

What is a Republican?

From the Congressional Record senate proceedings of Saturday, June 4:

Senator Owen speaking.
Mr. Heyburn. Mr. President—
The Vice President. Does the senator from Oklahoma yield to the senator from Idaho?
Mr. Owen. Certainly.

Mr. Heyburn. I want to correct the impression in the mind of the senator from Oklahoma that the state of Idaho favors the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people. It does not. The state of Idaho is a republican state, and the republican party of Idaho has never favored such a proposition.

Mr. Owen. The senator from Michigan (Mr. Burrows) or the senator from Idaho (Mr. Heyburn) can thus defeat or procure action if they wish to by co-operating with the other republican senators whose states—Indiana, South Dakota, and Iowa—like Michigan and Idaho, have sought this reform.

Mr. Heyburn. Mr. President—
The Vice President. Does the senator from Oklahoma yield further to the senator from Idaho?

Mr. Owen. I do.
Mr. Heyburn. It is only fair to say that the senator from Idaho has no inclination whatever to promote that scheme of government.

Mr. Owen. The five democratic senators whose people believe in this policy I do not question would willingly co-operate if permitted to do so.

It seems unavoidable, however, to ask the senate to instruct the committee if any action is to be expected.

Mr. Heyburn and Mr. Bradley addressed the chair.

The Vice President. Does the senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. Heyburn. I desire to call attention to the fact, inasmuch as I heard the name of Idaho—

The Vice President. Does the senator from Oklahoma yield to the senator from Idaho?

Mr. Owen. I yield to the senator from Idaho.

Mr. Heyburn. I merely want to get the record straight. I heard the name of Idaho mentioned in connection with the states that had announced in favor of this heresy. I desire to say that the legislature of Idaho, as a rule, is sane, but there have been times when it was not.

Mr. Owen. In due course I shall read the language of the legislature of the state of Idaho. Senator Owen presented a memorial from the Idaho legislature of March 14, 1908.

Mr. Heyburn. Mr. President—
The Vice President. Does the senator from Oklahoma yield to the senator from Idaho?

Mr. Owen. I yield.

Mr. Heyburn. I trust the senator from Oklahoma will yield, merely that I may say that while that is certified by the republican secretary of state, the certificate is of a resolution passed by a democratic legislature. McKinley was the speaker of the house, but it was a democratic legislature, and the resolution does not represent the republican views of Idaho. That was a legislature—

Mr. Owen. I am willing to let the republican views of Idaho be represented by the senator from Idaho.

Mr. Heyburn. Yes; but I was not going to give the republican views on this occasion. I stand ready to give them at any time; but I did not want the impression to go out that that was the action of a republican legislature.

Mr. Owen. The people of Idaho directly nominate United States senators. (Idaho primary laws, 1903, p. 360. Mandatory; state wide; rudimentary.)

Mr. Borah. Mr. President—
The Vice President. Does the senator from Oklahoma yield to the senator from Idaho?
Mr. Owen. Certainly.

Mr. Borah. I was absent from the chamber when Idaho was supposed to have been enlisted in this matter, and I desire to say that there is no doubt in my mind that Idaho is in favor of the principle of electing senators by popular vote, and that our legislature was not insane when it so declared.

Mr. Owen. I have not the slightest doubt of the correctness of the view of the junior senator from Idaho, and am glad to have the junior senator from Idaho answer the senior senator from Idaho as to the views of the people of Idaho, and as to the sanity of the legislature of that state.

Mr. Beveridge. It should not be forgotten

that President Taft has declared for the election of senators by direct vote of the people. He said in his letter of acceptance, "With respect to the election of senators by the direct votes of the people, I am inclined to favor it; but it is hardly a party question." He was right in both of these positions.

Puzzle: Find where the republican party stands upon the election of senators by the people.

TIMELY QUOTATIONS

Extract from "Political Parties in the United States," being a critical review of "Inquiry into the Origin and Course of the Political Parties in the United States," by the late ex-President Martin Van Buren; taken from the "Southern Review" of October, 1871, which Review was edited by Albert Taylor Bledsoe, LL. D.:

"There are no parties in despotisms to carry them on. They are things of force; and opposition is called treason and rebellion. Parties are the fruit only of free governments. Popular free governments are nothing but just governments responsible to the people. The 'consent of the governed,' as the Declaration of Independence affirms, is at once the warrant and criterion of its existence. Of course, it does not consist of obedience to power. Consent, as a principle of government, is inconsistent with power. Power may command; but, if inoperative without consent, then consent may be refused, and power is restrained. In carrying on, therefore, free government, the one great necessity of its existence, is continued free consent. If this consent ceases (the consent of the governed) free government ceases, and force, the soul of all despotisms, arises in its stead. Here, then, is the great problem in all free governments—how may the government be so organized and administered as to have the consent of the governed? It is clear that this consent can never flow from injustice or wrong, because nobody is interested in supporting wrong but the wrong-doer. The interest of all innocent persons is opposed to wrong, which never, by its nature, will suppress itself; and, if unsuppressed, spreads and perpetuates its evils. Nor can consent be produced by force. Force raises resistance in the heart and intensifies dissent. Free government is a device to get rid of wrong and force. To prevent wrong and to secure justice, is in reality the origin and aim of all free government. Parties arise from the same source as government. Government is necessary to protect society; and parties are necessary to protect free government. When bad men combine, the good must unite. If the good were always good, and lived forever, the same majority which establishes a free government would perpetuate it. But, unfortunately, good men die, and virtue is not hereditary. The evil which occasions the necessity of government to suppress it, is never extinguished."

