THE TRUTH ABOUT WYATT AIKEN

(Political Advertisement.)

To the Voters of the Third District:

The scurrilious attack made on me by one J. M. Baker, formerly of Lowndesville, S. C., but now of Washington, D. C., through the columns of the Newberry Herald and News (E. H. Aull's paper), makes it necessary for me to use this method of replying to the false and slanderous charges that have been made. I know that this attack will do me no harm among the people who know Baker, and I ask those who do not know him and his reputation for truth and veracity to make some inquiries. If they will ask the people of Abbeville and Anderson, they will soon find out the kind of man that he is. If they will ask his own relatives they will be told an interesting but rather sickening story of a note for $10,000, which was afterward compromised for $3,000 or $3,500. If they will ask Baker's classmates at Wofford College they will be told why he left that institution. They will find some illuminating information concerning him in the court records at Abbeville, and today they will find other information as to his business methods in the records of the courts in the District of Columbia. While I believe his attack will not hurt me in the District, I feel that I owe it to myself and to my friends to take some notice of it.

A SLIMY TRAIL.

At the opening campaign meeting at Newberry, when Mr. Dominick was making a garbled and misleading statement as to my record in Congress, I said that I believed he had secured his information "from one James M. Baker, the grandest rascal that ever lived in Abbeville, a man whom few in his neighborhood would believe," or words to that effect. I believed then, and I know now, that Baker had been furnishing Dominick with misinformation concerning my record, and I will prove it. Let any intelligent man read Baker's article and Dominick's speech, both of which are published in the same issue of the Newberry paper, and he will at once see that both came from the same source. The proof will be convincing even to a blind man. Baker and Dominick have the reputation of being pretty shrewd, but they have not been able to cover their tracks here.

THE M'CALLA CAMPAIGN.

Baker says the cause of my ill-will toward him is that he supported the late lamented I. H. McCalla in his campaign against me. That is not true, as Baker very well knows, but it is a fact that in that campaign he fought me most unfairly. I have no malice against Baker, but I do have a very thorough contempt for him. Mr. McCalla and myself had a hot race for congress. It was a man's fight, but there was no foul work on his part, and there was none on mine. We never lost respect for each other. I had his friendship before he died, and I valued it highly. I believe he voted for me after he quit running himself.

HOW BAKER LANDED.

Baker says I opposed his election as Secretary of the United States Senate. I did do that, and my only regret is that my efforts were not successful. I acted from a high sense of duty. I knew him to be thoroughly unworthy to hold such a high position of trust, and it was my duty as a public servant, responsible in some degree for good government and for having clean men in office, to try to prevent his election. I did not tell Senator Martine about Baker's connection with a discreditable bankruptcy proceeding. If Senator Martine heard of that he got it from some other source. But I did tell Senators Martine, as I told other Senators, of some of Baker's shady transactions, learned that some of the Senators were put in possession of certain testimony in the investigation of the Sully failure, in which it was shown that that gambling concern had been carrying an account for Baker without requiring him to put up margins. When asked the reason for this one of the firm replied in substance, "Oh, Baker was in a position where he could give us information, about legislation and help us. It was worth it." This testimony is a part of the public records of the courts of New York city and is accessible to anybody who wants to see it. I submit that the man who did this is unworthy to hold a position of trust in the senate of the United States or in any other body of honest men.

Baker at one time compromised his debts for ten cents on the dollar. Many an honest man has failed and has afterwards, when he got able, paid all his debts with interest, but nobody ever heard of Baker doing this. People who had money in the defunct bank at Lowndesville will not give such testimony.

It is common talk around the capitol at Washington that Baker was elected Secretary of the Senate as a sort of consolation prize to Senator Tillman. Senator Tillman wanted to be chairman of the committee on appropriations, and his colleagues were not willing for him to have it. Baker was a candidate for Secretary, and it was generally known that he had been a sort of Handy Andy for the Senator, servile and eager, always ready to fetch and carry. Senator Tillman had endorsed him for the Secretaryship, out of gratitude and out of his well known disposition to help his friends.

