

## Indiana Democrats to the Front

The Commoner feels like congratulating the democracy of Indiana upon the results of the state convention. There was a close fight over the question of nominating a senator by the convention. Governor Marshall led the fight for a nomination and was ably assisted by John E. Lamb, of Terre Haute and a number of other leaders. It would have been a great misfortune to the party had Marshall's fight failed, for with Beveridge nominated by the republicans, the democrats would have been at a great disadvantage had they shown an unwillingness to present their candidate to the voters. Governor Marshall's attitude on this subject and the ability and courage which he showed in the matter have focused public attention upon him and brought into prominence his qualities of leadership.

The nomination of John W. Kern for the senate is what might have been expected. He is a most lovable character and for a generation has been active in the affairs of his party. He has made many sacrifices for his party, and his friends will rejoice that he seems now on the eve of a victory which will not only add to his prestige but give him an opportunity to render effective service to his party and to his state. While Senator Beveridge has earned the respect of progressive democrats by his attack upon certain features of the republican policy, he can not expect to draw democratic votes from such a man as Kern. Beveridge's nomination in fact made it necessary to nominate a man like Kern, for had the democrats put up a candidate who was suspected of intimacy with the special interests, Beveridge would have made large inroads on the democratic votes, but with Kern as the party leader and the party's integrity demonstrated, the democrats ought to be able to make a winning fight. The Indiana platform follows:

"Democracy fixes no limits to honest accumulation of capital, but it denies that wealth and cunning, leagued together, may lawfully concentrate into a few hands the fruits of the productive energy of the world.

"We denounce the Payne-Aldrich tariff act as a masterpiece of injustice, involving remorse-

less exactions from the many to enrich the few, through the trusts and monopolies which it fosters. Tariff taxation, like other taxation, should be for public purposes only and not for private profit and should be so levied as not to discriminate against any section, class, industry or occupation and limited to the actual necessities of the government, economically administered.

"We condemn the cowardice of the republican party in Indiana in failing to meet the issues in a fair and manly way; that, in its endeavor to gain democratic votes, it has on the tariff question one proposition in state platforms and different and opposing propositions in congressional platforms; that by indorsement it commends President Taft, who approved the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, and in the same commends Senator Beveridge, who voted against the same measure, for his course in opposing such a tariff law.

"We favor the immediate enactment of a pension law by congress providing for a pension of not less than one (\$1) dollar a day for all union veterans of the civil war.

"We most heartily favor the ratification of the proposed amendment to the constitution of the United States authorizing congress to levy an income tax.

"We are opposed to all subsidies by the government and we especially condemn the present ship subsidy bill.

"We condemn the extravagant administration of affairs of the nation by the republican party.

"We favor the conservation of our natural resources and demand the withdrawal from entry of our remaining timber, coal and iron lands and water rights.

"We favor an amendment to the constitution of the United States providing for the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people."

The platform heartily commends United States Senator B. F. Shively and the Indiana democratic representatives in congress and the administration of the affairs of the state by Governor Marshall.

## Democracy's Opportunity and Duty

Hon. Jerry B. Sullivan of Iowa has written a letter to The Commoner which should be read by democrats everywhere:

Des Moines, Iowa, April 26.—The unrest in the public mind is an answer to the work of the republican party. There never was a time when the enactment of legislation along the line of true democracy was as needed as the present hour. The republican party is doing its utmost to repeal the legislation it enacted in the last twenty-five years. It has demonstrated it is not worthy of the confidence of the people. The democratic party must solve the questions now pending.

It is not a question of party politics, it is a question of the welfare of the government, and the prosperity of the people. Every democratic candidate for congress, should be pledged to carry out the principles of the platform. A platform is a contract between the candidate and the people, and its violation is as much a wrong, as the violation of any instrument is a breach of contract. Therefore in the coming campaign, state and congressional, the platform should emphasize the following principles and require the candidate to subscribe thereto:

1. Economy in the expenditure of public funds.
2. The fulfillment of party pledges.
3. The election of United States senators by the people.
4. The enactment of an income tax law.
5. The elimination of combinations and trusts.
6. The reduction of the tariff and especially on the necessaries of life.

These propositions are crystalized this hour in the mind of the voters of the nation. The nominee who sincerely believes in these principles, will carry out the platform declarations and will seek election because he believes these propositions should be enacted into law.

The democratic party is not entitled to power or confidence if its candidates are unwilling to be instructed by the party. A refusal to obey the party platform; opposition to the election

of the United States senators by the people; opposition to the voter having the right to express his choice at a primary election; unwilling to destroy combinations that control prices; unwilling to give to the interstate commerce commission the right of initiative as to rates of transportation on the highways of the nation; unwilling to reduce the tariff on the necessaries of life; such men should not be nominated and if successful at the primary should be defeated at the polls.

