

speech recorded in the Congressional Record of May 13, quotes from the testimony given by Judge Gary, president of the steel trust, before the ways and means committee last December. Here are the questions and answers:

"Mr. Cockran. You practically do control the ore supply of the country?"

"Mr. Gary. No; not now; not for the immediate future."

"Mr. Cockran. Well, the ultimate supply?"

"Mr. Gary. Yes, I think so—that is, pretty nearly. It is not absolute control."

When the steel trust absorbed the Tennessee Coal and Iron company it secured a practical monopoly of the iron ore of the United States. Mr. Gary admits that they have "pretty nearly" a monopoly of the ultimate supply. Their control has been estimated at from 62½ per cent to 85 per cent, but if the steel trust only controlled 50 per cent, the democrats would have been justified in voting for free iron ore, for putting the total production at forty millions, and the importation at one million, if the steel trust owned half of the domestic production, or twenty millions, and added the tariff on iron ore to the price, it would make \$5,000,000 out of the 25 per cent duty, while the treasury would collect but \$250,000. While it may not be possible to prove to a mathematical certainty that the steel trust asked for the tariff on iron ore, there is enough evidence to put a democrat on inquiry. For instance, Senator Smith, of Maryland, states that a person representing the trust told him that the trust favored a tariff on iron ore. Senator Stone declares that no representative of the trust ever communicated with him, but that does not overthrow Senator Smith's testimony. If every other senator testified that no representative of the trust had expressed an opinion in his presence, "would not answer the statement made by the senator from Maryland that a representative of the trust DID express such an opinion in his presence. If a representative of the trust had told Senator Stone that the steel trust was opposed to the tariff, the statement might be advanced to refute the statement made by the senator from Maryland, but the answer made by Senator Stone would not be accepted in court as an answer, especially as he declares that he has no acquaintance with representatives of the trust. But the testimony of Senator Smith of Maryland is hardly necessary to raise the presumption that the steel trust does want a tariff on iron ore. Such a tariff is not only a direct pecuniary benefit to the steel trust, but it assists it in its effort to control the iron industry.

Senator Culberson gives as his reason for voting for free iron ore his belief that it "might well have a tendency to shut out competition on the part of whatever independent industries there may be." Because he believes that a tariff of even 25 cents a ton will have "a tendency to increase the value of the property of this combination (the steel trust) and have a tendency to fix its monopolistic powers upon the American people and to deny to the independent iron people the power to compete with this existing monopoly," he voted for free iron ore, although he declared that "as a general rule" he favored "a revenue tariff practically upon everything that may come into the United States." He considers the question of iron ore as an exception to the rule, "because of the control already obtained by this corporation of the ultimate supply of iron ore in this country."

The advocates of a tariff on iron ore felt the force of Senator Culberson's argument and attempted to answer it by declaring that Mr. Schwab owned some iron mines in Cuba and would get the benefit of free iron ore. This is not an argument that a democrat can make. A republican who believes that the FOREIGNER pays the tariff might make such an argument and insist that Mr. Schwab, as the owner of foreign iron ore, would get the benefit of any reduction in the tariff on ore, but a democrat who believes that the CONSUMER pays the tariff must insist that the American consumer would get the benefit of free iron ore. But even if Mr. Schwab could make a profit of 25 cents a ton out of free iron ore, the profit made by him on the small amount imported would be inconsiderable compared with the amount that will be made by the steel trust on the domestic product, assuming that the domestic product will sell for the foreign price plus the tariff. Or will the advocates of protection say that Mr. Schwab would raise the price under free iron ore and collect for himself what might be collected by the government through a 25 cent tariff, but that the steel trust will at the same

time reduce its price 25 cents a ton in order to avoid making a profit of 25 cents a ton out of the tariff.

Senator Culberson gave as an additional reason for voting for free iron ore his desire to protect iron ore as a raw material and postpone its exhaustion. He quoted from the president's message of January 22, 1909, to the effect that "the known supply of high-grade iron ores in the United States approximates 3,840,000,000 tons, which at the present increasing rate of consumption can not be expected to last beyond the middle of the present century." While the president's position has been disputed by those who favor a duty on iron ore, still Senator Culberson was justified in giving weight to the president's warning, especially when in doing so he struck a blow at the greatest trust that there is in this country.

It will be necessary for those democrats who voted for the tariff on iron ore to become defenders of the steel trust and to insist that it is not a trust or that it at least has not a monopoly of iron ore where it is necessary to make this defense of the steel trust in order to defend their own votes. It is a pity that we must lose the aid of these democrats in our fight against the steel trust.

