Nov. 30, 1910

My dear Mr. MacColl:

Replying to your letter of Nov. 10, I infer from the concluding paragraph that detailed answers to my questions would require more time than you can spare. I assure you of my full appreciation of the length to which you have already gone in replying to me, and I again venture to remind you that I look upon your letters as a courtesy to me, but also upon my questions as an indication of my fairness to you who are taking so prominent a part in this tariff work. Certainly there will be no ground for complaint that I did not seek criticism of my views in advance of their publication in our magazine.

I feel obliged, however, to state that you have failed to clear up several points. You offer nothing to show that the increased cost for the mercerizing structure and for the mercerizing process itself would not have been automatically provided for by the progressive increases of rates according to increase of values as provided for in the Dingley bill, which rates were pronounced adequate by Mr. Lippitt. This contention is in no wise affected by the fixed duties on goods under 12½ cents a yard, for the increased cost for the mercerizing structure and the mercerizing process itself would automatically tend to lift such goods above the 12½ cent limit and make them subject to higher rates. This fact, which appears very clear to me, and the additional fact that neither you nor any one else has shown that the difference between the American and foreign costs of the mercerizing structures and process is greater than in the case of other processes of cotton manufacturing, leave me no escape from the conclusion that the increases due to the

Digital Image, 2009, The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pelletier Library

step-ladder specifics and to the 1 and 2 cent cumulative duties were entirely unwarranted.

Regarding Mr. Langshaw, the refusal of the Arkwrightt Club to make a statement of how the money was expended and Mr. Langshaw's protest certainly do raise the presumption of improper influence by means of money.

As for the N.A.C.M. I feel as if it would be a waste of time and rather presumptuous on my part to address Secretary Woodbury regarding attendance and membership. I ventured to ask you for the information because of your offer to help me. Will you kindly return the list of those present which I sent you?

Regarding the reported effort on the part of the Arkwright Club to unite with foreign manufacturers in an effort to restrict the consumption of cotton, you fail to refer directly to this point.

I note your fear that I am not a good protectionist. That may or may not be, but of one thing I grow more certain every day, and that is that my effort to scrutinize duties and determine whether they a re fair and warranted by the requirements of protection is far better calculated to place protection on an enduring foundation than is the policy of the standpatter who approves of no change unless it is in the nature of an increase.

I am writing thus at length not with the expectation that you will take more of your time in making replies to my points I have raised, but merely to let you know how your arguments have appealed to me.

Again thanking you for your courtesy, I am,

Yours very truly,

Digital Image, 2009. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pelletier Library