

SANTIAM NEWS SUPPLEMENT.

SCIO, OREGON, JULY 10, 1908.

WILL IT NEVER END?

The Iowa Republicans, who have just held their state convention, chose Mr. W. S. Hart for temporary chairman. Naturally Mr. Hart made a speech when he assumed the exalted dignity of his position. As reported in the papers, his speech consists of a series of words strung together without much regard to grammar or sense. On his first thought in reading it is that Mr. Hart was repeating, parrot-like, some standpat formulas which he had committed to memory more or less defectively and which he did not understand. One's second thought confirms the first. Still, out of the confusion of his school-boy rhetoric it is possible to extract a number of the old stale impostures of Dinglevism stated in the stale old phrases of the standpaters. He modifies their impudence a little by some reluctant concessions to the revisionist, but clearly Mr. Hart is joined to the tin god of protectionism until death pricks him loose.

When the tariff comes to be revised, he says, it will be done with a presumption in favor of the Dingley rates because they have caused "a high tide of prosperity and progress for years." If the Dingley tariff caused the prosperity which we enjoyed up to last Fall, it also caused the adversity which we have enjoyed since. Like other fetiches, the tariff tries to claim credit for all the good in the world and lay the blame for the evil upon something else, but people are not to be fooled forever by such a scurvy trick. The fact is that the tariff has no more to do with the tide of prosperity than with the tide of the ocean. What it does accomplish is to sweep the fruits of a prosperity which it neither helps nor hinders into the hands of a few privileged plutocrats and leave the rest of the population wondering why they have to work so hard and get so little for it. But, in spite of standpat imposture, they are beginning to understand.

We must have protection enough, declares Mr. Hart, "to insure to the American laborer the highest wages in the world and to the American farmer the best market in the world." Did one ever hear a whistler pounding on the old brass kettle? Has anybody ever heard of any laborer in any trade, art or craft whose wages have been raised by the tariff? Do not our protected tariff barons cut wages down to the lowest figure they possibly can without regard to the duties on their goods? What manufacturer ever made the Dingley tariff a reason for raising wages? What one ever hesitated to cut wages because he was protected by a duty? Our privileged tariff barons buy their labor, as they do their raw material, in the cheapest market; but it is a terrible crime when the rest of us ask for the right to buy our goods in the cheapest market. This is a case where sauce for the gander is very far from being sauce for the goose, and the consumer is the goose.

Originally the tariff was not imposed to raise wages. It was imposed because wages were already high. The argument was that the manufacturer must be protected by a tariff or he could not pay the high wages which prevailed. But when he had his tariff securely assented upon the country, then he be-

gan to shout that it had caused the high wages. Beautiful logic, is it not? The Egyptian legend of alligators generating themselves in the mud of the Nile is sane compared with the idea of the tariff causing its own cause. The whole domain of theology has nothing to offer more insulting to the reason. Does not every working man in the country know perfectly well that if his wages are high it is because there are more jobs than there are competent men bidding for them? And if there are more men than jobs, will not wages be cut down though the tariff will be as high as Haman's gibbet? Working men's votes cannot be won by talking to them as if they were half-witted. It is a time politicians began to revise those parts of their speeches which are designed to capture "labor and the farmers."

Even sillier than his twaddle to "labor" is Mr. Hart's sop to the farmers. The tariff gives them high prices, forsooth. How much has the tariff to do with the price of Hood River apples? If the tariff fixed the price of apples the wormy trees of Clackamas county ought to be as profitable as the carefully nurtured orchards of Hood River. Are they? The farmer gets high prices by producing an excellent article, to begin with. But that is only part of the story. He has to overcome the wiles of the middle man. He has to advertise. In short, he has to fight his way with persevering intelligence and dauntless courage. The tariff does not help him an atom. If the Dingley tariff makes high prices for the farmers, why are they forming unions all over the country to make high prices for themselves? Weary, dreary, foolish old impostures. How long, oh Lord, how, will the politicians continue to assault our ears with them—Portland Oregonian.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IS IN FULL RETREAT.

The republicans who attended the national convention as spectators and joined in the demonstration in favor of President Roosevelt and Senator LaFollette must have felt indignant as they watched the panic-stricken delegates running over each other in their effort to get away from the LaFollette reforms, some of which had been endorsed by the president himself. Congressman Cooper, of Wisconsin, representing the LaFollette men, brought in a minority report signed by himself alone. Fifty-two members of the committee signed the majority report, and one signed the minority report. The republican party will find the ratio of fifty-two to one a very embarrassing one to deal with in the coming campaign. Mr. Cooper's report contained a declaration in favor of publicity as to campaign funds. It was lost by a vote of 880 to 94, more than nine to one, and yet the president has been advocating legislation in favor of publicity as to campaign contributions, and Secretary Taft wrote a letter to Mr. Burrows advocating the passage of a publicity bill. How fortunate it was that Secretary Taft's letter was finally discovered and published! Senator Burrows, the man to whom the Taft letter was addressed, was the temporary chairman of the convention, and the convention over which he pre-

sided turned down the publicity plank by a vote of nine to one! Who will deny that, on this subject, the republican party is retreating?