Baker was given a position in the office of the late Senator C. C. Butler. When Tillman was a candidate for the Senate against Butler, Baker was a partisan of Butler and was very bitter against Tillman. There are a good many people who remember hearing Baker apply the foulest of epithets to Tillman and all his followers. But when Tillman was elected to the Senate, and came to Washington and became a power, the situation did not change as quickly as Baker changed. He worked himself into Tillman's good graces; he was "Quick to bend the pregnant hinges of the knee that thrift might follow fawning."

And now, after having been taken care of for all these years, he has betrayed his benefactor in his old age, at a time when gratitude would have been the compelling motive in a decent man's heart. Judas Iscariot sold his Master for thirty pieces of silver, but Judas repented.

Many people will recall the fact that when A. C. Latimer first ran for congress Baker fought him most outrageously, and ridiculed the idea of a plain farmer like Latimer being elected to such a position. Yet when Latimer was elected, and began climbing toward the pinnacle that he afterwards reached, Baker quickly became a sycophant and was never so happy as when basking in Latimer's shadow.

AS TO IMMIGRATION

Dominick's man Baker accuses me of having favored unrestricted immigration, and of having introduced a bill with this end in view. The truth is, as both ought to know, that I have always opposed unrestrictetd immigration, and that the bill I introduced was for the purpose of restricting and weeding out the immigration that threatened to come to South Carolina. My bill was to establish an Information Bureau at Ellis Island, where most of the immigrants coming to this country are landed, with competent officers in charge, who could look over the incoming immigrants, and, after selecting those suited to our people, give them information as to the opportunities and advantages to be found with us. We do need more white people in South Carolina, to supplant the worthless and dangerous negroes on the farms and as laborers, and if we can get some of the thrifty people from Germany it will be a blessing to us and to them. Some of the best people that we have in the Third district are descended from immigrant fathers and mothers. They are in Oconee, and Anderson, and Newberry, and in every county in the district. Nobody wants pauper labor, except perhaps a few mill presidents, and a few large land owners who are noted for swindling their tenants. The people of the Third district, in the mill villages and everywhere else, know my position as to immigratioin, and this eleventh-hour lie will not hurt me. In a recent speech I stated my position on immigration so clearly that no one except Baker and Dominick misunderstood it. I defeated Mr. McCalla on that very issue.

It is charged that I did nothing in support of the Burnett immigration bill, to restrict immigration, in the Sixty-second Congress. On Jan. 17, 1913, when the motion to lay the conference report on the table came up, I was absent. I was also absent when the motion was made to recommit the report. When the next vote came up agreeing to the conference report, on Jan. 25, 1913. I was present and was recorded as voting Yea. The bill passed and was sent to President Taft, who vetoed it. On Feb. 19, 1913, there was a vote on the passage of the bill over the President's veto, and I was present and voted Yea. The Congressional Record will cheerfully prove Baker to be a liar if he will turn to page 3429, Sixty-second Congress, third session.

THE PURE FOOD LAW

It is charged that I voted against the pure food bill. This is another half-truth, which is worse than outright falsehood. When the bill came before the house I objected to it because it invaded the rights of the states. The bill, as it stood then, would have taken away from the states all their rights and powers in the administration of their health laws and regulations. As a democrat I could not stand for that, and I voted against it, giving my reasons for doing so. Other democrats who voted with me were Adamson and Bartlett of Georgia, Burleson of Texas (now postmaster general), John Sharp Williams of Mississippi (now Senator), Candler of Mississippi, Garrett of Tennessee, Gillespie of Texas, Henry of Texas, Hill and Humphreys of Mississippi, Moore, Russell and Sheppard (now Senator) of Texas, Sherley of Kentucky, and Smith of Texas. That was pretty good company, was it not? The bill passed the House and went to the Senate, where the objectionable features were stricken out, and when it came back to the House I voted for it, as did the others, and it became a law. I have no apologies to make for my record on that bill.

AS TO THE SPEECHES

Baker make the insinuation that I have not written the speeches that I have made in Congress, that I have had to get somebody else to prepare them for me. It is rather fatiguing to have to answer such a charge. I have not made as many speeches as some other members, and perhaps they have not been as brilliant as some others, but at any rate they have been mine, AND BAKER KNOWS IT.

