

SLEMP'S SPEECH.

(Continued from 1st page.)

reference to the Ninth District that if we can maintain the markets for the products of our mines, and our forests and in the development of these industries keep our people employed, they will then provide a local market, close to the farm, for the surplus vegetables, poultry, fruit, horses, mules and animals for slaughter produced by our farmers, and make our people mutually helpful to each other in promoting the general good of all. And I believe it is better to have such conditions of markets and consequent employment even if it is accomplished by prices a little higher than to have no markets and no employment and consequently no ability of our people to purchase at any price, however low.

Other Changes.

It has been urged by some that other changes should have been made in the bill, particularly in the woolen and cotton schedules. There seemed to be a great difference of opinion in regard to whether the Payne tariff bill as to these schedules, does or does not represent in its rates the difference in the cost of production here and abroad. Consequently a provision was made as I have stated before for the establishment of a Tariff Commission and at the last session of Congress this was provided for, so that today scientific men and trained experts are at work going over this country and throughout the world seeking to ascertain the basis on which changes in these schedules, if needed, may in the future be made, and the President of the United States in his letter of August 30, 1910, has this to say:

"The Commission, however, already selected and at work is a Commission of interested 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 do. 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 Congress with a view to its amendment in that particular."

The Democrats Opposed This Commission.

I wish to state that I shall be found lacking up Mr. Taft in his recommendations to Congress, based on such information. It will be seen, therefore, that the Payne tariff bill has carried with it a provision to bring about changes in the tariff on ONE SCHEDULE at a time, such changes to be based on scientific and accurate information, so that the whole country and the business of the whole country need not be disturbed when one particular schedule is changed. Under these circumstances, therefore, the protection afforded the products of the Ninth District of Virginia, the establishment of a Tariff Commission, with powers as above outlined, the provision regarding the taxation of wealthy corporations, and the indisputable proof that the revision in the main was in accordance with the pledge contained in our National platform, I voted for the bill.

I claim for the Payne Bill that

- 1st:—It is the lowest tariff bill presented to the American people since the Civil War.
- 2nd:—It is the best revenue-producer we have ever had, changing in a short time, a national deficit of 50 million dollars, to a surplus of 28 million. This should be pleasing to all parties—certainly to our "Tariff-for-revenue" Democratic friends.
- 3rd:—It contains the principle of protection, but provides for a Tariff Commission, already in existence, and at work to rectify any remaining irregularities in the tariff, if any such be found.
- 4th:—It fully and amply protects the products of the Ninth Virginia District.

Criticisms.

Many criticisms have been offered to the bill which are wholly unjust and unfounded. The Payne Bill has been charged with the increase in price, even of things on which there is no duty, and my distinguished opponent falls into the general error of making criticisms in regard to which there is no justification.

Steel and Iron.

He states that in steel and iron products—

"The slight reductions were on things exported largely. The things which entered into the daily use of the American people were raised in price or remained unchanged."

A short statement will clarify this situation:

There were in this schedule
\$5 Decreases
and
30 Increases

The consumptive value in the domestic trade of the articles on which DECREASES were made, is \$1,281,000,000.00 while the consumptive value in the domestic trade of the INCREASED items amounts to \$57,675,000.00 a difference of \$1,243,325,000.00 showing conclusively that the above criticism of the Payne Tariff bill by my distinguished opponent was wholly unfounded.

Woolen Goods.

My distinguished opponent says that the tariff is responsible for an increase in the price of a woolen suit from \$2.50 to \$3.00 and that woolen goods have advanced 30 per cent., while wool has fallen off 8 per cent. in price. There is a conclusive answer to the responsibility of the Payne tariff law, if any, for these changes in price, if such changes have taken place, and that is there were only three slight changes in the wool and woolen schedules. ALL OF THESE CHANGES BEING REDUCTIONS. I wonder if my opponent draws the conclusion that a reduction in the tariff raises the price? So this criticism needs no further answer.

He says that there was a joker known as "Compensatory Duties" inserted in the bill. He is wrong about that. There was a provision in regard to compensatory duties in the Dingley bill which was not changed in the Payne bill, but when Mr. Cummins, Senator from Iowa, offered an amendment involving the elimination of the so-called "compensatory duties" every Democrat in the United States Senate, without an exception, voted against it. So that my opponent is taking to task the members of his own party in the United States Senate.

Rubber.

