

of remaining a candidate. He had, in fact, announced his intention of voting for Mr. Burton, and it was well understood that a number of influential Democrats had the same intention. This action is a justification of the Plain Dealer's course in supporting Mr. Burton two years ago for the same reasons that Democratic opposition to him has now been withdrawn. It is true that Mr. Burton is a Republican and remains true to the party organization. But it is also true that he represents the good in that party and has firmly resisted endeavors to induce him to favor what he believes to be evil tendencies in it. More than once the party lash has been applied, but without effect. . . . His election for the seventh time, and without opposition except by the minor parties, will give him a unique position in the next Congress and one of great influence, whatever may be the political complexion of the majority.

PARTY REGULARITY.

Cleveland Waechter und Anzeiger (Ger. Dem.), Oct. 24.—Whenever you hear the cry: "Vote the ticket straight!" you may depend upon it there are crooked designs back of it.

THE CHICAGO CHARTER QUESTION.

Chicago Chronicle (Rep. and pro-charter), Oct. 26.—The Lincoln News-Herald announces that after having for some time past advocated the proposed constitutional amendment it will hereafter oppose it. . . . It objects to the proposed amendment because, it says, it will defeat the adoption of an entirely new constitution. It says the whole State is as much hampered by the present constitution as Chicago is and wants a new one, but that Chicago opposes it and proposes to obtain relief from its own troubles and leave the rest of the State in a hole. . . . The truth is, as the News-Herald ought to know, that the whole State dreads a constitutional convention, and dreads it for the same reason that Hamlet dreaded death. That is, because it is better to bear the ills we have than to fly to others that we know not of. This State is honeycombed with socialism, populism and every other sort of political heresy and vagary, and it is the fear that some of these poisonous errors may creep into a new constitution that makes the State willing to put up as long as possible with the imperfections of the present one. . . . Many other reasons might be given why this State never will and never ought to see another constitutional convention, but we will promise the News-Herald that if the outside counties will scratch Chicago's back this time Chicago will return the favor whenever they choose to ask for relief through a reasonable constitutional amendment.

MISCELLANY

THE LONE TRAVELER.

For The Public.
Whence comest thou, lone traveler,
And whither is thy flight?
And why thy journey thus alone?
Day fadeth into night;
Day fadeth into night;
And still with outstretched, tireless wing,
Danger unheeding,
Onward thou'rt speeding,
Whither, ah, whither?
Art thou intrepid pioneer,
That leads the pathless way
To some bright, sunlit home, afar
From darksome winter day?
Or, laggard-like, hast lingered near
Some fav'rite marsh or fen,
Beyond the sight or ken
Of mortal eye?
Until, with shrill cry of alarm,
Thou'st found thyself alone

With dark'ning skies and winter's chill,
Mates and companions flown.
With swifter pinions art thou blest?
And canst thou overtake
Thy mates, and hope to make
With them thy home?
Ah, tireless wanderer! who guides
Thy lonely, weary way?
Dost follow unknown star that leads
Thee on to cloudless day?
Dost feel some wise, unerring sight,
That watches o'er thy pathless flight,
That thou 'mid storm and darkest night,
Undaunted, strong, without affright,
Thy way pursuest?
Hush! eager questioner; nor seek
Life's mysteries to unfold!
Enough that One doth hold
In wisdom and in love,
The universe above,
Beneath, around us all,
And naught is great, and naught is small
To Love Omnipotent!
SARAH MARTYN WRIGHT.

PROTECTION IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Portions of the address of W. L. Douglas, accepting the Democratic nomination for Governor of Massachusetts, October 13, 1904.

Our forefathers builded wisely when they tore down the tariff walls that surrounded each State previous to 1787 and made it unconstitutional to build new walls around the States. And yet, is there any stronger reason for an insurmountable tariff wall between New York and Canada than between New York and Pennsylvania? What would happen in this country if the tariff wall between us and Canada were extended around each State? Prosperity would vanish and we would sink to the low industrial level of the small European countries, each surrounded by a tariff wall, not nearly so high as our Dingley inclosure. What would happen to this grand old Commonwealth if cut off from the rest of the United States by a Dingley wall? Would not the New England States soon be depopulated if thus deprived of the foodstuffs and raw materials of the middle and western States? Only a truly great country can prosper under the blighting Dingley tariff.