The above words seem so good and so applicable to the politics of today that I send them for The Commoner's "Timely Quotations" column.

H. COCKERILLE.
Washington, D. C.

Practical Tariff Talks

A careful study of the steel schedule will disclose to any inquiring person why it was possible to organize a steel trust, and why it is so easy to maintain it. From the very beginning of tariff-making the steel and iron makers have been favored above others. As a result the business developed by leaps and bounds, and for more than thirty years this industry has been in absolute control of the steel market of this country. There have been a number of reductions in the steel schedules, but these have not kept pace with the increased ability of the steel maker to take trade away from his competitors. Today, the steel business, gigantic as it is, is still considered by the tariff makers as an infant industry. This is not the opinion of mere theorists, but of the steel men themselves. When the Payne-Aldrich bill was in the throes of formation, Charles M. Schwab, who knows more about the practical side of the manufacturing, repeatedly declared that it did not matter what tariff cuts were made, the industry could stand them.

Here are some of the things Schwab said: "American labor can make the best steel in the world, and with it we can compete with the world. I know that American laborers can pro-

duce more steel in a given time than any other workmen in the world. I know that they can put out better steel than any others. We can compete with any other country. We have nothing to fear from a cut in the tariff because we have the best goods. It is true we have to pay our workmen the highest wages, but the highest paid labor is the cheapest to the employer." That Schwab told the truth was proved in the tariff debate by a letter produced and read by Senator Bacon of Georgia. It was from the president of a railroad company that lies partly in Mexico and partly in the United States. This railroad bought its steel rails in America. For the rails that were laid in the United States section it paid between seven and eight dollars more than it paid for those in the Mexican section, and it purchased them all at the same time from the same factory. The reason was this: The tariff of \$7.84 a ton added that much to the price of any foreign manufacturer who would import into the United States, while in Mexico both the steel trust and the foreign maker were on an equality.

American steel makers have two distinct advantages that dispense with any further real need of heavy protection. One is the ownership of a great amount of raw materials close at hand; the other is that they have so standardized production that their first cost is less than that of any competitor. It was repeatedly shown in the tariff hearings and debates that the steel trust had frequently sold rails in the English market for less than the Birmingham manufacturers could make them. Yet these well-substantiated facts had no effect upon the votes of a majority of the senators. A few figures will show just how the excessive protection of the past has enabled the steel trust to pile up fabulous profits, paying dividends now of millions of stock that represent not a dollar of capital stock invested. In 1907 there were produced in this country four million tons of steel rails. The difference in price between the United States and abroad averaged about \$7.27 a ton. That is to say, if there had been no protection whatever, the rails would have cost that much less here at home than the steel makers sold them for abroad. That tax amounts to \$29,000,000, and in exchange the government secured a revenue of \$30,670.

Pig iron is one of the raw materials of the steel and iron trade. The production yearly is 26,000,000 tons. This is dutiable at \$4 a ton. The average price here was \$17.75 a ton; abroad it was sold for \$11.25. The tariff tax levied on the people was 104 millions, and the revenue received was but 1 1/2 millions. Steel billets are the raw material of the manufacturers of steel goods. The production in 1907 was 24,000,000 tons. The tariff was \$6.72 a ton, or a total of 157 millions on the American production. These billets sold abroad for about \$15, while here the price was maintained at an average of \$24.71. The government revenue was \$590,663. On wire nails, with a yearly production of 512,000 tons, the tax was \$11.20 a ton, or a total of \$5,700,000. In the United States nails sold for \$47.13 a ton, abroad for about \$34. The government revenue was \$91. In each instance it will be noted that the tariff was added to the foreign price, showing that the duty was absorbed by the steel makers. Nobody supervised their distribution of it among their workmen. Who couldn't get rich that way?
C. Q. D.

TELL IT TO YOUR WIFE
"You can not control the trusts by the government when the government is controlled by the trusts."—Senator Robert L. Owen.

TELL IT TO YOUR HUSBAND
"You can not control the trusts by the government when the government is controlled by the trusts."—Senator Robert L. Owen.

All new and renewal subscribers to The Commoner during the month of July will receive a year's subscription to the national farm paper, the American Homestead, without additional charge. Give your friends an opportunity to join you in accepting this offer.