Baker says the late Zach McGhee told him of having furnished me with material for a speech. Zach McGhee was my friend. He was a gentleman, and I don't believe he ever spent much time in Baker's company. It is characteristic of Baker to try to prove a falsehood by a dead man. Some years before his death Zach McGhee took a trip through England, and wrote a series of very interesting newspaper articles telling of his experiences and observations among the laboring people of that country, particularly with reference to wages and the cost of living, and the differences in this country because of the high tariff. I took some of these letters and read them into the Congressional Record, giving Mr. McGhee full credit for them. This was not a speech at all, and did not pretend to be. but was merely the introduction of some very valuable data collected by Mr. McGhee for the benefit of the members of Congress, as the tariff was then an issue. Those who would like to see the proof that Baker has lied about this, as about other things, may consult the Congressional Record of the second session of the Sixty-first Congress, pages 3565 to 3574 inclusive.

Every two years the democratic campaign committee issues a Campaign Handbook, for use in the pivotal districts, and for the guidance of Democratic speakers and editors during the campaign. This handbook has been issued five times since I have been in Congress, and three times it has contained speeches delivered by me on the floor of the House. I would not detract from the honor or glory of any other man, but I do not believe that any other member of Congress has been thus honored by his collegues during the ten years that I have been in the House. I make no claims to gifts of oratory, but when I do speak or write I have something to say and I tell the truth straight from the shoulder, as I am doing now.

AS TO ABSENTEEISM.

It is charged that I have been away from the House a great deal while it has been in session, that out of 991 roll calls I was absent 253 times. Charges of this kind have been made against members of Congress ever since we have had a congress. I have not taken the trouble to verify the figures as given by Baker, but, assuming that they are correct, which I doubt, I am surprised that I was recorded as voting so many times. The record is a good one, even as they state it. As everybody knows, it has been a custom in Congress from time immemorial for members to pair with each other. When a member is obliged to be absent, for illness or for any other reason, he gets a member of the opposite party to pair with him, and then neither will vote until the absent member returns and the pair is broken. This is a courtesy that all members of Congress extend to each other. I have had to be away from the House occasioinally, while it was in session, on account of illness of myself or members of my family, or on public business, and I have nearly always been paired. I have been in the House a great many times when a vote was taken, and have refrained from voting, because I was paired with some absent member. The pairs are shown in the Congressional Record, but not in the Journal of the House. If Dominick and his henchman, Baker, had wanted to be fair they would have quoted from the Record, and not from the Journal, and would have told the truth about the pairs.

THE CHAIRMANSHIP.

It is charged that I was not made Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, in spite of seniority, because I had been neglectful of duty in attending the committee meetings and was not equal to the work. At the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress it was up to me to take this Chairmanship, being the ranking member of the committee, but I did not care for it. I knew it meant a great deal of thankless work, and that it might interfere with my duty to my own district and keep me from giving it the close attention which it has been my pride to give it. Representative Ben Johnson of Kentucky was next to me on the committee, and was at that time a prospective candidate for governor of his state. He was very keen to get the chairmanship, for the reason that he thought it would help him in his race for governor. I did not know a great deal about Johnson, but had regarded him as my friend, and was quite willing to unload the Chairmanship on him. He seemed very grateful, and was profuse in his thanks. He offered to do anything in the world for me, and I asked him to appoint my old friend Dock Owens, a Confederate Veteran, who now lives at Greenwood but who once lived at Anderson, as messenger of the committee. This is a position that is not hard to fill, and pays some $1,100 or $1,200 a year, and it would have been a godsend to Mr. Owens in his declining years. Mr. Johnson did not keep his promise as to appointing Mr. Owens, and he did not act fairly in other matters, and I quit attending the committee meetings. I am so built that when a man deliberately plays false with me it is hard for me to get over it.

At the beginning of the Sixty-third Congress I learned that my opponents for re-election would try to use against me the fact that I was not made chairman of the District Committee, and would try to make it appear that I had been turned down because of fault of my own. I swallowed my pride and went to Mr. Johnson and asked him if he would be as good to me as I had been to him. I told him that I had given him the chairmanship to help him in his political fortunes, and asked him if he would do the same thing for me. I was not much surprised when he told me that he had defeated me for the chairmanship in a fair fight, and on his merits, and that I had no claim on him. I did not pursue the matter as vigorously as I might have done, for Mr. Johnson had his friends, of course, and I feared that a fight over the chairmanship might open the way for disruption in the party ranks, and I did not want to be responsible for anything of that kind.

