

Mr. Bryan's Challenge to President Taft

After replying to President Taft's challenge to Mr. Bryan, Mr. Bryan presented a challenge to the president. That challenge is reiterated. Here it is:

Mr. Bryan challenges Mr. Taft to make public the written and verbal recommendations upon which he appointed Justice White to the position of chief justice over Justice Harlan and the recommendations, written and verbal, on which he appointed the justices

whom he has placed on the supreme bench. Did he know how they stood on the trust question or was it PURELY ACCIDENTAL that ALL of his appointees took the trust side of the question?

He signed a publicity bill that requires publicity as to campaign contributions. Why not have a little publicity as to the influences that control the appointment of United States judges?

The man who freely issues challenges to others ought to be prepared to accept challenges on his own part.

Forty-five Years of Schedule K--A Story of Dodge and Delay

April, 1866—The wool-growers and wool-manufacturers meet at Washington, D. C., and agree upon a tariff on wool and wool goods.

April, 1866—The wool-growers recommend a tariff on wool to the United States revenue commission.

March 2, 1867—A republican congress passes a woolen tariff law substantially the same as that recommended by the wool growers and manufacturers.

January, 1880—Agitation for a revision of the tariff. The national association of wool growers opposes any change in Schedule K, but favors a tariff commission.

February, 1880—The president and secretary of the national association of wool manufacturers interview the president of the United States and obtain assurances as to the personnel of the new commission.

March, 1880—The national association of wool manufacturers recommends the passage of the tariff commission bill without amendment.

July, 1880—The national association of wool manufacturers circulates among manufacturers a petition which says:

"That the manufacturer should have a protective duty sufficient to offset the high cost of labor, interest and taxes; that the present tariff (Schedule K) should continue until special and minute information from experts shall indicate the changes that can safely be made; that the best method of obtaining the required information is through the Eaton tariff commission."

May 15, 1882—A tariff commission authorized by act of congress.

May, 1882—John L. Hayes, secretary of the national association of wool manufacturers, appointed president of the tariff commission. Later he is made chairman of the sub-committee to prepare the woolen and worsted schedules.

December, 1882—Report of tariff commission sent to congress.

March 3, 1883—Tariff bill passed increasing some rates in Schedule K and making reductions that did not help the consumer.

October 1, 1890—The McKinley bill is passed by a republican congress, increasing duties on wool goods. The duty on worsted tops, manufactured by William Whitman, president of the national association of wool manufacturers, is made equal to the duty on finished cloths.

August 27, 1894—The Wilson bill, passed by a democratic congress, becomes a law, revising Schedule K, with free wool and ad valorem duties on goods.

March, 1897—S. N. D. North, secretary of the national association of wool manufacturers, is admitted to the secret sessions of the senate finance committee during the framing of the Dingley bill. April 4, 1897, North writes to William Whitman:

"I am the only person whom the committee allows in its meetings."

June 2, 1897—William Whitman writes to Secretary North, who is attending tariff sessions of finance committee:

"We all depend upon you to watch closely our interests."

July 10, 1897—William Whitman writes to Secretary North, who is attending tariff sessions of finance committee:

"I depend on you, dress goods, yarns and tops."

July 25, 1897—The Dingley bill with Schedule K practically unchanged, becomes a law.

1898—The national association of wool manufacturers presents \$5,000 to S. N. D. North, its secretary, for services in connection with the revision of the tariff.

June, 1908—Agitation for a revision of the tariff. The republican national convention at Chicago pledges the party to revise the tariff to

equal the difference between the foreign and domestic cost of production plus a profit. This is practically the same as the proposition laid down by the national association of wool manufacturers in July, 1884, for the revision of the tariff.

September 26, 1908—William H. Taft, republican candidate for president, makes the following pledge in a speech at St. Paul:

"I am here to plight the faith of the republican party, in accordance with its platform, that the revision will be honest and exact, according to the measure stated in the platform."

August 5, 1909—A republican congress passes and President Taft signs the Payne-Aldrich bill, which leaves Schedule K practically unchanged.

September 16, 1909—President Taft confesses at Winona, Minn., that it was impossible to revise Schedule K because of the combine of wool-growers and wool-manufacturers.

April 8, 1910—William Whitman, president of the national association of wool manufacturers, before the Massachusetts cost-of-living commission, states that he—

"Does not know of any reason why President Taft should know any more about the wool tariff than does the gentleman who recently refused to receive Mr. Roosevelt."

August 20, 1910—President Taft, in a letter to Congressman William B. McKinley, states that—

"The precise difference in the cost of production sought for is not capable of definite ascertainment" and "all that even the most scientific person can do is to exercise his best judgment in reaching a conclusion."