With reference to the rubber schedule about which there has been some comment in the press of the country and about which my opponent makes the statement that on account of the increase on manufactured rubber in the Payne Tariff bill the rubber profits on rubber goods, rain coats, slickers, rubber boots, etc., would be almost "inconceivable" Now, let us examine this closely, because of its manifest extravagance. A statement that the profit to the manufacturer, due to the tariff, would be almost "inconceivable," is exceedingly strong and should not be made in public debate UNLESS UPON POSITIVE PROOF. The facts are that there were under the Dingley bill TWO CLASSES OF MANUFACTURED RUBBER GOODS admitted into this country:

One class was dutiable at 30% and the other class, the larger of the TWO Classes, was dutiable at 35%.

The Treasury Department officials asked that a UNIFORM RATE be had FOR ALL rubber manufactured goods, and this was fixed by the Payne bill at 35 per cent., thus increasing the duty ONLY 5 per cent. on BUT A SMALL PORTION of the manufactured rubber goods that entered this country. The TWO DIFFERENT CLASSIFICATIONS has caused about 1500 law-suits to be instituted against the Treasury Department by Importers, and UNIFORMITY was considered absolutely essential by the Department officials, and FOR THAT REASON A VERY SMALL PER CENT. OF RUBBER GOODS WAS INCREASED 5 per cent.

How this small 5 per cent. could be responsible for "INCONCEIVABLE" large profits, I wish my opponent would explain. Surely he believes "rubber will stretch." There has been an increase in the price of rubber goods, and I trust that those who are interested in the subject will remember that rubber goods in the MAIN, ARE MADE OF RAW RUBBER, RAW COTTON, AND SULPHUR being used in the process. THERE IS NO TARIFF ON RAW RUBBER—NO TARIFF ON RAW COTTON AND THE DUTY ON SULPHUR WAS REDUCED FIFTY PER CENT. BY THE PAYNE BILL.

During the past 18 months, raw rubber has increased in price about 100 per cent., and raw cotton has increased in price about 80 per cent. Now, will my opponent explain how the Payne bill is responsible for these increases in the prices of the raw materials, when they COME INTO THIS COUNTRY DUTY FREE? On the contrary, does not the advance in price of free raw material

bring about the advance in price of rubber goods, rather than ATTEMPT TO MAKE THE "INCONCEIVABLE" SMALL ADVANCE IN DUTY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INCREASE? In addition to this, there is a much greater DEMAND for rubber since the usage for rubber tires for carriages, automobiles, etc., has become so extensive, and the manifold uses of rubber have been extended.

Another instance of misleading statements is found in some newspapers to the effect that a piece of rubber goods sold in England at one dollar, sells in the United States at four dollars. Now, this is almost a criminally false statement. The tariff duty on rubber is only 35%—so if we add the duty to the English cost we could have the American cost as a maximum only \$1.35—that and NO MORE. A newspaper printing such stuff, should belong to the Ninth District "Ananias Club."

Cotton Goods.

Another criticism is that based on the cotton schedule. My opponent contends that the tariff was reduced on goods made in the South and increased on cotton goods made in New England. This is an unfair statement of the situation. The facts are that the duty was DECREASED on cotton goods used by the poor class of people and INCREASED ON THE COTTON GOODS USED BY THE RICH CLASS of people. Now if there be sectionalism, as my opponent would seem to desire to indicate, would not he be willing to waive such an intimation, in view of the cheaper price at which the poorer people can purchase their cotton goods? Bear in mind that costly fabrics can be woven of common cotton, just as costly vases can be made of common clay. It should be remembered that in the South today there are over 7 million spindles, more than half as many spindles as in New England, and it is the object of the Republican party to give all section and all industries regardless of section, the protection to which they are entitled. It has always protected rice, sugar, citrus fruits and other Southern products and industries, knowing it could not expect any electoral votes in the South.

This disposes of all the criticisms that my opponent makes of the Payne tariff bill, so far as specific instances are concerned. His objections are shown to be valueless and impotent, rather than scientific or substantial.

High Prices.

It is attempted to show by insinuation, rather than by argument, that the changes in the tariff are responsible for certain changes in prices. It is admitted that the prices that farmers receive for their farm products are due to the law of supply and demand but it is held that a woolen suit of clothes costs more on account of the tariff which has been reduced. Numerous inconsistencies appear to those who attribute an increased price of any product always wholly to the tariff. I happened to be in Wythe County the other day and saw 2,000 cattle being shipped and they were bringing the farmers about one hundred dollars per head, the highest price ever known in this section of the country, and on this class of cattle the tariff had not been changed.

