

**STRONG LETTER OF PRESIDENT.**

(Continued from Page 1.)

Some of the criticisms are just and some are wide of the mark and most unjust.

The truth is, that under the old protective idea the only purpose was to make the tariff high enough to protect the home industry. The excess of the tariff over the differences in the cost of production here and abroad was not regarded as objectionable, because it was supposed that competition between those who enjoyed the high protection would keep the price for the consumer down to what was reasonable for the manufacturers. The evil of excessive tariff rates, however, showed itself in the temptation of manufacturers to combine and suppress competition, and then to maintain the prices so as to take advantage of the excess of the tariff rate over the difference between the cost of production abroad and here.

The Payne tariff bill is the first bill passed by the Republican party in which the necessity for reducing rates to avoid this evil has been recognized, and it is therefore a decided step in the right direction and it ought to be accepted as such. On the whole, it was a downward revision, particularly on articles of necessity and on raw materials. The actual figures on the first year's operation of the law demonstrate this. It must also be remembered that the tariff rates in the new law on imported liquors, wines and silks were increased substantially over the Dingley rates, because these were luxuries and it was intended to increase the revenue.

The charge that the present tariff is responsible for the increase in the prices of necessities is demonstrably false, because the high prices, with very few exceptions, affect articles in the tariff upon which there was no increase in rates or in respect to which there was a substantial reduction.

**Tariff Board.**

Perhaps more important than any one feature of the operative part of the tariff law is that section which enables the Executive to appoint a tariff commission or board to secure the needed information for the proper amendment and perfection of the law. The difficulty in fixing the proper tariff rates in accord with the principle stated in the Republican platform is in securing reliable evidence as to the difference between the cost of production at home and the cost of production abroad. The bias of the manufacturer seeking protection and of the importer opposing it weakens the weight of their testimony. Moreover, when we understand that the cost of production differs in one country abroad from that in another, and that it changes from year to year and from month to month, we must realize that the precise difference in cost of production sought for is not capable of definite ascertainment, and that all that even the most scientific person can do in his investigation is, after consideration of many facts which he learns, to exercise his best judgment in reaching a conclusion.

The Commission, however, already selected and at work, is a commission of disinterested persons who will ascertain the facts, not in a formal hearing by examination and cross-examination of witnesses, but by the kind of investigation that statisticians and scientific investigators use. When the Commission completes its work, either on the entire tariff or on any of the schedules in respect to which issue has arisen, and the work of the Commission shows that the present tariff is wrong and should be changed, I expect to bring the matter to the attention of the Congress with a view to its amendment of the tariff in that particular. Of course, this will be impracticable unless Congress itself shall adopt the parliamentary rule, as I hope it will, that a bill to amend one schedule of the tariff may not be subject to a motion to amend by adding changes in other schedules.

It will thus be possible to take up a single schedule with respect to which it is probable that a great majority of each House will be unprejudiced, to submit the evidence, and to reach a fair conclusion, and this method will tend to avoid disturbing business conditions. For these reasons it seems to me that all Republicans—conservative, progressive and radical—may well abide the situation with respect to the tariff until evidence now being accumulated shall justify changes in the rates; and that it is much better for them to vote for Republicans than to help create a Democratic majority which would be utterly at war with the protective principle, and therefore would have no use for the findings of the Tariff Commission, as we may certainly infer from the solid Democratic vote in the present Congress against the necessary appropriation for the Commission's work.

**Results of Payne Law.**

One great virtue in the new tariff law, including the corporation tax, is that, taken with the earnest effort of the administration to keep down or reduce government expenditures and to reform the methods of collecting the customs revenue, it has, by its revenue-producing capacity, turned a deficit in the ordinary operations of the Government of \$58,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1909, to a surplus in the first full year of the law, ending August 5,

1910, of \$26,000,000. From a revenue standpoint, then, there can be no controversy over the effectiveness of the new law. Increased revenue indicates increased imports, and an examination of our imports during the past year will disclose a most substantial increase in manufacturers' material, from which, in the making of finished products, whether for exportation or home consumption, has come a larger volume of employment for our wage-earners, a larger purchasing power and a greater consumption of the products of our farms and fabrications of our factories. So far, then, as such importations do not displace home production, they must be of benefit to all. Generally speaking, a full measure of industrial activity in production, transportation and distribution has accompanied the operation of the new law. Under the maximum and minimum provisions we have concluded treaties with all foreign nations, gaining the best possible terms for entrance to their markets without sacrificing our own. By the Payne tariff law we have at last done justice to the Philippines by allowing the producers of those islands the benefit of our markets, with such limitations as to prevent injury to our home industries.