But in order to be prepared for just such a slander as this I went to the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee (which committee selects all the other committees of the House), and stated the situation to them and asked for a statement of the facts. They very promptly and gladly gave men the following:

"House of Representatives,
"Washington, April 24, 1913.

"Hon. Wyatt Aiken, House of Representatives.

"Dear Sir:—In response to your inquiry we, the members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the Sixty-second Congress, take pleasure in stating that in the selection of the Committee Chairmen at the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress you would have been chosen as Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia if we had not received your declination. There can be no question about this as you were the ranking member of that Committee and no other name was considered until after your declination had been received.

"Yours very truly,

(Signed.)
"O. W. Underwood,
"Henry T. Rainey,
"Cordell Hull,
"A. Mitchell Palmer,
"Claude Kitchen,
"Lincoln Dixon,
"Andrew J. Peters,
"Francis Burton Harrison,
"W. S. Hammond,
"D. W. Shackleford,
"Ollie M. James,
"Wm. Hughes."

If Baker will read this statement he will find attached to it the name of Hon. Ollie M. James of Kentucky, who was a member of the Ways and Means Committee in the Sixty-second Congress, and who is now a United States Senator, and whom he has attempted to quote against me.

This ought to be convincing proof, even to Dominick and Baker, as to the chairmanship matter. It is true that I have not been attending the meetings of the committee during the Sixty-third Congress, and it is also true that my course is approved by my colleagues who understand the situation. I have found plenty of other work to do. I attended one meeting of the committee, when my vote was needed to secure a favorable report on some needed legislation. It sometimes happens that the vote of one honest man is badly needed, and my vote has always been ready when it was needed, in committee or elsewhere. During my entire service in Congress I have never failed to vote, or to be paired, on any important issue.

THE ANDERSON POSTOFFICE

It is charged that I have kept an unworthy man, a republican, in office as postmaster at Anderson because of political cowardice. This is the first time I have ever been accused of cowardice, and it will probably be the last time. Here are the facts as to the Anderson postoffice:

Soon after President Wilson's inauguration, if not before, it was announced to be the policy of the administration that where republican postmasters were giving good service, and there were no demands for their removal on the part of the patrons of the office, the postmasters would be allowed to serve out their terms. I opposed that policy then and I am opposed to it now. If I had had my way, every republican postmaster in the country would have been fired within a month after Wilson's inauguration. But the administration thought the other course should be followed, and I have had to acquiesce.

Some months ago Mr. Cochran, the postmaster at Anderson, and the assistant postmaster and the assitant postmaster's father, after having been friends for a long time, became estranged and some bitter feeling ensued.

Serious charges were filed against the postmaster, and a postoffice inspector was detailed to investigate them. When his report came in it was unfavorable to the postmaster. But the officials of the Department, having had experience in matters of this kind, and pursuing the policy of taking nothing for granted—and perhaps having reason to believe that the inspector was not without bias or had been deceived in the matter—had another inspector detailed to make an investigation. This inspector had never been to Anderson before, and knew nobody there. He spent several weeks in Anderson, mingling with the people and trying to get at the facts, and his report was altogether different from that of the first inspector. Still another inspector made a report, and his report corroborrtaated that of the second inspector. These reports, made wholly independent of each other, tallied in almost every detail. The department officials were thoroughly convinced that the charges against Mr. Cochran were made through spite, and it was clearly established that most of the charges were without foundation while others were grossly exaggerated. The department officials informed me that not sufficient grounds for the postmaster's removal had been shown, and that there was nothing for me to do.

It is true that when the difficulty between the postmaster and the assistant postmaster first occurred some good people at Anderson wrote that they thought the postmaster should be removed. Most of them have since written that they were mistaken, that they did not fully understand the circumstances, and that they thought it would be only justice for him to serve out his term, which expires in December. There are a number of applicants for the office, all of whom are my friends, and every one of them has informed me that he is willing for Mr. Cochran to serve out his term. It is worthy of mention in this connection that there are some 25 or 30 clerks and carriers in the Anderson postoffice. They are as fine and clean a body of men as I have ever known. Every single one of them has sided unrecerredly with the postmaster in this affair. Surely, if there had been anything very badly wrong, they would not have stood for it—certainly not all of them.

