

The Largest
Guaranteed Local
Circulation

Greensboro Daily News

WEATHER

Sunday and
Monday fair.
Light winds.

VOL. II, NO. 90.

GREENSBORO, N. C., SUNDAY, MAY 1, 1910

SECTION TWO—PAGES 9 TO 16

PRICE: FIVE CENTS



HOUSE FURNISHINGS.

Framed Pictures, Etchings, Pastels, Water colors and Carbons, Values 75c. to \$10.00.
Chafing Dishes, Coffee Machines and Percolators—the well known Stetson brand—\$10.00 Chafing Dishes for \$7.98.
\$6.00 Chafing Dishes for \$4.98.
\$5.00 Chafing Dishes for \$3.98.
\$6.00 Percolators, nickel or copper, for \$4.98.
\$5.00 Coffee Machines, nickel, for \$6.98.

Meyer's

DEPARTMENT STORE GREENSBORO N. C.

BOYS' AND GIRLS' PLAY SUITS.

We show 35 styles of Rompers and Play Suits, in low neck and short sleeves, high neck and short sleeves, with and without pants.
35c. for Gingham and Linene.
50c. for Chambray and Linene.
75c. for Pure Linen.
All sizes, 1 to 8 years.
Blue Denim Overalls, 30c.
Buster Brown Overalls, 50c.
Sizes 6 to 14 years.
Indian and Rough Rider Suits, \$1.25.

Imported Black Dress Goods

We shall offer for the first time Monday 25 pieces of high grade thin wool black dress goods, such as voiles, bastiste, nun's veiling, marquisette, chiffon cloth, silk down, figured landown, ribbon stripe marquisette, the finest cross-black thin goods, ever imported, worth from \$1.25 to \$2.00 yard, they are 38 to 44 inches wide. First choice, 98c. yard; second choice, 68c. yard.



Sale of Dresses in Silks, Linens and Cotton Fabrics

500 dresses for ladies, misses, children, just from the makers in New York, made in the latest ideas on new models of Poulards, Taffetas, Satins, Pongees, in all colors, also linen in colors, also lawns, also chambrays, also gingham, also percales, also seersuckers; also 250 white ladies' lingerie dresses trimmed in lace, embroideries and net. Never before has such an array of dresses been displayed in Greensboro. The best argument is the price. The goods alone do not represent the price. We have marked these beautiful dresses for quick selling. Sizes in child's, 2 to 14; misses and little women, 14 to 18; ladies, 34 to 42. \$1.95 to \$28.50, which is about 2-3 of the actual value.

Seasonable Laces

Valenciennes laces of the finest textures, German vals, diamond mesh vals, round mesh vals, over 100 patterns to select from, narrow and medium widths in edging and insertions, they are drop patterns and broken sets taken from our regular stocks of 10c., 15c. and 20c., laces, choice, 5c. yard; 60c. dozen.



"Nuform" Corsets

THE "NUFORM" Corset follows the figure—it embraces the body closely in its graceful curving outlines. It is not tight here and loose there—pinching and squeezing the body to its shape. It is shaped to fit the figure and fit all over. The "NUFORM" expresses beauty—beauty in all the natural lines of the figure. Your corset, the corset that will present your figure to the best advantage, is represented among the many varying styles of the "Nuform."

MOTOR COATS.

Hibbernized Rajah coats, at \$9.95.
All-silk Gold cloth Rajah, Rough Pongee, plain and braided, in five new models, all colors, worth up to \$35.00, choice, \$19.95.

SPECIAL SALE.

Rugs, Mattings, Linoleum, Table Covers, Trunks, Suit Cases and Bags, etc.



THREE PHONES.
107, Main Floor,
150, Ready-to-Wear,
Second Floor,
House Furnishing, 3rd Floor.

Millinery Reduction

Preparing for the summer opening, we offer 150 Ready Trimmed hats at much less than their value.
25 beautiful Hats, all ready trimmed, that sold for \$4.00; choice, \$2.50.
50 Ready Trimmed Hats that sold for \$5.00; choice, \$3.50.
25 choice Hats, all ready trimmed, that sold for \$8.00 and \$10.00; choice, \$5.00.
50 Paris and New York models that sold as high as \$20.00; choice, \$7.50.
Flowers for less than half Paris cost.
2,000 bunches of the finest imported Flowers that ever adorned a hat, every conceivable kind and color; not a cheap flower in the lot.



First choice, worth up to \$3.00, for 30c. Second choice, worth up to \$2.00, for 25c. Third choice, worth up to \$1.00, for 15c.

HOUSE FURNISHINGS.

