

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 11, NO. 29

Lincoln, Nebraska, July 28, 1911

Whole Number 549

Where Governor Thomas R. Marshall Stands

Governor Thomas R. Marshall of Indiana sends to *The Commoner* the following in answer to the questions propounded to those whose names have been mentioned in connection with the democratic presidential nominations:

Executive Department, State of Indiana, Indianapolis, July 18, 1911. Editor *The Commoner*: I fully approve of the plan of asking candidates questions as to their views upon great public questions.

In two campaigns in Indiana I have insisted that the people should insist upon answers to questions which they deemed vital to themselves. I do not, however, consider myself a candidate for the nomination for president. I hold it to be such a position that no man is big enough to run after it and no man is small enough to run from it. I am leaving it entirely to the will of the democracy of Indiana as to whether my name shall be presented to the convention or not.

I have been impressed with the belief that our recent platforms have presented so many good things that some voters have been lost to us upon minor issues. I hope, therefore, that the next fight will be made upon: one, a tariff for revenue only; two, economy in public expenditures; three, the preservation of the rights of the states; and four, opposition to the so-called new nationalism.

This view of mine does not, however, absolve me from the duty of answering as fully as I can the questions which you have propounded.

No. 1—I believe that the congress of the United States has neither moral nor constitutional right to levy tariff duties except such as may be necessary for the support of the government, economically administered.

No. 2—I am for free raw materials as the end ultimately to be reached but I think the present house of representatives was justified in approaching the subject of free wool in the way in which it did. They were confronted, as I saw it, with a condition as well as a theory.

No. 3—The element of protection in the revision of the tariff should be given no consideration.

No. 4—I believe that the three branches of government are co-ordinate and that each one

should keep within its constitutional sphere and that a great deal of our present trouble has arisen from the encroachments of one branch upon the rights of another.

No. 5—I think the United States supreme court erred in legislating the word "unreasonable" into the Sherman anti-trust act, and that this is an instance of the evils arising from one branch of government trenching on the rights of another.

No. 6—I do not favor the repeal of any criminal clause in any anti-trust law and believe that congress should make it clear that all restraint of trade by corporations is unreasonable.

No. 7—It is well known that I am in favor of the election of United States senators by the people and that I promulgated the doctrine, and was a factor in having the last democratic convention adopt it, that in the event of success in Indiana, the nominee of the convention would be the democratic senator from Indiana. That nominee was John W. Kern.

No. 8—I recommended to the last general assembly of Indiana and it ratified, the income tax amendment.

No. 9—I believe that all governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and am, therefore, for the immediate independence of the Filipinos.

No. 10—We have passed a very stringent corrupt practices act in Indiana which I think will materially decrease the evils of campaign contributions and expenditures. I have always been for publicity both before and after elections, so that the people may know in advance the character of the support which the party and the candidate receive.

No. 11—I believe that men should work and spend their money for principles and not for men; that public officials should gladly listen to the views and advice of all citizens, but that in the determination of policies and in the making of appointments they should not be subjected to the suspicion even of having been influenced by either campaign contributions or pledges. If the democracy of my state shall present my name to the convention, I am anxious that they shall announce what they have spent and the sources from which they have obtained it. I

have no fear that they will promise anything in my name because the democracy of Indiana believes that public office is a public trust and that an official should not be hampered by ante-election promises. They will not make any promises in my name and they and I will welcome the utmost publicity.

No. 12—I believe in the support of the state governments in all their rights.

No. 13—I indorsed, in 1908, the labor planks in the democratic platform and have seen no reason to change my views.

No. 14—I do not believe that the creature is greater than the Creator. I think the signs of the times indicate either strict regulation of railroads or government ownership and as I hesitate to yield my views to the government going into business, I believe that both the railroad and the government will see it to the best interests of each to strictly regulate the railroads.

No. 15—A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable, but under strict regulation of law, I believe in a monopoly for public service corporations where the rights of the people both as to service and as to charges are scrupulously guarded, publicity preserved and investigation and readjustment of rates provided for.

Nos. 16, 17, 18 and 19—I do not pretend to possess extensive knowledge of the banking question. I have some views gleaned while trying cases as a lawyer which it seems to me would materially assist in preventing insolvency and securing the depositor, but these can not be expressed in a reasonable answer to an inquiry. I am opposed to the Aldrich currency scheme and to a central bank. In Indiana, the banks secure the state and the various municipalities for their deposits. I could not see why, in 1908, they should not secure the individual depositor. Centralization of money like centralization of power, is a distinct evil. If desirable, I shall be glad at any time to express my full views upon these questions. Views may disagree; the ultimate object to be obtained is the safety of the depositor and the prevention of panics by the centralization of wealth.

As fully as I can, I have thus answered all of your questions. Very respectfully yours,
THOMAS R. MARSHALL.

A TEMPORARY SUPPORT

Wall street's support of a democratic candidate is likely to be temporary. In 1904 Wall street seemed very anxious to help the democratic party—it promised all the money necessary and these promises circulated at their face value at St. Louis. But when the convention was over Wall street's ardor cooled. Senator Daniel remarked after the election that some who were active in securing Judge Parker's nomination took no interest afterwards. The promised contributions were not forthcoming, and just before the election the financiers—those who called themselves democrats and those who called themselves republicans—got together and threw their united support to Roosevelt. And so it will be again. Wall street will control the democratic convention if it can, but if it does it will throw the party down at the polls. Wall street will not trust the democratic party, no matter who is nominated. It is folly, therefore, for the party to allow Wall street to dictate the nomination. No democrat whom Wall street

would support could get the vote of the rank and file of the party. The only chance for success is to nominate a progressive democrat and appeal to the growing progressive sentiment of the country.

THE SECRET CAUCUS

The *Commoner* contends that a secret caucus of REPRESENTATIVES is undemocratic and dangerous. The secret ballot is all right for the individual but not for the legislator. The secret ballot protects the individual in his right to vote as he pleases because he acts for himself. But a representative does not act for himself—he acts for others. Most states require the roll to be called on the passage of all measures, thus compelling the representatives to act in the open. The same rule applies to the caucus. If a caucus indorses or defeats a proposition the vote should be a matter of record. It is neither right nor democratic for a representative to cast a secret ballot in caucus and then hide behind the action of the caucus. Let there be light. If the

readers agree with this position they are requested to write to members of congress. It is surprising to see democrats advocating a secret caucus.

JUST LIKE THE TIMES-DISPATCH

The Richmond (Va.) *Times-Dispatch* criticises the New York *World* for its attacks upon New York democrats and asks "Is the *World* for Taft or against him?" The *World* is very much like the Richmond *Times-Dispatch*. If the democrats can be persuaded to nominate an Aldrich democrat the *World* will sincerely seek to defeat Mr. Taft. If the democrats nominate a real democrat the *World* may give him half-hearted support but will really favor Mr. Taft's reelection.

MR. TAFT AGREEABLE

The "wise ones" of the democratic party are now fixing it up for Mr. Harmon to beat Mr. Wilson, which will be all right with Mr. Taft.—Wichita (Kan.) *Beacon*.