It is because Massachusetts is partly cut off from the rest of this country, and is, by protected trusts, deprived of the cheap raw materials to which she is fairly entitled, as one of the States composing our Union, that her more intelligent and enterprising citizens are now agitating for reciprocity with Canada and other countries. She is unwilling to further sacrifice her industries upon the altar of protection, and is asking her representatives in Congress not to forget her interests.
But few, perhaps, realize the heavy tariff burden now carried by Massachusetts. Based upon the census figures for

1900 and upon the Statistics of Manufactures of Massachusetts for 1903, the value of the materials or stock used in our manufactures in 1903 was \$660,000,000. Rough estimates indicate that the tariff tax upon such of these materials as are dutiable is about \$71,000,000. That is, materials which would cost our manufacturers but \$589,000,000 were they free, now cost \$660,000,000. With free raw materials, goods which last year cost us \$1,243,000,000 to produce, would have cost us only \$1,172,000,000. That is, taxed raw materials add more than six per cent. to the cost of manufacturing goods in this Commonwealth. Only those who know the small margins on which most manufactured goods are sold can appreciate the handicap thus placed upon our industries and the effect that its removal would have upon our manufactures, especially in obtaining foreign trade. Give our manufacturers as cheap materials as have manufacturers in England, and we will soon be masters of the world's markets in the several great industries in which we are by nature and by acquired abilities preeminent.

To our workmen free raw materials would mean more work and steadier employment at higher wages. If not higher money wages, at least higher purchasing power, for prices would be lower and the cost of living less.

In 1903, about \$250,000,000 was paid in wages to about 535,000 workers in Massachusetts. The average earnings, then, was about \$471.23 a year, or \$9.06 per week. If the manufacturers could save \$71,000,000 on materials, they could pay \$71,000,000 more in wages, and manufacture goods at the same cost as at present. That is, they could afford to raise wages about 30 per cent., and not make the goods cost more than now.

Had our cotton manufacturers untaxed yarns, chemicals and dyestuffs, coal, and other materials and supplies, it is probable that the 30,000 workers now on strike in Fall River against a 12½ per cent. reduction in wages, on top of a ten per cent. reduction last fall, would now be at work at higher wages.

As nearly all of the materials and supplies used in our manufactures comes from outside Massachusetts, it is probable that our Commonwealth loses five times as much as she gains by protection—to somebody, somewhere. That is, we put six dollars into the protection pool for every one that we get out. Our protectionist statesmen at Washington insist that we shall go on doing this and keep quiet.

The greatest of our manufacturing industries is that of boots and shoes.

The value of the factory product of the 645 establishments reported in the Massachusetts Statistics of Manufactures for 1903 was \$159,247,529; and the value of stock used, \$100,300,514.

Considering the product of these 645 establishments, for which we can make approximate estimates of the values of the various kinds of materials used, we estimate the amount of the tariff tax on these materials and supplies at \$9,900,000. The tax on sole leather alone is estimated at \$2,250,000, or ten per cent. of the value of the leather used. There can be but little doubt about this tax, for both sole and upper leather, made in the United States from imported hides, is sold to foreign manufacturers at prices much less than we can buy it.

As about 25 per cent. of all leather manufactured in this country is made from foreign hides and skins, it is clear not only that the duty of 15 per cent. on hides not only enhances the price of leather made from imported hides, but the price of all sole leather to American manufacturers by 11 or 12 per cent.

Very little sole leather is made in Massachusetts. Nearly all of this tariff tax is supposed to go to the beef and sole leather trusts. To the beef trust by virtue of the 15 per cent. duty on hides, and to the leather trust by virtue of the 20 per cent. duty on leather. Some of the members of the beef trust have become large tanners of hides in order that they may get the full benefit of these duties. It is doubtful if the prices of cattle are affected in the least by the duty on hides.

As there were about 110,000,000 pairs of boots and shoes made in Massachusetts in 1903, the average manufacturing cost per pair was about \$1.44 and the average tax about nine cents per pair. The saving of this tariff tax by reciprocal trade treaties or otherwise would enable us to greatly increase our output and to give steadier employment to labor. The saving to the 3,000,000 people of Massachusetts in the cost of shoes would be nearly \$1,000,000.