Again, the present law in its corporation tax imposes a new kind of tax which has many of the merits of an income tax. It taxes success, not failure. Unlike a personal income tax, it is easily and exactly collected, and by an increase or decrease in the rate enables Congress with exactness to regulate its income to its necessary expenditures. More than this, it furnishes an indirect but effective method of keeping the Government advised as to the kind of business done by all corporations. It is one of the most useful and important changes in our revenue laws, as the future will show. In spite of the criticisms heaped upon it at its passage, no party responsible for revenues or anxious to retain every means of legitimate supervision of corporations will repeal it.

**Interstate Commerce.**

The next most important work of the present Congress was the passage of the amendment to the interstate commerce bill. The Republican platform favored amendment to the interstate commerce act with a view to giving greater power to the Interstate Commerce Commission in regulating the operation of railroads and the fixing of traffic rates, and also favored such national legislation and supervision as would prevent the future over-issue of stocks and bonds by interstate carriers. After the adjournment of the Congress at its extra session, I invited two of my Cabinet and a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission and a member of Congress to make recommendations as to the needed amendments to the interstate commerce act. These gentlemen reported to me, and in September last, in a speech in Des Moines, I foreshadowed their recommendations as I intended to make them to the Congress for the amendment of the interstate commerce act.

First, by the establishment of a commerce court; second, by empowering the Commission to classify merchandise as well as to fix rates for classes; third, by giving the right to a shipper to designate the route by which his goods shall be transported beyond the line of the initial carrier; fourth, by empowering the Commission to consider the justice or injustice of any rate without the complaint or initiation of a shipper; fifth, the empowering the Commission to suspend proposed increases of rates by carriers until the Commission shall have a chance to pass upon the reasonableness of the increase; sixth, by provisions for the Federal regulation of the issue of stocks and bonds by interstate railways; seventh, by a clause forbidding an interstate commerce railway company from acquiring stock in a competing road; eighth, by a section permitting the making of traffic agreements between competing railroads limited in point of time and subject matter, and subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

These amendments were in accordance with the text of the Republican platform. Subsequently, bills were drawn embodying this recommended legislation, in which, while the principle was maintained, there were limitations introduced, as justice suggested, after a conference with all the parties interested. The bill was submitted to the Congress, and after a great deal of discussion, both in the House and the Senate, it was enacted into law, with many amendments which did not materially change the effect of the recommendations except to strike out certain provisions promised in the Republican platform, to permit traffic agreements between railways in spite of the anti-trust law, to forbid one railway company to acquire stock in a competing company, and to secure supervision by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the issue of stocks and bonds by interstate railways.

For this last, was substituted a provision authorizing the appointment of a commission to consider the evils arising from the over-issue of stocks and bonds, and the methods of preventing such evils by Congressional regulation. In addition to the purposes already recited accomplished by the bill, the so-called long and short haul clause of the existing law (Continued on Page 2.)



**DR. JOHN M. FAISON WOULD ABOLISH THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**"If I Had it in My Power I Would Abolish the Free School System in North Carolina," so Declared Dr. Faison the Democratic Candidate for Congress in the 3rd District, on More Than One Occasion**

**DR. FAISON TRIES TO MAKE DENIAL**

**The Proof Furnished by Men of Character Who Heard Him Make the Hostile Declaration Against the Schools—Dr. Faison Against Progress and Public Improvements**

**Will the People of the District Give Him More Power for His Reactionary and Destructive Policy?**

The following from the Clinton News-Dispatch of the 15th, relative to the Democratic Congressional candidate in the Third District, brings to light some interesting facts about the policies of the candidate, Dr. John M. Faison:

**What the Dispatch Says.**

The editor of this paper has been reliably informed that Dr. John M. Faison, the Democratic candidate for Congress in this district, was opposed to the public school system in this State and wanted to destroy it, and we have made editorial comment to that effect several times recently in our columns. Dr. Faison seeing the disastrous effect that his "Red Shirt" record, and his open hostility to the public schools were having upon his candidacy in the district gets mad and desperate, and sends us a short clipping from our columns, and in his reckless disregard for the truth says we have lied on him.