It is true that three ministers of the city of Anderson did sign a petition to the President, asking that the postmaster be removed. Two of these, I understand, have but recently come to Anderson and they had not had time to get acquainted with conditions. The other minister who signed the petition is pastor of a small church, and, I am told, spends comparatively little of his time in the city. None of the other 29 or more white ministers in the city signed the petition, although most, if not all were asked to do so. Some of them even went so far as to write letters to Washington expressing their disgust with the methods being used against the postmaster, and letting it be known that they were more than willing for him to remain in office until the expiration of his term. These letters are all on file in Washington, and it would have been so easy for Baker to have quoted them if he had been trying to be decent.

Baker characterizes Mr. Cochran as "a drunken sot." Mr. Cochran is able to take care of himself, and Baker will probably be called to account for such language. It is probably true that he has been drinking too much. Any man who drinks at all drinks too much. I can say this, because in my own young manhood I used to drink, but I quit drinking when I was elected to Congress and I have not taken a drink since. It is extremely distasteful to make these personal references, but so many slanders have been circulated on me that I would not be at all surprised to learn that the character assassins are saying that I, too, have been a "drunken sot" here in Washington.

So much for the Anderson postoffice. There has been no vacancy, although a desperate effort has been made to create one. I have not tried to keep Mr. Cochran in office, and I have not tried to get him out, for I knew that would be useless unless there was cause. The postoffice department officials say there was not sufficient cause.

But I have been keeping close up with the situation as regards the service, and there has not been one single complaint as to the service given by the postoffice in Anderson. The department officials say the office ranks second to none in the country in point of efficiency. Only recently it has been my pleasure to co-operate in securing better mail service in and out of the city of Anderson, and right now we are working on a plan to improve the delivery service in the city and on the rural routes.

As I have stated, if I had had my way Mr. Cochran and every other Republican postmaster in the country would have been removed long ago. There is a Republican postmaster at Greenville, and there are Republican postmasters still in office at other places in South Carolina and all over the country. As fast as their commissions expire they are being removed and their places filled by Democrats. Baker knows this, if Dominick does not. And by the way, why is it that Baker is so distressed about a Republican remaining as postmaster at Anderson, when he has been working so hard to enable Republican employes of the Senate to hold their jobs while capable Democrats are asking for them?

I have every reason to believe that if it were left to the patrons of the Anderson postoffice, 90 per cent of them would vote for Mr. Cochran to serve his term out. Baker and Dominick are not patrons of the office, and I have had many assurances within the past two or three days that the people of Anderson resent their gratuitious interfence..

Baker says a certain man has been "slated" for the job. Another lie; that is all there is to that. If there had been any "slating" I would have been a party to it, and I know nothing of it. I have not decided whom I will recommend for the position, but when the time comes I will give the matter careful consideration and do the best I can. All the applicants are good men, and I believe any one of them would make a good postmaster.

THE CANAL VOTE.

I am criticised because I did not vote with President Wilson on the canal tolls matter. This has been threshed out time and again, but I had as well say something about that, too. One of the main arguments for going to the enormous expense of building the Panama canal was that it would open a short water way between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and would insure cheaper freight rates across the continent and to and from the middle west to the two seaboards. We built the canal with that understanding. Free tolls for coast wise vessels was one of the main planks in the Baltimore platform, and this plank was specifically endorsed by President Wilson, Mr. Bryan and other Democratic leaders during the campaign. They told us the platform meant just what it said. I believed that then, and I believe it now. When I became a candidate for re-election to Congress two years ago I signed the pledge, required by the State Convention, that I would "support the principles and policies of the party." Free tolls was considered a Democratic principle and a Democratic policy. We passed a law providing for free tolls in the Sixty-second Congress, and it was a surprise to all of us when President Wilson came before us suddenly one day last spring and demanded that we repeal that law. He gave no reason for his action, and he has given none since. I have never been able to find any satisfactory reason for voting to repeal the law, and I did not vote that way. Other Democrats, Speaker Clark, Mr. Underwood, the Democratic floor leader, Mr. Kitchin of North Carolina, who will be the Democratic leader in the next Congress, voted just as I did. The charge that we lined up with the Republicans is false, for it was not a party question, and the Republicans were as badly divided as the Democrats. The charge that in favoring free tolls we were favoring a ship subsidy is equally false. On the other hand, if the coast wise ships using the canal have to pay tolls they will have to charge higher rates, and that will be in the interest of the railroads, their competitors, so that making the ships pay tolls is a form of railroad subsidy. As a matter of fact Great Britain never raised the question of free tolls until it was brought up by the Tehuntapec Railroad, in Mexico, and the Canadian Pacific Railroad, both of which are owned by British interests. In repealing the provision for free tolls for vessels engaged in coastwise shipping we were legislating directly for the benefit of this English-owned railroad in Mexico and this English-owned Canadian railroad, and the trans-continental railroads in our own country, and no sensible man can deny that fact. The more I think about my vote on the canal tolls question the more convinced I am that I was right, politically, economically and in every other way.