Speaking for myself, I would gladly give up the duty of 25 per cent. on shoes to obtain free raw materials. Yes, even to obtain free hides and free sole leather. If the handicap of taxed leather were removed I could produce shoes at as low cost as could any manufacturer in any foreign country and meet the competition of the world. Cheap labor is not cheap. It is clear

when effectiveness is considered. Our Massachusetts methods of manufacturing and the economical division of labor enables us to produce shoes at as low labor cost, quality considered, as anywhere in the world. It is the high cost of materials that bars us from the fullest possible participation in foreign markets. In spite of this handicap our last year's exports of boots and shoes from the United States were valued at \$7,238,940.

But I am not alone in these views. Early in 1903, 311 out of 375 important manufacturers of boots and shoes in New England declared in favor of giving up the duty on shoes if hides were made free. Many of our very largest manufacturers have frequently and publicly denounced the duty on hides and proclaimed their willingness to part with the duty on shoes.

Besides the effect of the tariff tax on raw materials, which affects the manufacturers primarily, we must not forget or neglect, as the Republicans do, the interests of the consumers, of whom there are about 3,000,000 in Massachusetts. The motto of the Democratic party is, as I understand it: "The greatest good to the greatest number."

Careful estimates show that the average tariff tax per family paid in 1903 was about \$111 for the United States. Of this tax only \$16.52 per family went to the Government. Over \$94 went to the trusts and other protected interests. It is probable that this tax for the benefit of trusts averaged \$100 per family for the 650,000 families in Massachusetts, or \$65,000,000 for the Commonwealth.

While it is impossible as long as we obtain our revenue largely from tariff taxes, to prevent considerable salvage for the protected trusts, yet our aim should be to minimize this loss and to get into our treasury at Washington nearly every dollar collected from the people. There should be no tariff "graft" for the trusts. This \$100 tariff tax paid by each family should go for more and better food and clothing for our women and children, and not to increase the dividends on the watered stocks of the protected corporations. Our constant aim should be to reduce the cost of living and to increase the comforts and health of the people.

A NEW ENGLAND ESTIMATE OF WATSON.

From the Boston Evening Transcript of October 15, 1904.

Thomas E. Watson, the Georgian populist leader, now candidate for the presidency on the People's Party ticket, is not a man who will have to

be seriously reckoned with in national politics; but he is nevertheless a serious force in the South. What he said and did and the way in which he bore himself during his recent campaigning visit to New York and New Jersey attracted much attention from men who look beneath the surface in politics. Watson is worth study.

His platform, made very plain in his sincere, impassioned and somewhat bitter letter of acceptance, to which all the New York newspapers gave much space on Sunday and Monday, is of course the old Bryan platform with additions. It stands for "bimetallism," the public ownership of railroads, etc., the popular election of judges (including the justices of the United States supreme court), the referendum, etc. But none of these specific "planks" or demands explains the man or gives a very clear idea of what he stands for; for they are more or less ineffective efforts to translate into current political phraseology what is really a social idea. Watson is more interesting than his platform, and more significant.

Respectably born and reared, of good Southern stock, with no pretensions to "aristocracy," but with a good and secure claim on dignity, decency and sincerity, he took seriously the Southern talk about Jeffersonian democracy which to most men is a mere formula—a dogma that is useful and sonorous in public addresses, but has no relation to public or private life. For the whole tendency of Southern thought is away from a real democracy. Every step it has taken in Watson's lifetime has been towards an oligarchy—directly away from a real democracy. But here is a man who really read Jefferson (he has written a "life" of him), who sincerely accepted the Declaration of Independence, who believes that the people ought to decide all public questions and that they will decide wisely—a real democratic man.

He has practiced the law with a fair measure of success; he has served in Congress; he has already had a long experience in politics, as a candidate once for the vice presidency and now for the presidency; he has done as much public speaking, perhaps, as any man in public life, Bryan only excepted, but none of these activities gives the central clew to the man's character and temperament. His real life has been spent in his library. His "Life of Jefferson" and his "History of the French Revolution" tell the true story of his ambition and dis-