We print below his letter, and in order to show whether or not we have misrepresented him, we have procured from Col. Geo. E. Butler, our Republican candidate for Congress, some correspondence with prominent Democrats and Republicans, whose honor and veracity cannot be questioned, which letters establish the truth of our charges beyond doubt, and shows Dr. Faison's unfitness for Congress or any other office of public trust in a district composed of enlightened and intelligent people. Dr. Faison's intemperate letter to us and the replies thereto are set out as follows:

**Dr. Faison's Reckless Denial.**

"But how can people who have to depend on public schools to educate their children support Dr. Faison, who has always opposed and has fought the public schools all his life."—The News-Dispatch, Aug. 25. Mr. Thos. E. Owen, Ed. News-Dispatch, Clinton, N. C.

Such statements as these are lies pure and simple, and you will correct the same in your next issue if you have any self-respect; please publish. JNO. M. FAISON. Faison, N. C., Aug. 30, 1910.

**Here is the Proof.**

Here follows the correspondence with Colonel Butler, which is a sufficient reply to Dr. Faison: Clinton, N. C., Aug. 31, 1910.

Mr. Thad Jones, Kenansville, N. C. My Dear Sir:—I am reliably informed by several reputable gentlemen that Dr. Faison, the Democratic candidate for Congress in this dis-

trict, has always shown hostility to the public schools, and as late as this summer appeared before a joint meeting of the Board of Education and Board of Commissioners of Duplin County, and in a speech opposed a movement to enlarge and improve the public schools in his home town of Faison, N. C., and that he stated publicly in that speech that if he had it within his power he would overthrow the whole public school system in the State. If any such statement was made by him it is important that the good people of this district, of both parties, should know it. I am writing you, as a man who stands for morality, education and good citizenship in your county and State, and as I understand you were present and heard him, I want to know the facts in regard thereto. Yours very truly, GEO. E. BUTLER.

**What Mr. Thad Jones Says.**

Mr. Jones replies as follows: Kenansville, N. C., Sept. 1, 1910. Maj. Geo. E. Butler, Clinton, N. C.

My Dear Sir:—Your letter of Aug. 31st to hand, and in reply I beg to state that in my opinion you have been correctly informed as to Dr. J. M. Faison's record toward the public schools, and as to what he said here in a speech before a joint session of the Board of Education and Board of Commissioners of Duplin County this summer. I was present as a spectator and heard him make the statement in an address opposing the public school movement in his town. "That if he had it in his power he would OVERTHROW THE ENTIRE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM IN NORTH CAROLINA." Mr. L. A. Beasley, Chairman of the Board of Education, heard his speech, also Mr. D. S. Hines, editor of the Eastern Carolina News, and numerous other good citizens. This statement has been the topic of much comment among our people, as many of us were surprised and shocked at same from a man who was then and is now chairman of the Board of Commissioners of my county, and a candidate for Congress in this district. As you know, I do not take a very active part in politics, but spend much of my time at educational and religious gatherings, and make public addresses for the moral uplift of the people, and as it is not a party question, I do not hesitate to do anything I can to advance the cause.

And I believe you to be a friend and promoter of public education, as your past record shows. Yours very truly, THAD JONES.

**Corroborated by a Prominent Merchant.**

Corroborating this letter of Mr. Jones we print the following letter from L. M. Cooper, a prominent merchant of Kenansville:

Kenansville, N. C., Sept. 2, 1910. Maj. Geo. E. Butler, Clinton, N. C.

Dear Sir:—I have seen a copy of the correspondence between you and Mr. Thad Jones, and while I was not in the courthouse, and did not hear his now famous attack on the public schools, yet I heard it freely discussed soon afterward, and in a conversation with my friend, D. S. Hines, Editor of the Eastern Carolina News, he informed me that he was present and HEARD DR. FAISON SAY THAT IF HE HAD IT IN HIS POWER HE WOULD DESTROY THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM IN NORTH CAROLINA. Yours truly, L. M. COOPER.

**What the Democratic Deputy Sheriff Says—Dr. Faison Also Against Public Improvement.**

A similar letter to the one above, addressed to Mr. Jones, was also written to Mr. John S. Herring, the Democratic deputy sheriff of Duplin County, and follows his reply:

Kenansville, N. C., Sept. 2, 1910. Hon. George E. Butler, Clinton, N. C.