Several persons have stated that they heard Mr. Dominick say, just after this vote was taken, that if he had been in Congress he would have voted just as I did. It appears that when he got to examining the statement as to my record, as furnished him by Baker, he found so little to criticise that he decided to attack me on my vote on the canal tolls. It appears that he abandoned his own convictions in the hope of gaining votes if he could show that I was not in sympathy with the President.

THE USE OF MONEY.

It is charged that I have spent a great deal of money in my campaign, that I have "degraded and corrupted politics." This must be amusing to most people, who know the facts. I have never spent a great deal of money, because I have not had it to spend. I have had the good fortune to defeat several rich men, who spent money lavishly, who had more money than I could have raised if my life had depended on it. Since the campaign publicity law has been in effect I have filed at the close of each campaign a sworn statement as to my expenses, and if I have sworn falsely I am subject to prosecution in the courts and fine and imprisonment. But this charge is so absured that I can hardly give it serious consideration.

"LITTLE THINGS."

It is charged that my work in Congress has consisted of "little things." Well, life itself is made up of little things. I have always believed that a man who does little things well does a tolerably big thing. I have tried to give close and prompt attention to the wants of the people of my district. The congressman who tries to attend to his duties faithfully eats no idle bread. No man can truthfully say that the interests of the Third district have suffered since I have been in Congress. On the contrary, it would be very easy to show that the Third district has fared much better than many others.

It is given to but few members of Congress to get their names connected with national legislation. Take the new tariff law, for instance. It is known as the Underwood law, and rightly so, for Mr. Underwood, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, introduced it in the House and skillfully handled it. And yet every Democratic member of Congress had a hand in making that bill and in its passage. It was considered by the Democratic caucus and amended by Democratic votes on the floor of the House. The same thing is true of the new currency law, known as the Glass-Owen law. It was introduced in the house by Hon. Carter Glass, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and nobody is jealous of him because it bears his name. Yet he will cheerfully bear testimony that every Democratic member of Congress had a hand in its making and in its enactment. The same thing is true of the Smith cotton futures bill, and the Lever bill for agricultural extension work. They were amended and rewritten many times before they finally became law. The same thing will be true of my bill to provide for long-time credits on farm lands at low interest. That bill may pass and it will be known as the Aiken law, if I remain in Congress, but it will doubtless undergo many amendments before it gets up to the President for his signature. This is true of all legislation, for, in almost every instance, legislation is the result of compromise. There are many men in Congress, and they have many minds, and they are as a rule good minds. When a bill gets through and becomes a law it is the work of the combined wisdom of the entire body.

I cannot brag on myself, for self-praise is half scandal, but I do believe that my record in congress will compare at least favorably with the average, and I would like for some unbiased man to make the comparison some day.

SIXTY-SIX BILLS

nick that I have secured the passage of only 66 bills since I have been in Congress. I have not counted them, but if there were as many as 66 bills that is probably 50 per cent greater than it is probably 50 per cent greater than any other member of Congress has to his credit during my service. During one Congress I secured the passage of more bills than any other member of Congress, Democrat or try. It is claimed that most of these were "small bills." That is probably true, and if it is true it proves that I have been looking after the interests of the small fellows in my district instead of trying to score the big fellows, that while trying to do my full duty on matters of national importance I have always found time to attend to the small matters which directly affect my people at home, no matter how humble.

