

JUDGE PARKER'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE

Sept. 26, 1904.

To the Hon. Champ Clark and Others, Committee, Etc.:

Gentlemen—In my response to your committee at the formal notification proceedings I referred to some matters not mentioned in this letter. I desire that these be considered as incorporated herein, and regret that lack of space prevents specific reference to them all. I wish here, however, again to refer to my views there expressed as to the gold standard, to declare again my unqualified belief in said standard and to express my appreciation of the action of the convention in reply to my communication upon that subject.

Grave public questions are pressing for decision. The Democratic party appeals to the people with confidence that its position on these questions will be accepted and endorsed at the polls. While the issues involved are numerous, some stand forth pre-eminent in the public mind. Among these are tariff reform, imperialism, economical administration and honesty in the public service. I shall briefly consider these and some others within the necessarily prescribed limits of this letter.

Imperialism.
While I presented my views at the notification proceedings concerning this vital issue, the overshadowing importance of this question impels me to refer to it again. The issue is often-times referred to as constitutionalism versus imperialism.

If we would retain our liberties and constitutional rights unimpaired we cannot permit or tolerate at any time or for any purpose the arrogation of unconstitutional powers by the executive branch of our government. We should be ever mindful of the words of Webster, "Liberty is only to be preserved by maintaining constitutional restraints and a just division of political powers."

Already the national government has become centralized beyond any point contemplated or imagined by the founders of the constitution. How tremendously all this has added to the power of the president! It has developed from year to year until it almost equals that of many monarchs. While the growth of our country and the magnitude of interstate interests may seem to furnish a plausible reason for this centralization of power, yet these same facts afford the most potent reason why the executive should not be permitted to encroach upon the other departments of the government and assume legislative or other powers not expressly conferred by the constitution.

The magnitude of the country and

diversity of interests and population would enable a determined, ambitious and able executive, unmindful of constitutional limitations and fired with the lust of power, to go far in the usurpation of authority and the aggrandizement of personal power before the situation could be fully appreciated or the people be aroused.

The issue of imperialism which has been thrust upon the country involves a decision whether the law of the land or the rule of individual caprice shall govern. The principle of imperialism may give rise to brilliant, startling, dazzling results, but the principle of democracy holds in check the brilliant executive and subjects him to the sober, conservative control of the people.

The people of the United States stand at the parting of the ways. Shall we follow the footsteps of our fathers along the paths of peace, prosperity and contentment, guided by the ever living spirit of the constitution which they framed for us, or shall we go along other and untried paths hitherto shunned by all, following blindly new ideals which, though appealing with brilliancy to the imagination and ambition, may prove a will-o'-the-wisp, leading us into difficulties from which it may be impossible to extricate ourselves without lasting injury to our national character and institutions?

The Tariff and Trusts.
Tariff reform is one of the cardinal principles of the Democratic faith, and the necessity for it was never greater than at the present time. It should be undertaken at once in the interest of all our people.

The Dingley tariff is excessive in many of its rates and, as to them at least, unjust and oppressively burdensome to the people. It secures to domestic manufacturers, singly or in combination, the privilege of exacting excessive prices at home and prices far above the level of sales made regularly by them abroad with profit, thus giving a bounty to foreigners at the expense of our own people. It levies oppressive and unjust taxes upon many articles forming in whole or part the so called raw material of many of our manufactured products, not only burdening the consumer, but also closing to the manufacturer the markets he needs and seeks abroad. Its unjust taxation burdens the people generally, forcing them to pay excessive prices for food, fuel, clothing and other necessities of life. It levies duties on many articles not normally imported in any considerable amount which are made extensively at home, for which the most extreme protectionist would hardly justify protective taxes, and which in large amounts are exported. Such duties have been and will continue to be a direct incentive to the formation of huge industrial combinations, which, secure from foreign competition, are enabled to stifle domestic competition and practically to monopolize the home market.

It contains many duties imposed for

the express purpose only, as was openly avowed, of furnishing a basis for reduction by means of reciprocal trade treaties, which the Republican administration, impliedly at least, promised to negotiate. Having on this promise secured the increased duties, the Republican party leaders, spurred on by protected interests, defeated the treaties negotiated by the executive, and now these same interests cling to and to which they have no moral right.