High grade, quadruple silver plated ware.
\$10.00 Candelabras, five lights, for \$7.49.
\$9.00 Candelabras, three lights, for \$6.98.
\$7.00 Candlestick, 13 1/2 inches high, for \$4.98.
\$10.00 Knives and Forks, grape pattern, French grey finish, guaranteed 25 years, for \$7.98.
\$10.00 4-piece Tea Set, for \$8.35.
\$5.00 Sugar and Cream, plain, for \$4.39.
\$6.00 Military Brushes for \$4.98.
\$4.00 Serving or Tea Trays for \$3.39.
\$3.50 Serving or Tea Trays for \$2.98.
\$2.25 Serving or Tea Trays for \$1.98.
\$3.00 Bread Trays for \$2.49.
\$4.00 Bread Trays for \$3.49.
\$4.00 Fern Dishes for \$3.49.

We Give Yellow Trading Stamps

We Give Yellow Trading Stamps

We Give Yellow Trading Stamps

We Give Yellow Trading Stamps

Tariff Speech Made by Hon. Nicholas Longworth of Ohio

Delivered before the League of Republican clubs at Washington, D. C., on Saturday, April 9, 1910.

We print below for the information of our readers some remarks on the tariff question and the duty of Republicans, which were delivered by the Hon. Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio, who has always been and no doubt is and always will be in full accordance with the views of his father-in-law, Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. Longworth said: Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. President, Fellow-Republicans: The time will be soon at hand when we shall enter upon a campaign of vast importance. It may involve not only the success or failure of the administration of President Taft, but it may involve the integrity of the Republican party. I do not believe, with some of my party colleagues, that the storm is here that we should fly signals of distress, but I do believe that it is no time to merely try to laugh away the seriousness of the situation. We have been through a tariff fight, which always and naturally causes disagreement, if not discord, in the ranks of any party upon which the responsibility for enacting the tariff law has rested. We are engaged now in passing legislation which causes wide difference of opinion if not discord in the ranks of the party clothed with the responsibility for that legislation. Upon the success or failure of that legislation at this session of Congress will rest largely the question of the success or failure of this administration, for the record upon which we must go before the people in this campaign is not yet wholly made up.

Republican Sincerity. The Republican party can not afford to have its bona fides questioned. It can not afford to have the sincerity of its pledges doubted. For it is because of the proved sincerity of its pledges, because of its proved ability to redeem them, that it has had and merited the confidence of the American people almost continuously since its existence as a party. The Republican party has never made a promise that it did not intend to keep and know that it would be able to keep. We must now allow it to be said that we have adopted the Democratic principle of making promises to catch the votes, regardless of our ability to carry them out. If we fail to pass, at least in substance, the legislation which we promised in our

platform and which the President has advocated, we shall deserve that our motives at the time of making those promises be questioned.

There seems to be a disposition on the part of some statesmen on capital hill to think that the question of an early adjournment is of more importance than anything else. For my part, I think that the time for adjournment is of no importance. I am willing to stay here all summer if by so doing we shall be able to pass Republican legislation, in accordance with the Taft program.

A Taft Man Through and Through. I am a Taft man—not on the surface, but through and through. I am not willing to use his name as a cloak for my support of other men and of other interests. I am not willing to praise him in public and work against him in private. I am with him, not a part of the way, but the whole way, and I am sincere when I say that the success of his administration is of far more importance to me than the success of my own individual campaign. If in order to be elected to Congress or in any other office I had to repudiate the things he stands for, whether opposing him openly or damning him with faint praise, no office in this country would be good enough for me.

Revision of the tariff. I have said that our entire record upon which we shall appeal to the people is not yet made up, but a large part of it is—certainly the principal part—and it was made last spring at the extra session of Congress called by the President to revise the tariff. If we can not stand upon that which we shall fall, even though we do pass the legislation which is now before me, and I, for one, am not a bit afraid of the final judgment of the people on the Payne law. I am not content merely to apologize for it. I am glad to boast of it. If I can justify to my constituents my vote in favor of the Payne law I shall be fully resigned, and shall make no complaint if I am succeeded in Congress by a Democrat.

Facts Concerning Iron Ore and Lumber. A very distinguished man, a Republican senator of the United States, has recently, in an elaborate speech, attacked the Payne law and defended his

vote against it. He files a long bill of particulars in his indictment, alleging certain duties that he could not stand for; and most prominent of them are the duties on iron ore and lumber. He makes no mention, however, of the fact that both these duties are substantially different from what they were in the Dingley law, and it is important therefore, in view of the Senator's great prominence and the weight which attaches to his words, to examine the facts with relation to these two items. To one who is not familiar with the facts it might seem to follow from the Senator's indictment that the duties on these very important articles were either raised or left as they were. Let us see what the facts really are:

Reduction of Duty on Iron Ore. The duty on iron ore under the Wilson law was 75 cents a ton; under the Dingley law 40 cents; and in the Payne law it has been reduced to 15 cents a ton. In other words, the Payne law has reduced the duty on iron ore from that which was imposed under the last Democratic administration 80 per cent, and it has reduced the duty provided in the Dingley law 60 per cent. Is 15 cents a ton on iron ore a duty so high that it will discourage importation from other countries or have a perceptible effect on the price to the consumer? Take the year 1907, in which, I believe, the largest importations of iron ore were made under the Dingley law. There were imported in that year more than a million tons of iron ore of a value of more than \$3,000,000, the duty being at an average ad valorem rate of about 12 per cent. If the duty of 15 cents a ton now provided in the Payne law had been in force the average ad valorem rate would have been only 5 per cent. Can anyone seriously argue that a 5 per cent. duty on iron ore can be of any substantial benefit to the steel trust, or that it can have an even perceptible effect upon the price to the consumer? Personally I should have preferred that iron ore had remained on the free list, as it was reported from the ways and means committee and passed by the House; but because the Senate and conference committee did not go to the whole way along the path that I preferred, was I justified in voting against the conference report when it went 60 per cent. of the way? On the contrary, that was one of the reasons why I voted for the Payne bill.

Reduction of Duty on Lumber. Take the case of lumber. The duty on lumber was reduced from \$2 to \$1.25 in the Payne law. In other words, had the Payne law failed to pass, the duty would have remained 30 per cent. higher than it is today. The distinguished senator complains of the duty on lumber because "it is the material of which the homes of the people are builded, and because by the making of mighty fortunes out of lumber our forests have been ruthlessly slaughtered." Would the wiping out of the duty entirely have resulted, on the one hand, in a decrease of price to the consumer, or, on the other hand, would it prevent the ruthless slaughtering of the forests? For my part, I am in doubt as to whether it would have reduced the price, but I have always believed, and still believe, that the placing of lumber upon the free list and the widening thereby of the market from which the American people can draw their supply of lumber would tend in the direction of forest conservation; and therefore I was, and still am, for free lumber. And yet I realize that my belief is opposed to that of the man who, I presume, is entitled to be considered the greatest living authority in this country on the question of the forests and forest conservation. Gifford Pinchot's Judgment. Shortly before the bill was reported to the House the Republican members of the ways and means committee were almost evenly divided upon the question as to whether there ought to be a duty on lumber; in fact, a majority of the committee favored the placing of lumber on the free list; and being in grave doubt as to what we ought to do, we requested the then chief forester, Gifford Pinchot, to appear before us and give us the benefit of his knowledge and judgment. During the course of his statement he was asked two questions which had a most important influence upon the subsequent action of the committee. The first was whether or not the placing of lumber on the free list would tend to reduce the price to the consumer and, the second, whether or not it would tend in the direction of forest conservation. His reply to the first question was: "My judgment is that free lumber, under present conditions, would have practically no effect on the price to the consumer."

And in replying to the second he said: "I do not believe that the conservation of the forests requires a reduction of the tariff or would be aided by a reduction of the tariff."

A Wise Middle Course. In view of the opinion of this high authority, those of us who favored free lumber could have hardly been justified in insisting that our views be carried out, and so we split the difference and in the bill as reported to the House we recommended a duty of 81 on lumber. Had it not been for Mr. Pinchot's positive opinion there is no possible question but that free lumber would have been reported by the committee and passed by the House. If there is

one man more responsible than any other, more responsible than all others put together, for the fact that today lumber is not upon the free list it is Gifford Pinchot. The senator and Mr. Pinchot are at the exact opposite poles upon the most important question, perhaps, in the tariff law. The judgment of each is of value. It would be invidious to compare their responsibility one with the other. I wonder, then, while I am inclined in this controversy to be upon the side of the senator, whether or not it may finally result that Congress, in steering a middle course, has not drawn the supply of lumber toward the direction of forest conservation; and therefore I was, and still am, for free lumber. And yet I realize that my belief is opposed to that of the man who, I presume, is entitled to be considered the greatest living authority in this country on the question of the forests and forest conservation.

Stands for Will of the Majority. I am not accustomed to paraphrase the words of any man, however eloquent, but I hope I may be acquitted upon this question of willful plagiarism when I say that like President Taft I wanted free iron ore, but I could stand for the duty proposed and passed, and I stand for it now. Like President Taft, I wanted other materials put on the free list, and yet only two were so treated; but I could stand for the largely reduced duties on many of these articles proposed and passed, and I stand for them now.

I was opposed to an increase of 400 per cent. in the duty on peanuts, one of the food staples of the youth of America, without which no country could long exist. This increased duty was demanded by the united Democratic delegation of the great State of Virginia; and because their demand was not yielded to in the Payne law I could stand for the duties on peanuts proposed and passed, and I stand for them now.

