

## Judge Parker's Letter of Acceptance

Judge Parker's letter of acceptance is as follows:

To the Honorable 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 indorsed 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.

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 oftentimes referred to as constitutionalism vs. imperialism.

If we would retain our liberties and constitutional rights unimpaired, we can not 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 its diversity of interests and population would enable a determined, ambitious and able executive, untrammelled by 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, dashing 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?

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 people.

The Dingley tariff is excessive in many of its rates, and, as to them at least, unjustly and oppressively burdens 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 market 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 amount 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 the benefit of these duties which the people never intended they should have, and to which they have no moral right.

Even now the argument more 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 al-

ways differed as to the principle of custom 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 taxation 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 extortations 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 having fixed 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.

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 safe guard the interests of all the people.

Whether there is any common law which can be applied and enforced by the federal courts, can not 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 against The Call Publishing company, to be found in the 181st 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.

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 inure 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 secure 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 two-fold 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 republican platform contain a favorable reference to one of the suspended treaties. The reciprocity clauses of the Dingley act seem destined to remain a monument

### Cancer of the Lip Permanently Cured with Soothing, Balmly Oils.

Elliston, Mont., March 4, 1904.

Dr. D. M. Bye Co., Indianapolis, Ind.  
DEAR SIRS—I write this to let you know that the cancer is cured and all healed up. I was at two doctors with it before I wrote you. They tried it all summer and it got worse all the time, and after I started your treatment it was only six weeks until I was cured and well as ever. I am very thankful to you and I will do you all the good I can. I am satisfied it will never break out any more. I remain yours respectfully,  
JAMES SMITH.

There is no need of the knife or burning plaster, no need of pain or disfigurement; the Combination Oil Cure for cancers is soothing and balmly, safe and sure. Write for free book to the Home Office, Dr. D. M. Bye Co., Drawer 505, Dept 28, Indianapolis, Ind.