Even now the argument most frequently urged in behalf of the Dingley tariff and against tariff reform generally is the necessity of caring for our infant industries. Many of these industries after a hundred years of lusty growth are looming up as industrial giants. In their case at least the Dingley tariff invites combination and monopoly and gives justification to the expression that the tariff is the mother of trusts.

For the above mentioned reasons, among many others, the people demand reform of these abuses, and such reform demands and should receive immediate attention.

The two leading parties have always differed as to the principle of customs taxation. Our party has always advanced the theory that the object is the raising of revenue for support of the government whatever other results may incidentally flow therefrom. The Republican party, on the other hand, contends that customs duties should be levied primarily for protection, so called, with revenue as the subordinate purpose, thus using the power of taxing to build up the business and property of the few at the expense of the many.

This difference of principle still subsists, but our party appreciates that the long continued policy of the country, as manifested in its statutes, makes it necessary that tariff reform should be prudently and sagaciously undertaken on scientific principles, to the end that there should not be an immediate revolution in existing conditions.

In the words of our platform we demand "a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses, and for the common weal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions and discriminations."

It is true that the Republicans, who do not admit in their platform that the Dingley tariff needs the slightest alteration, are likely to retain a majority of the federal senate throughout the next presidential term and could, therefore, if they chose, block every attempt at legislative relief. But it should be remembered that the Republican party includes many revisionists, and I believe it will shrink from defying the popular will expressed unmistakably and peremptorily at the ballot box.

The people demand reform of existing conditions. Since the last Democratic administration the cost of living has grievously increased. Those hav-

ing seen incomes have suffered keenly; those living on wages, if there has been any increase, know that such increase has not kept pace with the advance in the cost of living, including rent and the necessities of life. Many today are out of work, unable to secure any wages at all. To alleviate these conditions in so far as is in our power should be our earnest endeavor.

Trust Remedies.
I pointed out in my earlier response the remedy which, in my judgment, can effectually be applied against monopolies, and the assurance was then given that if existing laws, including both statute and common law, proved inadequate, contrary to my expectations, I favor such further legislation within constitutional limitations as will best promote and safeguard the interests of all the people.

Whether there is any common law which can be applied and enforced by the federal courts cannot be determined by the president or by a candidate for the presidency.

The determination of this question was left by the people in framing the constitution to the judiciary and not to the executive. The supreme court of the United States has recently considered this question, and, in the case of the Western Union Telegraph company versus the Call Publishing company, to be found in the one hundred and eighty-first volume of the United States supreme court reports, at page 92, it decided that common law principles could be applied by United States courts in cases involving interstate commerce in the absence of United States statutes specifically covering the case. Such is the law of the land.

Reciprocity.

In my address to the notification committee I said that tariff reform "is demanded by the best interests of both manufacturer and consumer." With equal truth it can be said that the benefits of reciprocal trade treaties would extend to both. That the consumer would be helped is unquestionable. That the manufacturer would receive great benefit by extending his markets abroad hardly needs demonstration. His productive capacity has outgrown the home market. The very term "home market" has changed in its significance. Once, from the manufacturers' point of view, it meant expansion; today the marvelous growth of our manufacturing industries has far exceeded the consumptive capacity of our domestic markets, and the term "home market" implies contraction rather than expansion. If we would run our mills to their full capacity, thus giving steady employment to our workmen and securing to them and to the manufacturer the profits accruing from increased production, other markets must be found. Furthermore, when our manufacturers are dependent on raw materials in whole or part imported, it is vital to the extension of their markets abroad that they se-

ecure their materials on the most favorable terms.

Our martyred president, William McKinley, appreciated this situation. He pointed out in his last address to the people that we must make sensible trade arrangements if "we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus." He said: "A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade. . . . The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not."

This argument was made in the interest of our manufacturers, whose products, he urged, "have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention." He had come to realize that the so called stand pat policy must give way; that there must be a reduction of duties to enable our manufacturers to cultivate foreign markets. The last words of this president, who had won the affection of his countrymen, ought to be studied by every man who has any doubt of the necessity of a reduction in tariff rates in the interest of the manufacturer. They present with clearness a situation and a proposed remedy that prompted the provision in our platform which declares that "we favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada and with peoples of other countries where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, mining or commerce."