Another plank of the LaFollette platform authorized the ascertaining of the value of the railroads. This plank was lost by a vote of 917 to 63—nearly fifteen to one—and yet President Roosevelt has advocated this very proposition. Here is a retreat on the railroad question.

In another column reference is made to the injunction plank. The injunction plank adopted by the republican convention is a retreat from the position taken by the president and from the position taken by Secretary Taft in his speeches, although neither of them went as far as they ought to have gone in their effort to prevent what is known as government by injunction. Here is the tailed retreat.

The president has advocated the income tax as a means of preventing swollen fortunes and of equalizing the burdens of government. The republican platform is silent on the subject. Was the president right in the position he took? If so, then the convention was wrong in not endorsing him. Will the republican voters follow the president in this just demand or will they follow the republican organization in retreating from it?

The president advocated an inheritance tax, but the republican convention is silent on that subject. Was the president ahead of the republican party in advocating this reform, or has the republican party receded from the president's position? Did the president give a false alarm on this question or has the party sounded a retreat?

In the president's message to congress last spring he presented an indictment against the great lawbreakers to prevent the enforcement of the law and to evade the punishments provided by law. The platform adopted by the republican convention contains no intimation of danger. If there are any conspiracies, the convention did not see them; if there are any combinations, it had not heard of them; if there are any dangers ahead, it was unconscious of them. Was the president mistaken when he issued his defiance, or are the republican managers deceived when they think that an aroused public will calmly contemplate the encroachments of predatory wealth. This is retreat number six.

The convention, by vote of 893 to 114—more than seven to one—voted down the plank in favor of the popular election of United States senators. It is true that the president and Secretary Taft have never advocated the popular election of senators. They seem to take the Hamiltonian rather than the Jeffersonian view, but the most popular reform in the United States to-day is the reform that has for its object the election of United States senators by direct vote. It has five times been endorsed by the national house of representatives—three times when the house of representatives was republican. It has been endorsed by nearly two-thirds of the states of the union, and there is probably not a state in the union in which it would not be endorsed at a popular election and yet in spite of the

record made in the house of representatives and by the various states, this reform is rejected by a seven-to-one vote in a republican national convention.

Here are seven propositions upon which the republican party, in national convention assembled, has retreated from the position taken by that party in congress or from the position taken by the president. What have Roosevelt republicans to say? The president has awakened a spirit of reform within his party, he has at least revealed to the world that there are reformers in the republican party. Can this spirit now be quelled by a standpat convention? Millions of republicans have enlisted at the president's call to arms and are ready to march forward; will they furl their banners and turn back merely because the president acquiesces in the sounding of a retreat?—From Bryan's Commoner.

CARELESS DRIVING.

That there are many people who, through bad or careless driving, succeed in spoiling a horse which came to them as free from vice or tricks as could be desired, is the opinion of a veteran horseman, who writes:

A horse which by nature is not a shier can easily be transformed into something very like one by being unmercifully thrashed if he becomes startled at some unfamiliar sight. The next time he encounters anything of the kind he remembers his thrashing and associates the sight with suffering; then he shies again, and the punishment is repeated, with disastrous effects. The man who is careless about his horse, and allows his horse to drive himself, will spoil any animal, as it is likely to end up by letting the horse down as not; but this observation must not be taken as suggesting that a driver should always be fidgeting and worrying his horse. His aim should be to get the animal to go right and to keep him at it; it is often the so-called coachman who produces the ill-mannered horse.

In frequent cases it is the driver's fault when a horse stumbles, but even when it is not so it is quite unnecessary to use the whip in nine cases out of ten. If the horse once begins to connect a stumble with a thrashing, he gets flurried when he puts a foot wrong, and is very likely to come down in consequence; but if he gets careless it is necessary to wake him up by a light stroke just to remind him that he must keep awake. Of course the jugging at a horse's mouth is as certain a way to ruin the animal as anything can be; and it is very far removed from a good practice to shout at and rate a horse for no particular fault. A naturally timid animal is liable to lose its head on such occasions, whilst a bad tempered one resents it, for horses are not fools, and are far more amenable to kindness combined with firmness than they are to illusage or violence of any kind. This being the case, it is unfortunate that their memories should be so good, for the recollection of chastisement has often transformed an ordinarily tempered horse into a perfect savage, and a good reliable worker into a useless brute. Of course, horses can be spoiled in many other ways, but it is believed that the causes mentioned above are responsible for most of the losses incurred by owners through the deterioration of their animals.—From the Homestead.