

# The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. II, NO. 30

Lincoln, Nebraska, August 4, 1911

Whole Number 550

## Where Former Governor Joseph W. Folk Stands

Former Governor Joseph W. Folk, of Missouri, 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 nomination:

St. Louis, Mo., July 18, 1911.—Editor The Commoner: I enclose you my answers to the questions submitted by The Commoner:

Question.—Do you favor tariff for revenue only?

Answer.—Yes. A tariff should be for no other purpose than that of revenue. The chief object of a protective tariff is to stifle competition, and to that extent create monopoly. A tariff only for revenue is for the benefit of the public, but a tariff for protection is for the benefit of a few, at the expense of the public. A protective tariff is a graft given to a class, enabling that class to prey upon the rest of the people. True democracy can not offer one class an advantage over another in the shape of subsidies, bounties, protective tariffs, or other special privileges. It can only promise each man that no one else shall be given an advantage over him, and that each shall have an equal opportunity to live and labor, and enjoy the fruits of honest toil.

Q.—Do you favor free raw material and the placing of a revenue duty only on manufactured goods?

A.—Yes. I favor free raw materials, including free lumber and free wool. A tariff of 20 per cent on wool, while lower than the existing tariff is a concession to the protectionists and to that extent undemocratic.

Q.—Do you believe that in the revision of the tariff the element of protection should be given consideration?

A.—No. The doctrine of incidental protection should have no place in the democratic faith. If protection is a bad thing, there should not be any at all; if it is a good thing, the interests should be given all they want. The tariff for revenue with incidental protection theory, permits some congressmen to pose as democrats and vote for protection; when the bars are let down for protection on one thing, the tariff pirates rush through and steal on

other things. The incidental protection doctrine enables special interests to obtain through this subterfuge monopoly tariffs. The nature of that protective tariff can not be changed by calling it a revenue tariff with "incidental" protection. Of course, any tariff may involve some protection, but this should be an unavoidable evil rather than an object to be desired.

Q.—Do you believe that the three branches of government are co-ordinate and that each one should keep within its constitutional sphere?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you approve the recent Standard Oil decision wherein the United States supreme court legislated the word "unreasonable" into the Sherman anti-trust act?

A.—No. The principle of reasonable doubt applies when it is a question of fact as to whether a law has been violated or not. There should be no such thing as a reasonable violation of law; crime should always be unreasonable.

Q.—Do you favor the repeal of the criminal clause of the anti-trust law, or do you believe that in view of supreme court legislation congress should make it clear that all restraint of trade is unreasonable?

A.—I do not favor the repeal of the criminal clause of the anti-trust law, but I do favor its vigorous enforcement. There should be individual responsibility to the criminal laws on the part of the operators of corporations. A corporation is merely an association of individuals, exercising a charter power conferred by some state. A corporation can no more violate a law by itself, than a chair or any other inanimate object can violate a law. Some men might take a chair and through its instrumentality, by striking another man with it, commit a crime. It would be just as logical in that case to punish the chair and allow the man to go free, as it is when a number of individuals, through the instrumentality of a corporation, violate the law, to fine the corporation and permit the individuals who caused it to violate the law to go unwhipped of justice. Congress should define restraint of trade and make it clear that all restraint of trade is unreasonable.

Q.—Do you favor the election of senators by the people?

A.—I do.

Q.—Do you favor the income tax?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you believe that it is the duty of the American people to promise independence to the Filipinos immediately, and to give it in the same way in which they gave independence to the Cubans?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you believe in the publicity of campaign contributions and expenditures both before and after election day in order that the people may know in advance the character of support each party and candidate receives?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you willing that the source of every dollar of contribution made to your campaign fund either after your nomination or during the contest for the nomination shall be made public prior to election day?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you believe in the support of state governments in all their rights?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you indorse the labor planks of the 1908 platform?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you believe in the strict regulation of railroads?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you indorse the democratic platform of 1908 respecting trusts wherein it declares that "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable" and presents a remedy?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you approve the plan known as the Aldrich currency scheme?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you favor asset currency in any form?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you believe in the establishment of what is known as a central bank?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you favor legislation compelling banks to insure depositors?

A.—Yes.

### UNDERWOOD UNMASKED

The action of Chairman Underwood in opposing an immediate effort to reduce the iron and steel schedule reveals the real Underwood. Speaker Clark and other tariff reformers tried to secure the passage of a resolution instructing the ways and means committee to take up other schedules, including the iron and steel schedule, but Underwood and Fitzgerald, of New York, the Fitzgerald who saved Cannon in the last congress—succeeded in defeating the resolution. Mr. Kitcher, a member of the committee reminded Mr. Underwood that he had told the country that all his worldly goods were tied up in the iron and steel industry and that a failure to report a bill covering that schedule might be attributed to his connection with the business, but even this did not move him. Some of the democrats thought Mr. Bryan did Mr. Underwood an injustice when he charged him with being tainted with protection—what do these democrats think now—since Mr. Under-

wood has put himself at the head of the opposition to Speaker Clark's tariff reduction program? The tariff on wool was the camel's nose. The animal is trying to enter the tent. The unmasking of Chairman Underwood will serve a useful purpose if it arouses the democrats to an understanding of the mistake made in putting Mr. Underwood at the head of the committee—if it solidifies his policy of delay.

The most effective way to shear him of his power is to change the caucus rules so as to require a PUBLIC RECORD VOTE on every question affecting the party's policy. Protection is a nocturnal animal; it shuns the light. A record vote, open to the newspapers, would have enabled Clark to have carried his resolution. The caucus rules ought to be changed at once.

### DO YOUR BEST

The democratic congress should secure as much reduction in the woolen schedule as possible at this session. It can not afford to deny the people effort at relief merely because it can

not get as much as is desired. Free wool would have given a lower schedule and enabled the house to force a better compromise but the senate amendment is much better than the present law. President Taft should be given a chance to sign or veto a reduction of the woolen schedule.

### THE PEOPLE'S COMMISSION

Press dispatches report that President Taft thinks it would be discourteous to the tariff commission to permit reduction of the woolen schedule before it makes a report. The president should remember that the democratic house is a tariff commission appointed by the people and that it would be discourteous to ignore the demand of the voters expressed through the house.

### ACT NOW

The senate and house should quit playing politics and agree upon the optional plan of electing senators or upon some other plan which will eliminate the partisan issue raised over control of the elections.