How also will the Democrat orators explain the rise of prices in England where there is no protective tariff? How will they explain the fact that the prices have gone up in many instances on articles that enter free to a greater degree than those on the protected list? The truth of the matter is that human nature is alike the world over, and we are all in favor of higher prices for what we have to sell. A very interesting fact overlooked by our democratic friends is that out of two hundred and fifty articles examined by a select committee, it is shown that the products of the farm have increased about 36% while the products of 134 selected articles of manufacture have increased only 5.7% so that while both have increased in price, the farmer has received relatively an increase SEVEN TIMES GREATER than that which the manufacturer has received.

I call attention to the following:

	% Above 1900
Products of the forests	40.03
Products of the farm, crude	36.1
Products of the farm, manufactured	24.2
Products of mines and wells	13.5
Products of manufacture	5.7
Products of fisheries	5.1
Products imported	1.7

In my judgment the farmer is receiving a fair price for what he sells, but very often a middle man charges the consumer a greater profit than he ought. This, however, should sooner or later be adjusted by the necessities of the case. I am glad the farmer is prosperous. "He is the basis and bulwark of our civilization. He represents the sober second thought of the country." He is, through the telephone and rural free delivery service, getting in touch with the markets of the world. He, therefore, is better informed and can exercise better judgment in regard to what he has to sell than at any previous time in our history. He has come into his own and I am glad. I recognize that his prices are regulated in a great measure by the law of supply and demand, but I likewise contend that the development of industries, through the operation of the protective

tariff policy of the republican party, has much to do with shaping this very law of supply and demand. Whenever an industrial enterprise is started, men can find employment other than on the farm. Thus, a producer is converted into a consumer, and put out of competition with those who remain to till the soil.

It is unnecessary to recall the prices of farm products and of cattle from 1893 to 1897, under the operation of a law that was destructive to a tariff system, but if there is anyone in the audience who does not remember the prices he received for farm products and for labor, if either could be sold at all, during this period of the operation of a free-trade law, then ask your father about it, or your older brother. He will remember. I mention these instances to suggest to the farmers in the country that they are getting along quite well; that there are a great many more people who are interested in reducing the prices of what the farmer has to sell, than there are of those who desire a reduction of the imported articles. To show how thoroughly well the farmer is getting along today permit me to read the purchasing value of ten bushels of wheat in March, 1910, as compared with March, 1896, during the last Democratic administration:

Purchasing Value of Farm Products.

10 bushels of wheat bought	In 1896.	In 1910.
Coffee	47 lbs.	134 lbs.
Sugar	132 lbs.	249 lbs.
Shirts	85 yds.	118 yds.
Nails (10d)	210 lbs.	641 lbs.

So the farmer, under the operation of republican legislation somehow or other seems to be getting along better than he ever did.

Wages of Labor.

It ought to be further explained that the increased cost of farm products has brought about increased wages to the laborer and in the United States it can be shown conclusively that wages have advanced more rapidly than they have in European countries. In fact up to the year 1907 the wages kept pace with that of the increased cost of living; but, in practically every manufacturing, railroad, and other industry of the country, the wages of the laborer have increased in the last ten years anywhere from 5% to 45%. The increase of wages per hour in the cotton mills has been 44.2% over 1900. It is not to be supposed that our democratic friends who in 1896 advocated the debasement of our currency for the purpose of increasing the volume of money and thus raise prices, can find any serious fault with the argument that the increased supply of gold has a great deal to do with the purchasing power of a dollar and the higher prices of products. The point I wish to emphasize is that these conditions will adjust themselves in the course of time, though I believe that the farmer's prices under the industrial system and economic policy formulated in the nation, will retain in a large measure the prices they now have. So much, therefore, for the Payne Tariff bill and the criticisms of it made by my opponent.

Future Tariff Legislation.

My own position in regard to future tariff legislation is thus—

We now have a tariff Commission at work with competent experts already employed to ascertain the difference in cost of production here and abroad of articles produced in this country and imported herein. I should favor taking up one schedule at a time so as not to disturb the business of the entire country because of changes in one schedule and arranging a tariff equal to this difference and so adjusted that our manufacturers have a reasonable and only a reasonable profit. If investigation shows that an item in a particular schedule is too high, I will vote to lower it; if it is too low, I will vote to raise it. In other words we fix a limit upward, beyond which we will not go and a limit downward beyond which we will not go. This is the Republican principle and by that will I abide.

Regulation of Corporations.