The party that believes in these fundamental truths and will seek their enactment into law without fear and without favor, will receive the confidence of the people at the November election, 1910. The republican party as now constituted, has violated that confidence.

Democracy must arise to the occasion and place as its candidates only those who are willing to abide by the party platform. Unless it does it will not have the confidence of the people, and if received, it will not be continued.

The democratic party must be democratic. It can not become the party of vested rights. The issue is clearly defined, it is system and privilege on one side and opportunities and equal rights on the other. The boldness of Congressman Foss of the old colony district in Boston, Mass., should encourage every lover of the right to be true to his convictions. It should be notice to progressive republicans that there is no hope of salvation in the republican party controlled by Aldrich, Cannon & Co.

Unity of thought and purpose should guide those of the same opinion into one party. The party that gives the greatest hope of the success of these principles, is the democratic party. Its success means progress, its defeat the triumph of privilege and vested rights. The forces seeking to control prices, enacting legislation in the interest of privileges, who believe party is superior to principle, can not find a home in the democratic party. Those who favor equal rights believe in equal opportunities can. This class is sufficient in number to control legislation. They now have the opportunity by as-

sisting in the election of democrats to congress. Let the democratic party be worthy of their assistance, that ultimate success will not be for a day, but for all time.

JERRY B. SULLIVAN.

### THE TRUST PROGRAM

The Christian Science Monitor of Boston quotes George W. Perkins, partner of J. P. Morgan, as saying at Harvard University: "Great corporations would not be a menace, but a great public benefit if managed under laws that would compel proper publicity and punish officers for improper methods." "How can this be done?" he asks and answers that it is only attainable through national control, adding: "State control is impossible because steam and electricity have largely wiped out state lines in commercial undertakings."

This is the trust program; center everything at Washington. Take the control of corporations out of the hands of the states and then wait for congress to act. If the trusts can control the president, the senate or the house—any one of the three—they can prevent regulation. They have for more than fifteen years prevented the reformation of the senate because they can control the senate now more easily than they could if senators were elected by popular vote. It is difficult enough to regulate "great corporations" when both the state and the federal governments have a right to regulate—it will be still harder if the federal government is given exclusive control. Every democrat will oppose this scheme—the fact that it is advanced by trust magnates is conclusive proof that it is antagonistic to the interests of the public. The democratic position is that federal remedies should be added to, not substituted for, state remedies.

### COUNTY OPTION IN MINNESOTA

County option is a direct challenge to the liquor business in politics. That business is so mixed up with corporation influence that to attack the one involves the other. The two stand cheek by jowl in legislation. The representative of corporate interests may be depended upon to render valued service, public or secret, in behalf of the liquor trust, and it need not surprise a constituency electing a man on an anti-option platform to find him working for the corporations as against the interests of the people.

The situation calls for the election of men who will go further than a mere passive acquiescence in the action of their party. Elected, they temporarily constitute the party. Every man seeking office at the disposal of the people must be put on record, for or against this proposition. Then if we are beaten—if a majority of the people of the state say by their vote that they prefer liquor-corporation control, well and good. We will accept the verdict with what grace we can, and prepare for another battle. But there must be no hedging, no beating about the bush, no "gentleman's agreement" to send a man to St. Paul pledged only to use his discretion. Such a vote will go to the liquor interests. The coming campaign is one of serious political and business and moral import to the state. Pledge your candidate to a clean-cut declaration, not of what he will approve, but of what he is willing and ready to work for. Although we lack the referendum, the voters of Minnesota can compel action on any measure they desire by the simple expedient of calling for the candidate's platform at every public meeting he addresses, and by making him go on record.

County option goes farther than the mere passing issue, important as the latter may be. It is essential democracy in government. It gives into the hands of the people control of their own business. It breaks down one side of the wall that has grown up between the people and their affairs. It strikes a blow at the boss system of party control. It removes from the counters of state-wide bargain and sale the health and welfare and happiness of the locality concerned with a problem entirely local to its own interests. It is a direct-acting, powerful instrument in the hands of the people to bring back into their possession, out of the hands of the interests and the party caucus, direct municipal control. It is right in principle. It is efficient in practice. The only serious objection that can be raised to it is that it lessens the influence of the least desirable elements in our political life—an objection which should win for it the firm support of all who desire the democracy of direct, untrammelled rule by the people.—Farm, Stock and Home, Minneapolis, Minn.