The persistent refusal of the Republican majority in the federal senate to ratify the reciprocity treaties negotiated in pursuance of the policy advocated alike by Mr. Blaine and Mr. McKinley, and expressly sanctioned in the Dingley act itself, is a discouraging exhibition of bad faith. As already mentioned by me, the exorbitant duty imposed on many an imported article by the Dingley tariff was avowedly intended by its author not to be permanent, but to serve temporarily as a maximum, from which the federal government was empowered to offer a reduction in return for an equivalent concession on the part of a foreign country. President McKinley undertook honestly to carry out the purpose of the act. A number of reciprocity agreements were negotiated, which, if ratified, would have had the twofold result of cheapening many imported products for American consumers and of opening and enlarging foreign markets to American producers. Not one of those agreements has met with the approval of the Republican masters of the senate. Indeed they did not even permit their consideration. In view of the attitude of the present executive, no new agreement need be expected from him. Nor does the Re-

publican platform contain a favorable reference to one of the suspended treaties. The reciprocity clauses of the Dingley act seem destined to remain a monument of legislative cozenage and political bad faith unless the people take the matter in their own hands at the ballot box and command a reduction of duties in return for reciprocal concessions.

Independence For the Filipinos.

In some quarters it has been assumed that in the discussion of the Philippine question in my response the phrase "self government" was intended to mean something less than independence. It was not intended that it should be understood to mean nor do I think as used it does mean less than independence. However, to eliminate all possibility for conjecture I now state that I am in hearty accord with that plank in our platform that favors doing for the Filipinos what we have already done for the Cubans, and I favor making the promise to them now that we shall take such action as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it. If independence such as the Cubans enjoy cannot be prudently granted to the Filipinos at this time, the promise that it shall come the moment they are capable of receiving it will tend to stimulate rather than hinder their development. And this should be done not only in justice to the Filipinos, but to preserve our own rights, for a free people cannot withhold freedom from another people and themselves remain free. The toleration of tyranny over others will soon breed contempt for freedom and self government and weaken our power of resistance to insidious usurpation of our constitutional rights.

American Citizenship.

The pledge of the platform to secure to our citizens, without distinction of race or creed, whether native born or naturalized, at home and abroad, the equal protection of the laws and the enjoyment of all the rights and privileges open to them under the covenants of our treaties, as their just due, should be made good to them. In the accomplishment of that result it is essential that a passport issued by the government of the United States to an American citizen shall be accepted the world over as proof of citizenship.

Civil Service.

The statute relating to civil service is the outcome of the efforts of thoughtful, unselfish and public spirited citizens. Operation under it has frequently been of such a character as to offend against the spirit of the statute, but the results achieved, even under a partial enforcement of the law, have been such as to both deserve and command the utterance of the Democratic party that it stands committed to the principle of civil service reform and demands its just and impartial enforcement.

Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A vast expanse of country in the west, portions of which are to be found

Continued on page 10.

The only Spot Cash Department Store
in Centre County.

THE RACKET

We buy for Cash and sell for Cash.
We can save you Money.

We are ready for Fall trade which we expect to be larger than ever before. Our store is full of seasonable goods bought for CASH, in many cases much under their real value. They go to you the same way. When we get a bargain we always give our customers a bargain. Come in, look over our stock and compare prices; you won't be asked to buy.

JUST A FEW HINTS OF OUR LOW PRICES:

Standard Ginghams, fast colors, - - - - -	6c a yard	Fancy Novelties in Dress Goods, - - - - -	25c
Good Calico, - - - - -	5c a yard	All Wool Dress Goods, Plain Blue and Red, - - - - -	25c a yard
Outing Flannel, - - - - -	6c a yard	Ladies' Umbrellas, Fancy Handles, worth \$1.25, - - - - -	98c
Skirt Patterns of Outing Flannel, - - - - -	25c.	Black Sateen Petticoats, sold elsewhere at \$1.25, - - - - -	98c
Boys' Heavy Winter Underwear, was 25 to 40c, - - - - -	15c each	Another Lot of Beautiful Pictures; we have sold thousands of these, - - - - -	10c

EXCLUSIVE AGENTS IN CENTRE COUNTY FOR BUTTERICK PATTERNS.

If you are not satisfied with anything you buy at The Racket, bring it back and get your money.

Come to THE FAIR and come to THE RACKET.

RACKET STORE COMPANY