Dear Sir:—Yours of Sept. 1, 1910, received, and in reply to same will say to you that I was in a meeting before the county commissioners of Duplin County when a petition was before them for a graded school for the town of Faison and vicinity, and in that meeting Dr. J. M. Faison, chairman of the Board of Commissioners, did everything in his power to defeat the granting of such an election, AND DID MAKE A STATEMENT THAT HE WOULD ABOLISH THE WHOLE FREE SCHOOL SYSTEM IF HE HAD THE POWER TO DO SO, AND I HAVE KNOWN DR. J. M. FAISON TO OPPOSE ALL PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE COUNTY OF DUPLIN, ESPECIALLY THE FIXING OF A JAIL AND A GOOD COURT HOUSE. Very respectfully, J. S. HERRING.

**Mr. Weatherby, of Faison, and Others Hear the Same Revolutionary Statement.**

Mr. E. C. Weatherby, a prominent citizen of Faison, N. C., Dr. Faison's home town, in reply to a similar letter addressed to him replies as follows:

Faison, N. C., Sept. 3, 1910.

Maj. George E. Butler, Clinton, N. C. Dear Sir:—Your letter reached here during my absence from town and was handed me on my arrival yesterday afternoon.

In regard to the school question, and the position of Dr. J. M. Faison has taken in the matter, is as follows:

A few months ago, Mr. Paul Armstrong, Mr. William Smith, the writer and others, desiring to improve the public facilities of this town, secured a petition signed by numerous property holders residing in this district and presented the same to a joint session of the board of education and board of commissioners of Duplin County. The granting of this petition was vigorously opposed by Dr. Faison, who appeared in person and by attorney before said joint session and, in the course of his speech opposing this petition he stated that if he had his way he would destroy (or demolish) the whole public school system of North Carolina.

He made the same statement a few days before to me in front of his office in Faison, and I am informed that he has made the same statement on another occasion.

I have just called on William Smith and Paul Armstrong, and they also state with me that Dr. Faison did say that if it was in his power he would destroy the public school system in North Carolina.

I remain, Yours very truly, C. E. WEATHERBY.

Now, to the intelligent and cultured citizens of the Third District of North Carolina, we submit the case. It was bad enough for Dr. Faison to oppose and seek to destroy the public schools in his state, which is the only means that 800,000 school children of this State have of getting an education, and to prepare them for citizenship; but the more deplorable part of it is that he should have denied it in public print and called the editor of this paper "a liar" for exposing him. We have not lost our temper, yet, Doctor, and we don't propose to, but we are determined that the people of this district shall know what manner of man you are before they elevate you to Congress.

Speaking candidly and temperately, we feel that your election to Congress would be a public calamity, and would turn backward the wheels of progress and educational advancement in this district for a decade. We have not yet lost confidence in an honest and intelligent electorate, and we do not believe they will do it.

**Another Letter From Dr. Faison—He Gets All the Proof He Wants.**

Later: Since writing the above, we have received another letter from Dr. John Faison, dated September 5th, and we quote from that letter as follows:

"Again you state that you can prove that I favor abolishing public schools. I simply demand your proof forthwith, which you cannot produce. Respectfully,

"JOHN M. FAISON. Faison, N. C., Sept. 5, 1910."

Replying to this communication, we simply refer you, Doctor, to the above signed statements, from your countymen, both Democrats and Republicans, who heard you make these damaging statements which you now try to deny. It was too bad for you ever to have made such statements, but for you to deny it and call us ugly names, puts you in a class where few men of self-respect will support you.

**OLD VETERANS, HEAR YOUR COMRADES.**

(Continued from Page 1.)

In the Confederate Army and that on account of such service he has been unable to make a living for himself and wife for five years; that at the meeting of the Board of Pensions for Randolph County, July, 1907, 1908, 1909, he did make application for a pension and furnished a doctor's certificate showing that by reason of such service in the Confederate Army he was unable to earn a living and that he is now worth less and has not been worth more than \$250 during the past five years; that since making such applications he has never received a pension, but has asked by letter and in person those in authority about the same at different times since; that he did go before W. C. Hammond, a member of said County Board, during July, 1909, and that the said Hammond did at that time tell him "if he would vote the Democratic ticket he (Hammond) would secure the pension for him, and if he did not vote it, he would not secure it"; that a certain Democrat candidate for the Legislature did during the fall of 1908 come to him and say: "if he (Modlin) would then agree to vote the Democratic ticket that his pension papers would then be sent to Raleigh the day after the election and he would receive his pension thereafter."

In witness hereof I hereby set my hand and seal this the date given above.

(Signed) B. N. MODLIN. Witness: W. L. Nance and Mrs. B. N. Modlin.

We do not believe that the Democrats have a man smart enough to frame a tariff bill that would afford sufficient revenue and at the same time would not protect the interests.—Durham Herald.