October 17, 1910—William Whitman, president of the national association of wool manufacturers, spends four hours with the tariff board at Washington and then issues the following statement:

"I opposed the tariff commission very strongly, but the tariff board is a very different thing. I want to do what I can to show my appreciation of President Taft. I believe he means well and is doing well, and I am ready to meet him halfway."

December 8, 1910—Banquet of the American association of woolen and worsted manufacturers at New York. Chairman Emery of the tariff board present. On this occasion Chairman Emery said:

"There are certain things that are very difficult to get, and one thing, that according to the platform of the republican party—and incidentally that does not mean anything to me, except that I have been given the job according to that platform—is to try to get the cost of production. I thank you all, gentlemen, that you did not laugh. (Laughter.) * * * I frankly say right here that this idea of settling things on cost alone by any mathematical or algebraical or geometric ratio or problem or theory, is all nonsense. You must not think I am joking about this thing, but there is a joke about it, and the joke is this: I have no powers whatsoever. The tariff board has no powers. There is really no such thing as a tariff board. The law says that for certain purposes the president may employ such persons as he sees fit. I am one of such persons. That is all." (Laughter and applause.)

February 1, 1911—Banquet of the national association of wool manufacturers at Washington, attended by thirty-five stand-pat senators and representatives and two members of the tariff board, Chairman Emery and J. B. Reynolds. William M. Wood, president of the American Washer company, said on this occasion:

"If all the schedules of the tariff were as well balanced as Schedule K it would be the most

remarkable document, next to the constitution of the United States, that the human mind has ever produced."

August 15, 1911—Passage of the Underwood-La Follette bill to revise Schedule K and providing for duties of 29 per cent on wool and 49 per cent on wool goods.

August 16, 1911—President Taft vetoes the Underwood-La Follette bill on the ground that the tariff board has not reported.—Worcester (Mass.) Evening Post.

THE CANADIAN CAMPAIGN

Below will be found a letter recently received by Mr. Bryan from a prominent Canadian conservative, giving his opinion as to the causes that contributed to the defeat of reciprocity:

"* * * Yes, the conservatives won a great victory. I attributed it first to the loyalty cry, raising the sentiment of allegiance to England. The politicians here, including myself made a few stump speeches through this county—all stating it was simply the entering wedge that would lead up to commercial union and annexation of Canada.

"Secondly, they argued Canada now had one transcontinental railway in operation, and two others were very nearly completed, viz., the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern—for that reason felt they had the transportation facilities for carrying out the produce of the west and shipping through Canadian ports to Great Britain.

"Thirdly, they argued Great Britain was the customer for our agricultural products—not the United States, although the United States might take a certain amount, they were competitors and would produce a certain quantity themselves.

"Fourth, the speeches of Champ Clark and one or two others, whose names I do not recall at the moment, in which they almost openly stated this continent would all come under one flag; and other statements much stronger, attributed very materially to the adverse vote to reciprocity.

"There were a number of sentences in President Taft's speeches as well—one at Atlantic City some time ago, and others; the intent of which was easily construed as conveying that the present negotiations would lead to closer political relations.

"President Taft's expression 'that Canada had arrived at the parting of the ways' is a great text for speakers to draw from. They interpreted it as meaning that Canada was now at the point where she would give up a certain amount of her allegiance to England.

"According to our statistics we use 80 per cent of the natural products of today—16 per cent is sent to Great Britain—the other 4 per cent is distributed to foreign countries. The home market is always the best, and any country that can use 80 per cent of its own production is not very badly situated as to the disposal of the balance.

"There is another point that had considerable bearing, notwithstanding the United States was anxious to have reciprocity in natural products, they did not equalize their tariff on other goods with Canada; in other words, the bars are much higher against Canada going into the United States than coming from the United States into Canada, in the way of duties; they should have started out on a fair basis and equalized the duties, as stated above, then come on with reciprocity in the natural products.

"Taking it all in all, my impression is that the sentimental part of it had more effect than any other canvass. Secondly, the ill-advised references to annexation by some of our American statesmen had a very bad effect on the carrying of the reciprocity pact."

It will be noticed that he mentions the "over" high tariff as a cause. We have not shown ourselves very friendly to other nations in tariff matters and the president had just vetoed the farmers' free list. Our tariff wall must be lowered before we are in position to talk about encouraging commerce.

A GOOD SIGN

Hon. George Fred Williams is again a power in Massachusetts politics—that is a good sign. Foss is making good; he has earned a reelection.

LIFE'S COMPASS

Four things a man must learn to do
If he would make his record true:
To think without confusion clearly;
To love his fellow-men sincerely;
To act from honest motives purely;
To trust in God and Heaven securely.

—Henry VanDyke.