, differing though they do upon some other questions; take their stand in solid phalanx behind Bryan and Bryanism, no longer the subject of sneers and jeers, but the man honored and respected wherever the word liberty has been lisped and the principle endorsed by the very men who once derided it?

"THEORETICALLY"

Theoretically, the democratic party is perfectly in harmony with the foundations upon which our government has been built; and the democratic party, with its heart-beat keeping time to the music of democracy is worthy of every service and every sacrifice. But the democratic party as the agent of special interests is unworthy a single act of service or a single deed of sacrifice. In the language of another, it is

like the man who "kneels at the foot of the cross but worships the impenitent thief." Let us in Nebraska, "with malice toward none, with charity for all," build our party so that it shall be worthy the honored name it bears.

PARTY LEADERS

I read, a few days ago, in an Omaha newspaper, an editorial entitled "Party Leaders." From that editorial I take this extract:

"Lincoln was not made the leader of the republican party by any formal action. He was such a leader long before he was nominated for president, and would have continued to be a leader if Seward had been chosen to head the ticket instead of him. It was the evolution of things and his great ability that made him a leader. In the evolution that is now in progress, the unerring judgment of the common people will select a democratic leader."

I will now read to you an editorial that appeared a few days ago in the Boston Journal, a republican paper. Here it is:

"When Colonel Bryan paid his first visit to Boston he was regarded by the east in general as a dangerous agitator. Now he is welcomed as a leader of a movement which, to a large extent has abolished party lines and done away with the ultra-conservatism which brooked no concessions to liberal ideas. He has not been successful as a candidate for the presidency, but he has seen the movement which he did so much to start become the dominant force in American politics."

It will occur to a great many people that a party does not have to search very far for a real leader when it has a man who, defeated three times for the presidency and without any office or administration through which to impress his views upon the public, has yet exerted such influence upon his countrymen that, according to the testimony of a newspaper politically opposed to him, he has seen the principles for which he has fought "become the dominant force in American politics."

On this question of leadership: Sometimes skilful politicians and even newspaper editors don't recognize a leader when they see him. Sometimes even some of those who follow a man do not realize that he is a real leader. They follow him reluctantly, and they follow him because he is going in the right direction and they can't help it. We had an example of this a few days ago in the United States senate, when one of our distinguished guests, Senator Owen of Oklahoma, showed that he was a real leader of men in the magnificent fight he made for Arizona's admission. He fought for the right. Doubtless there were some who supported him who did not really want to do it, but he was a leader because he was going in the right direction and they could not help but follow him. God had joined Senator Owen to a holy cause.

And that which God has joined together—not even my old friend Bill Dech can put asunder.

IN THE HEARTS OF THE PEOPLE

You don't always look at official rosters in searching for the name of a leader. Sometimes you even skip the editorial columns of great newspapers, for sometimes even the editors don't know. There are times when, in searching for the name of a leader, you look into the hearts of the people. I feel that I am looking into the hearts of the people now, and I think I see a name written there. Bryan is the name; and just below that name I see, in letters of living light, the words, grown through a quarter of century of American politics, "He has made a good fight; he has kept the faith; and he has not finished his course."

"The king is dead!" cry the representatives of special interests in Nebraska; and from the very heart of a now thoroughly awakened people comes the answer, "Long live the king!"

NOT CONSTITUTIONAL

Los Angeles, Cal., March 25, 1911—Dear Commoner: As an admiring reader of your paper, I take the liberty to ask your authority for the statement in the first column of the last issue: "The judge's right to declare a law unconstitutional is not an inherited right. It is granted by the constitution." What constitution? When? Where? My limited reading has led me to believe that right so far from being inherited or granted was usurped by John Marshall in 1803 in Marbury vs. Madison, and followed up by his decision in 1809 in U. S. vs. Peters, in 1819 by McCulloch vs. Maryland, and in 1821, by Cohens vs. Virginia. Am I wrong about this? Yours very truly,

852 W. 47th St.

J. H. RYCKMAN.

Practical Tariff Talks

The speech of Chairman Payne, of the house ways and means committee, one of the sponsors of the present tariff law, is to be distributed by the thousands in the coming campaign. The republicans regard it as excellent campaign material. If Mr. Payne were entirely truthful, this might prove to be the case. But the facts are against most of his contentions. Take the matter of stockings. In his speech, Mr. Payne says that "of certain sizes two-thirds of all the stockings worn by women and children in the country were made in Germany." There is nothing in the records to prove this assertion, but much to disprove it. The total consumption of stockings in this country annually is 360,000,000 pairs. Of this number more than 250,000,000 are worn by the women and children. The total imports of all kinds and all grades for the year 1907, the last figures available, were 61,000,000 pairs. If all of these came from Germany or abroad, then five-sixths of what we use were made at home. How then, can what Mr. Payne stated be true?

The truth is the stocking schedule is outrageous. Half of the total importation of stockings were of the cheaper kinds, those costing at wholesale \$1 per dozen or less. Over 46 per cent of the remainder were of the next two grades, the \$1.50 and \$2 per dozen kind. These are the grades that sell for fifteen and twenty-five cents a pair at retail. The tariff on the higher grade stockings was already prohibitive. The reason why the tariff was raised nearly two cents a pair on the 57,000,000 pairs of cheaper stockings sent in from abroad was to bring these into the prohibitive zone also, and thus enable the manufacturers at home to secure a complete monopoly of the business. When these manufacturers get their full grip upon the market, which they will be able to do in time, either the two for a quarter or three for a half dollar stockings will disappear or be made of cheaper material. The importer will not stand the two cent raise himself, and the manufacturer will simply take it over himself and add it to the price he makes jobbers.

Mr. Payne's speech is a very enthusiastic endorsement of the entire bill that bears his name. Mr. Payne sought to prove that it was not only revision downward, but revision in the interest of the average man. It is difficult to understand how he expected to find believers. The rich man who buys a diamond and imports it pays a tax of but 10 per cent, while the imitations, rhinestones, Brazilian stones and the like, those that are used for ornaments by the poor, are taxed 20 per cent. What defense can be made to that? This bill taxes the coarse gloves that the laborer uses at his work at 66 per cent, while on the gloves of the finest quality the duty is but 14 per cent. The ordinary steel buttons on the trousers of the average man carry a duty of 127 per cent, the ivory buttons of the rich man are taxed but 57 per cent. The cheapest grade of carpets are taxed 127 per cent, the finest grades but 50 per cent. The fine silk costume of the society belle comes in under a tax of 50 per cent, while the plain woolen or worsted garb of the factory girl is taxed 135 per cent. The finest imported blankets are taxed 71 per cent, the cheapest and coarsest 165 per cent. Can any one defend such discrimination? Yet that is the Payne-Aldrich tariff law—a few of its schedules only.

Rough marble, used for many purposes, is left just as it was in the old law, while onyx, used to ornament the palaces of the rich, the luxurious hotels and the like, was reduced from \$1.50 a cubic foot to 65 cents, the same as marble. Payne's summary classes one as a luxury, the other as a necessity. Nearly three quarters of a million dollars' worth of watch movements of the cheaper grade were increased 16 per cent at the behest of the watch trust, making the tax on the cheaper grades more than double that on the costliest—77 per cent on the former, 35 per cent on the latter. When any republican quotes from Mr. Payne's panegyric to prove his point, ask him to explain these few of many items. C. Q. D.

The Cleveland Leader says: Col. Bryan lectured at Princeton on Faith. Apparently hope has at last taken flight." Our esteemed contemporary should remember that the greatest of these is charity.