

than property taxation, it is income taxation—which makes people pay according to the income they enjoy. If a man has a farm and you tax him according to the value of his land he has to pay it, even if he has no crop that year to pay it with, but if you tax his income, and he has a large tax to pay it is because he has a large income with which to pay it, and if his income decreases his tax also decreases.

But, my friends, there is such a thing as farming out taxes, and I want to speak for a moment on that. Taxes are farmed out now in three ways. First, when we allow manufacturers to make tariff laws and decide how much they will take from the rest of the people; second, when we allow municipal corporations to determine how much they will charge without any power to regulate them; third, when we allow railroads to determine how much they shall charge, and fourth, when we allow industrial monopolies to hold people by the throat and take from their pockets whatever the managers of the monopolies desire. Now, when I say that our protective tariff is a system by which taxes are farmed out, I am aware that I may find some critics, but when our high tariff laws are made they are made by the men who want taxation, not by the man who pays the taxes.

When I asked for a place on the ways and means committee, or rather, asked an eastern democrat to recommend me, he said, "There is no chance." I had a letter of introduction to him from a friend of his; he was pleased to receive the letter, and told me he would be glad to do anything he could for me, and so I told him I wanted a place on that committee. He said "that is impossible." I asked why. He said, "We put men from the manufacturing states on that committee." I said, "What about the consumers?" He said, "We don't put them on that committee." When the protectionists are in power, they make up the committee from the men who represent the tax eater and not the tax payer; and these men make the laws in their own interests, and the manufacturers collect from the people not only as much as goes into the treasury, but sometimes ten times as much as goes into the treasury. Why, if a man proposed to your city council that he be allowed to collect a certain amount for your city, and that he would charge ten times as much for collecting that amount as the amount he turned in, would you think of employing him? And yet we have instances when the amount paid by the people on account of the tariff is ten times the amount turned into the treasury. This is not only farming out the taxes, but it is paying a large commission for the collection of the taxes.

And so we are farming out the taxes when we charter a corporation which is not regulated by competition. There are only two ways of regulating corporations, one is by law and the other is by competition, and when competition is not possible, the people are taxed without representation and without mercy unless there is efficient regulation.

All over this land we have seen this struggle between the people and the corporations, and we see it in this country today on the railroad question. In 1896 the democratic platform declared for railroad regulation, in 1900 it did so, and again in 1904. After ten years of effort on our part, a republican president took the lead on the subject, and he had the fight of his life to get his bill through the senate. Ten years of effort to get regulation, and when the time came it took the president and all his influence, and the influence of all the democrats, to get the bill through the senate, and at last the president, in order to make it a republican measure, compromised with the representatives of the railroads in the United States senate. If I am to talk on taxation, I must be allowed to refer to the taxation this country is bearing today, because we do not regulate the corporations as we ought to regulate them. Some constantly talk against the government ownership of railroads, but say nothing against railroad extortion and discrimination. Well we have not reached that question, but we have reached the question of our railroad regulation, and I have sometimes felt tempted to suggest that the man who spends his time talking about the dangers of government ownership could better serve the public by protecting the masses from the greed of the corporations of today.

Seventeen years ago this fall I went down into the southeast corner of my state to make a political speech. After speaking in the afternoon at the county seat, I went out several miles into the country to speak at a schoolhouse. I don't remember what I said that night, but I remember what a farmer said who also made a speech. He said he rented his land from the railroad. He added that the company let him hold the title and pay the taxes, but that he

was really a tenant, for he got what was left after the company took what it wanted; and today our railroads are doing much the same, and the people who patronize them are simply getting for their crops what is left after the railroads take what they want. The only regulation we have thus far does not go to the root of the matter.

What is the effect of our new rate law, which was so hard to get? There are two effects so far. One is, it stopped rebates; that is good, but what was the pecuniary effect? Why, the railroads keep the money they formerly paid to the favored shippers—that is, the railroads get more money. What was the other effect? It stopped passes, and that gave to the railroads the money that those used to save who rode on passes. So far, we have increased the revenues of the road and that is all that the law has thus far done. Rebates were bad and it was necessary to stop them, but stopping rebates helps the railroads. When the various states said: "Well, now, we have given you this advantage by stopping rebates and passes, we will reduce passenger and freight rates, and make you share the advantage with the people." In some of the states the railroads are so ungrateful for what has been given them that they go into the courts to try to keep people from having the benefit of the two-cent rate. The railroads now want to have all regulating power taken from the states and lodged in the federal government. The states are nearer to the people and the representatives more responsive to the will of the people, and I am not willing that we shall surrender any of the authority that the states now have over the railroads.