My opponent asserts that in certain cases the manufacturers profits are too high. The illustrations he gives are grossly unfair. For example, he claims, that one cotton mill declared a dividend of 66% (which probably was cumulative and not an annual dividend) and fails to note a number of other cotton mills that declared a dividend of only 10% in the lists he was reading from. But this is not all. An examination of 38 cotton companies shows an average dividend of only 6.38%, which is NOT unreasonable. This disposes of the criticism in question, which should never have been made. So far as excessive profits due to the tariff are concerned, if there be such, which I very much doubt, I announce myself ready to abide by the recommendations of the President, based on the investigation now being conducted by the Tariff Commission, maintaining at all times the principle of protection. The statement regarding the United States Steel Corporation is so misleading that it is scarcely necessary to refer to it. He places the net profits at almost twice what they really are. This corporation is composed of a great number of subsidiary corporations, Mr. Carnegie alone receiving 400 million dollars in bonds for his company, which was the foundation of the United States Steel Corporation.

My opponent fails to state also that the tariff on the product of this Corporation was reduced 50% by the Payne bill.

We come now to the matter which I think the people of this country are most interested in, and that is the way to reach high prices that are not brought about by the tariff. I mention this question in this way because our Democratic friends claim that the tariff causes high prices. This I do not admit. But, in case they were in anyway due to the tariff, the remedy proposed by Mr. Stuart and myself would be the same, namely, to fix a tariff rate equal to the difference in the cost of production here and abroad with a reasonable profit to the home manufacturer.

So far as high prices are due to the law of supply and demand, I do not know how to reach them. As an economic fact however, this feature regulates itself. If a demand for a commodity be very great, the price is raised, because more people want it. It then follows that other people begin to manufacture these goods, the supply then equals the demand and sometimes exceeds it when the price falls. This is the natural law of trade and it is not proposed that any legislation could affect it.

The remaining and most serious difficulty as to high prices is due to combinations, or corporations getting control of an entire product, such as meat, rubber, coffee, tea, or, in fact, any other commodity. There is a coffee trust, but coffee enters this country free of duty, and yet we pay more for coffee than the people of England and Germany do, where a revenue duty is placed on it. Tea is on the free list, and yet there is a tea trust. There is said to be a rubber trust, yet rubber enters this country free of duty. There is said to be a meat trust, yet meat is exported from this country. The tariff cannot be responsible for any fluctuations in the prices of these commodities. The only way to reach the combination which control the market of a product, is to pass a law that will regulate these corporations, so far as interstate shipments are concerned. Let us take coffee for example; there is no duty on it, no tariff whatever. The average selling price in New York is not over 8 cents a pound. This pays the Brazilian farmer for producing coffee, pays the export tax to the Brazilian Government, pays the cost of transportation to New York and pays the Importers profits. The same coffee is sold to the American public anywhere from 15 to 18 cents per pound, depending upon the attractiveness of the name, and the retailer makes but a small profit at that. It is evident that a change in tariff cannot reach this. We must have a law that will do in effect for these large trusts and combinations, what the Republican party has already done for the railroads of the country, that is, not destroy them, but regulate them. This certainly can be done so far as interstate shipments are concerned and the states can regulate as they see fit. This theory would doubtless be opposed by the Democratic party as violative of States rights; but it seems to me that this step should be taken in the interest of the people. If I am again returned to Congress, which I have no doubt I will be, I will bend every effort in this direction. It should be our intention to correct evils and not to create them. We do not wish to turn over the American markets to the foreign manufacturer or to the foreign laborer, nor should we permit any combination of capital, whether foreign or domestic to monopolize our markets to the injury of American people. In my judgment a plan of this kind can be worked out just as has been done with the railroads. Now if the Government can regulate the corporations which deal in interstate transportation, it seems to me it can regulate the corporations who use that transportation.

It seems to me that the position of my opponent in announcing a remedy for excessive profits, is, to say the least, not very strong. For evils that he claims are due to the tariff he offers the same remedy that the Republicans offer and at which they have been working for several months. Now, if you had a sick child, would you change doctors just to get the same identical treatment? WHAT? WOULD BE THE SENSE IN THAT? For prices due to combinations and monopolies he offers no suggestions whatever.

Personal Issues.

My opponent says that he is opposed to having personal issue injected into the campaign, but that he will not shut them if they are injected. He intimates also that he would retort in kind. This has been construed by some of the newspapers, as if a threat had been made against me to bring out something in regard to my personal life. All that I have to say on this subject is that I do not care to enter into a personal campaign, but it there is any one in the district who thinks he knows something in regard to my personal life, that should be known to the people of the district, as effecting my candidacy for Congress, I challenge him to bring it forward now, and not wait until near the close of the campaign.