Fourth, But there is another fact that the democrat must take into consideration in deciding upon the wisdom of a democratic vote for a tariff on iron ore. We are engaged in a great struggle between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff. The republicans stand for a protective tariff, and under the pretense that they are levying a tariff only sufficient to cover the difference in the cost of production here and abroad "with a reasonable profit to the manufacturer," they are levying duties that can not be justified on principle, on policy, or on necessity. The democrats are endeavoring to inform the country as to the iniquities of a high tariff. In this effort they are handicapped by the fact that nearly all of the papers of prominence are republican. In the contested states at least four out of five of the papers lean to the republican side. Some of these papers are advocating a reduction of the tariff, but they are doing it from the republican standpoint and with the expectation of claiming for the republican party whatever credit may come from reduction, if it is secured. Several republican senators have shown symptoms of tariff reform. They have not been consistent tariff reformers, for their efforts at reduction have been spasmodic and sporadic, but they are being lionized by those republican papers which favor reduction. When these tariff reform republicans voted for free lumber, while a number of democrats voted to put a tariff on lumber, the fact was heralded throughout the country as an evidence that democrats were opposing tariff reduction, while prominent republicans were attempting to secure reductions in the interest of the public. When these same tariff reform republicans demanded free iron ore, and eighteen democrats voted for a tariff on iron ore, it was again announced that the democrats were opposing tariff reduction, and the steel trust was credited with exerting an influence upon democratic leaders. In vain will the eighteen democrats who voted for a tariff on iron ore insist that they were not influenced by the steel trust—their protest will never reach the voters; in vain will they insist that the democratic party stands for a tariff on raw materials—there are enough democratic votes to contradict it; in vain will they contend that the duty which they voted for was merely a revenue duty—it benefits a trust. Their power to assist the democratic party is weakened, and their effectiveness upon the stump materially lessened. When one of them attempts to denounce the iniquities of a high tariff, he will be met with the question, "Did you not vote for a tariff on iron ore when a number of republicans tried to put iron ore on the free list?" and then he will need the rest of the time to explain why he did so. He will be asked to explain why ten democrats voted for free iron ore while he voted against it. He will also be asked to explain what percentage of the iron ore of the country is controlled by the steel trust, and to figure out how much the steel trust will make out of the tariff on iron ore. And then, if he has any time left, he will probably be devoting it to explaining why the democratic party adopts a platform, if the platform is not binding upon those who represent the party.

The democrats of the rank and file have a right to expect that their representatives will consider the effect of their votes in strengthening or weakening public confidence in the party. Can democratic senators who voted for a tariff

on iron ore imagine for a moment that they have strengthened the party's position? If democratic senators justify their votes for free iron ore on the ground that they are not willing to strengthen the death grip of the steel trust upon the iron industry of the country, are republican papers and speakers likely to overlook such an argument in attempting to explain the failure of the republican party to reduce the tariff.

The republican party was in an embarrassing position; the republican platform was intentionally so written as to permit the leaders to practice a deliberate deception upon the public. The protected interests furnishing the campaign fund demanded, as might have been expected, the maintenance of tariff rates. The democratic party was in position to make a great deal of capital out of the republican dilemma. Never in recent years have we had such an opportunity to strike the republican party in a vital spot, but the party has been unable to take advantage of the situation because democratic members and senators are continually helping the republicans out in their embarrassment. When Speaker Cannon was about to be rebuked twenty-three democrats went over and saved him from humiliation and at the time prevented the democrats from carrying out the plank of their platform demanding the reformation of the rules of the house. When there seemed to be a chance to put lumber upon the free list and carry out a plank of the democratic platform, a number of members and senators joined with the republicans and prevented it. When there seemed to be a chance to put iron ore on the free list and strike a blow at the steel trust, a number of democratic members and senators found reasons for voting for a tariff on iron ore. How can the democratic party hope to make a successful fight with this division in its ranks on important principles and on important schedules?

No matter how honest these democrats may have been they have put their party on the defensive and brought rejoicing into the republican camp.

Senator Stone closes his speech in the following language:

"I do not hold myself above criticism, from any source, and I do not object to criticism when fairly made; and so in this instance I do not protest against Colonel Bryan expressing his opinion, but I think we understand the situation here better than he does, and that we understand these questions fully as well as he does, and hence the confidence I have in the correctness of my vote has not been shaken by the expressed view of my distinguished friend."

The Commoner can return the compliment and say that Mr. Bryan recognizes the fallibility of human opinion and admits his liability to error, but he believes that Senator Stone and those who voted with him erred and erred to the great injury of the party and the country, and his confidence in his position on this subject is not shaken by the expressed views of his distinguished friend, Senator Stone.

The Commoner will be glad to publish brief communications on both sides of this question.

ALDRICH'S EASY TASK

Some of the republican papers are giving Mr. Aldrich credit for great ability in the management of the tariff discussion, but it must be remembered that Mr. Aldrich's task is made easy by the fact that he is the representative of "the system" and has all the assistants that he needs. If the readers will pardon the illustration, Mr. Aldrich's position is something like the position of the shepherd on the western plains who has a number of sheep-dogs to assist him. The dogs round up any sheep that show signs of waywardness, and thus save the shepherd many steps. So with Mr. Aldrich. The trust representatives are his faithful assistants and line up such senators and congressmen as are responsive to the call of the trusts. The votes that have been cast in congress indicate that the trust representatives have been neither asleep nor inactive. The "pressure" that they bring to bear on the legislators relieves Mr. Aldrich of a great deal of labor. If Mr. Aldrich relied upon his argument or upon personal influence, he would not get very far in the tariff fight, but with the trusts behind him to threaten obstreperous congressmen and to hold out promises of influence and campaign funds, he is able to continue his march toward a high-tariff victory. When the people decide to send senators and members who will guard the interests of ALL the people instead of listening to the demands of a few, Mr. Aldrich will be as powerless as the tariff reformers are now.