I was opposed to a protective duty on alligators, as requested by a distinguished Democratic senator; but because this demand was refused in the Payne law I could stand for the alligator paragraph as proposed and passed, and I stand for it now. I was opposed to a duty of 10 cents on tea, as demanded by a distinguished Democratic senator; but because the Payne law left tea on the free list I could stand for the tea paragraph as proposed and passed, and I stand for it now. I was opposed to a great many of the duties carried in the conference report, which I thought could have been substantially lowered with safety, but because a majority of my party decided that they were wise I could stand for the duties proposed and passed, and I stand for them now.

Payne Law an Immense Improvement. It is useless to try to muddy the waters by attempting to misrepresent the exact significance of the aye and no vote upon the adoption of the conference report. The situation was simply this: That if that report had not been adopted, if its opponents had been victorious, the duties carried in the Dingley law would still be in full force and

effect, and our efforts to revise the tariff in accordance with the pledges of the Republican platform would have gone for naught. It is not a question of what might have been done in the future. There was no future for that extra session of Congress. The time to act was then, or not at all. So far as the conference report was concerned, we had either to take it or leave it, and the one essential, practical fact of the whole proposition was that a vote against the Payne law was a vote for the Dingley law. You can not get out of it by saying that a negative vote was intended as a protest against any particular schedule in the bill. You can not get out of it by saying that your negative vote was a protest against the wool schedule, or the cotton schedule, or the duties on iron or steel, or the lumber schedule, or free hides, or free trade with the Philippines, or the corporation tax, or anything else that you may be pleased to mention. You can not argue that a negative vote was an effective protest against any particular schedule or duty, whether you meant to protest against high duties or low duties.

It must not be forgotten that in the House, at least, a number of votes were cast against the Payne law in protest, not that some duties were too high, but that some were too low. It must not be forgotten that two gentlemen in the House voted against the entire bill as a protest against one single item of all the four thousand odd items in the bill, one because he thought the duty on that item was too high and the other because he thought it was too low. The only possible theory upon which a negative vote can be defended is that he who cast it conscientiously believed not only that there were some bad things in the bill, but that the bad things largely counterbalanced the good. I have no quarrel with any man Democrat or Republican, who cast the vote upon that theory. Had that been my conscientious belief I should have voted as he did. But I believed, on the contrary, that the Payne law was an immense improvement over the Dingley law, and I stand for it now. The Republican party believe that the Payne law was an improvement over the Dingley law, and the Republican party stand by it.

What a Negative Vote Meant. Stripped of all non-sensical language, the question stands out clear and open. A vote against the legislation meant a vote for no legislation. The man who voted "no" on the adoption of the conference report voted against a reduction of 80 per cent. of the duty on iron ore, against a reduction of 60 per cent. of the duty on lumber, against a reduction of 30 per cent. of the duty on tea, against a reduction of 25 per cent. of the duty on

meats; against a reduction in the duties on sugar and salt; against a reduction of the duties on many vegetables; against free hides; against free oil; against free art; against free trade with the Philippines; against a maximum and minimum tariff, as advocated by Thomas Jefferson 100 years ago; against a tariff board; against a corporation tax; and last, but not least, against increasing by more than \$40,000,000 a year the revenues of the government, which could have possibly been avoided had the Dingley law been allowed to stand.

An Enormous Revenue Producer. The Republican platform, upon which we all stood, promised a revision of the tariff to be based upon two principles: First, that sufficient revenue should be raised for the needs of the government; and second, that duties should be placed on articles sufficient to equalize the difference between their cost of production here and abroad, with a reasonable profit to the producer. In the first of these we have undoubtedly been most successful. As the President has repeatedly pointed out, the Payne law has already proved to be an enormous revenue producer, larger by many millions than the Dingley law ever was; larger by many millions than the Dingley law could possibly have been if the opponents of the Payne law had triumphed and it was still in existence.

If we have made mistakes in our second pledge, if we have made some duties higher than was necessary to equalize the difference between the cost of production here and abroad, and if, on the contrary, we have made some duties not sufficiently high to equalize this difference, it is to be regretted. But we never guaranteed that the law would be perfect. It was difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain the cost of production here and abroad of every article produced by our industry, and to make the duties equalize this cost. And while we had made mistakes in our second pledge, any possible progress we had made in the first of our pledges, this information could not in any way be set aside.

The Tariff Board. The Payne law provided for a tariff board, and through the efforts of President Taft the Senate, in its report, has been greatly extended as to the scope of the investigation of these duties, and Congress, in the future, will be able to make the most complete information upon which to base a tariff reduction. And when that time shall come, I have no doubt that the Payne law will be as much to the credit of the Congress of the Republicans, the law will be as much to the credit of the Payne law as the law is better than the Dingley law. (Continued on Page 14.)