State Issues.

With reference now to State issues I must be brief, since this speech is already too long.

A discussion of the State issues has no particular part in the campaign, since neither candidate for Congress has any power to change the state law. It is pertinent, however, to mention the re-

ord of any public servant as to whether he has or has not fulfilled the pledges and promises he made to the people on which he was elected. My opponent was elected to an honorable office from his own County upon a platform of his party which PROMISED A SUBMISSION TO THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE of the Constitution after it had been prepared by the Constitutional Convention. This pledge was violated and it is pertinent to discuss that feature as to whether or not my opponent was justified in violating his pledge to the people. So far as the 15th Amendment goes I should say this, that we are at peace at the present time with all the states in the Union. The negro question is more nearly settled in the South than it has been since the days of the Civil War. The 15th Amendment has been practically abrogated in so far as the Southern States are concerned, and the Northern states have accepted the good spirit the action of all the Southern states in reference to white supremacy. This I should maintain at all hazards, at all times and under all circumstances. I do not see, however, that the repeal of the 15th Amendment would accomplish anything more practical than has already been accomplished so far as the Southern negro is concerned and would have the effect of making the negro question a national one. It is mentioned in the campaign purely and solely for the purpose of diverting the minds of the people from the real issues of the campaign and the real effect of cutting down representation in Congress between one-third and one-half. We would lose at least four Congressmen in Virginia and our influence in the National body would be to that extent lessened. The only man of national prominence, and they are notorious, rather than noted, who advocate the repeal of the 15th Amendment are Tillman, Vanderman, and Davis, of Arkansas. I can see no reason, therefore, for its repeal at the present time, or for any agitation or discussion of this subject in this District. If my opponent could have his party as a national matter declare for it, he might have some justification in attempting to lug it into the campaign.

Mr. Slemph closed his speech with a statement of what he had accomplished for the District and made an appeal to the voters to stand firm in the faith of the republican party to carry out the policy of William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt and Wm. H. Taft.

Appalachian Exposition

Greatest Ever Held in
The South
AT Knoxville, Tennessee
Sept. 12
to Oct. 12

Magnificent and Mammoth Buildings
More to See and Amuse than Ever Offered at a Southern Exposition.
\$10,000 in Purses for Running and Trotting Races.
\$10,000 in Aerial Exploitation, by Machines of Wright Brothers, Sigsbee and Other Aeronauts. "See the Ships."
\$25,000 in Matchless Fireworks, "Grand Battle of the Clouds" and "Pain's Fall of Pompeii."
Mullhall's Famous Wild West and Twenty-Five Other Shows of Note.
Greatest Bands in all America.

Admission to Grounds 50 Cts
in Day. After 6 P. M.,
25 Cents.

REMEMBER THESE SPECIAL DATES:
Live Stock and Races Sept. 12-17
Night Horse Show Sept. 13, 14, 15
Bench Show Sept. 22, 23, 24
Pigeon and Pet Stock Show Sept. 27, Oct. 1
Poultry Show Oct. 5-12
Wright Brothers' Air Ship Days Sept. 23-29
Strooble's Dirigible Balloon, Every Day Sept. 12, Oct. 12
Pain's Fire Works Every Evening Sept. 12, Oct. 12
Battle of the Clouds Sept. 19, 24
Fall of Pompeii Sept. 26, Oct. 1

Remarkably Low Rates to Knoxville and Return
See This Great Exposition
W. J. OLIVER, Pres.

DR. G. M. PEAVLER,
Treats Diseases of the
Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat,
BRISTOL, TENN.
Will be in Appalachia Third
Friday in Each Month.
may 13-95-1

FOX & PECK,
Civil and Mining Engineers.
Big Stone Gap, Va. Harlan, Ky.
Reports and estimates on Coal and Timber Lands, Design and Plans of Coal and Coke Plants, Land, Railroad and Mine Engineering, Electric Blue Printing.

A Few More Special Bargains In Rented Pianos

1 Stieff Baby Grand \$600
Regular price \$800
1 Stieff Baby Grand \$550
Regular price \$750
1 Stieff Upright \$350
Regular price \$425

These are exceptionally good bargains. The Pianos are as good as new, in perfect condition, and fully guaranteed.

We also have one—
Fredrick Doll Piano at \$175
and one
Kranich & Bach at \$100

Write for terms.

Chas. M. Stieff,
Branch Warerooms, 716 Main St.,
LYNCHBURG, VA.
C. W. WHITMORE, Manager.