WHAT DOMINICK DID.

I had hoped to go through this campaign without making any direct reference to Mr. Dominick, but since he has seen fit to help circulate false statements about me I will tell the truth about him. In 1902 Mr. Dominick was a member of the legislature from Newberry county. There was a bill pending to increase the salary of the sheriff of Orangeburg county. It had passed one house, and had passed the other house with an amendment, and had passed a conference committee and got into free conference. On the last day of the session the desired change was incorporated in the general supply bill, and then the Orangeburg delegation asked that the individual bill be killed by having the free conferees report a disagreement. But in the rush of the closing hours Mr. Dominick, who was on the free conference committee, wrote a report and carried it to the other members of the committee and told them he had arranged it to suit the parties interested, and they took his word for it and signed it without reading it. The bill was about to be put through and become a law, when somebody discovered that Mr. Dominick had struck out all before and after the enacting words, and had written a new bill entirely, providing for the establishment of breweries or beer bottling concerns in certain cities. Mr. Dominick's report was rejected, and in all the history of South Carolina no member of the legislature ever received such severe condemnation from his colleagues as Mr. Dominick received on the floor of the House and Senate. There are doubtless men living in every county in the Third district today who were in the legislature at that time, and who will testify as to the truth of what I say. It is interesting to add in this connection that when Mr. Dominick offered for re-election to the legislature the following year he was overwhelmingly repudiated by his home people, receiving only something like 400 votes in the entire county. And his home people tell me that in his race for Congress this year he will again be repudiated and that he will fail to carry his home county by many hundreds of votes.

They have not forgotten how he made the county pay him an outrageous fee for doing work which it was his duty to do, while drawing a salary as clerk of the board of county commissioners, without extra compensation.

IN CONCLUSION

I have tried to answer this slanderous attack fully, although I believe it has not cost me votes, because I felt that I owed to my friends, who have been so true to me in the past, to do so. If I have not answered any essential charge it is because I have overlooked it. I have been necessarily busy here since the attack appeared in the Newberry paper.

I have linked Dominick's name with Baker's in this matter, for I have known for months that Baker has been furnishing Dominick with ammunition. Dominick probably realizes by now that the ammunition is faulty and won't shoot straight. Many people know of Baker's frequent trips to Anderson and other places in the Third district, more than 500 miles from his post of duty, to confer with Dominick. It is notorious that Baker has been neglecting his work in order to go to South Carolina to engineer a campaign against me, while I have been here in Washington looking after the interests entrusted to my care. If what I have writen about Baker is not true he has a remedy. I cordially invite him to sue me for libel.

Congress has been in session almost continuously for the past four years, and I have not been able to canvass the district each year, as had been my custom before, and as I wanted to do. We have been in session continuously since April, 1913, and it looks today as if we will be in session until the fourth of March, when this congress expires by limitation. I went to the Third district in the early part of August and made the campaign tour as arranged by the executive committee, speaking at each court house. During that week the European war suddenly broke loose, and we found one morning that the South was facing a great disaster because of the threatened drop in the price of cotton caused by the closing of the European markets. I had hoped to spend the remainder of the time until the primary in the district, visiting my friends, but the situation became so serious by the close of the campaign tour that I hurried here, and have been here ever since. I felt that if the people of the district ever did need my services in Washington they needed them in this crisis. I want to get away from here next week, but do not know that I will be able to do so.

I will arrange to have this article printed in as manw of the newspapers of the district as possible in their next issue, and will also have some copies printed in circular form. I will ask my friends to try to get this article generally circulated over over the entire district at once. I thank my friends in advance for this, as I thank them for all their goodness to me in the past.

And in conclusion, I want to say that I have lived all my life in the Third district, more than half a century, and am now serving my sixth term in Congress. My life has been an open book. I know the people of the district, and I believe they know me. If, after all these years, the people are willing to retire me on the slanderous charges, made at the eleventh hour of the campaign, by a proven scoundrel, I am read to step down and out. I believe, though, that the people of the Third district believe in decency and fair play, and that on the 25th of August they will rebuke the methods used against me in no uncertain terms.

Let me close this article, which is already lengthy, with the following words from Speaker Champ Clark: "Men should not be sent to congress