But the effort of the railroad managers to get away from the states ought to be a warning to the people to keep in the state all the power that the state now has. No wonder that the railroads are willing to risk congress. They have risked congress for a good many years; and I am reminded of a joke that John Allen perpetrated. He came into the house one day after General Wheeler had voted and asked: "How did General Wheeler vote?" Some one told him that General Wheeler voted "aye." He said: "I will vote aye, for I followed General Wheeler through four years of war, and he never led me into any danger." General Wheeler had to get up and explain that John was never under his command; but it was a good joke and it served its purpose. I am not surprised that the railroads are willing to have the power transferred to Washington, for they have had the United States senate for twenty years, and it has protected them in their extortion.

When you permit a monopoly to charge whatever it wishes for the necessities of life you turn over the taxing power to them and in the case of the monopoly you do not even get a commission. The steel trust, for instance, is collecting a tribute from the people of this country. Every time you ship a pound of freight you pay tribute to the steel trust, for you pay your freight to the railroad, and the railroad has to increase its charges because of the steel trust, and within a week we have had the figures given to us to show that the steel trust, in order to increase its earnings, has made inferior rails. When a man rides on the railroad today he is not only contributing by freights to the large dividends of the steel trust, but his life is less secure because of the greed of the steel trust.

I have felt it was worth while to speak of present day taxation without representation, for it is not sufficient that we shall assemble here and praise the man who led the fight against the kind of injustice from which his people suffered, and shut our eyes to the injustice from which our people suffer today. I hope that in Virginia a new crop of Patrick Henrys will arise, who, speaking for the people, and reflecting the conscience of the people, will insist that a foreign despot having been driven from our land no domestic despot shall be allowed to take the throne.

But, my friends, there is another phase of this subject. Patrick Henry opposed taxation without representation that the people might have justice, and he presented in a sentence one of the reasons for representative government; and this doctrine has spread around the world. There is not a civilized land where this idea has not been planted and is not growing. Representative government! Why? That the people may rule, and this suggests the two schools of thought on the subject of representative government. Wherever they have had representative government they have had two theories; one theory is that the representative is elected to think for the people; the other theory is that the people think for themselves and elect representatives to act for the people. I do not know what your theory is, but my theory—and I believe the democratic

theory—is that the people do their own thinking, and elect servants to do what the people want done.

We are always talking about leaders, and yet there are two theories in regard to a leader; one is that the leader is to think for the people, and the other is that he is to think with the people. My idea is that he thinks with the people, not for the people. I would not think it an honor to be the leader of people who did not think; but it is an honor to be a co-laborer with people who do think. Some one has said that a leader is a man who is going in the same direction with the people, but a little bit ahead. I know of no better definition of a leader. If a man is going to be a leader he must have followers, and people will not follow him unless he is going in the same direction they are. Occasionally men have thought themselves leaders, and they look around, and found the procession going off on another street. This is not unusual, and there is no more pathetic sight in this country than a leader without any followers, and yet we have had them. And when it does occur it occurs because the leader deserts his people.

The representative, therefore, is a man who represents and to emphasize this point, I will add that if after a man is elected to represent the people, a question arises where he knows their position to be different from his, he ought to resign, and let them elect somebody to carry out their wishes. He may go back before them as a candidate and, telling them his views, ask them whether they want him to carry out those ideas, but no man who believes in the right of the people to govern themselves, will embezzle public power and use it as a personal asset. I care not whether in embezzling it he uses it to fill his own purse or to give expression to his egotism; a man who thinks he knows so much more than the people who elected him that he ignores their wishes, ought to be kept at home.

Principles do not change, but conditions sometimes require new applications. For instance, suppose the law reads: "Thou shalt not kill a man with a stick or a stone." Then suppose a gun is invented. The old law will not do, so you move to amend by adding the words "or gun." You would take an old principle and bring it down to date. We know that the state legislatures elected the senators for about one hundred years without protest, but it kept getting worse and worse; finally an amendment was proposed providing for the election of senators by the people and, Brother Tucker, you were on that committee, if I am not mistaken, and you fought for it—and we carried it through the Fifty-second congress. It was carried through the Fifty-third congress, and then a misfortune befell the country—we had a republican congress, which did not give the subject consideration; and then another republican congress, and it did not, but the sentiment continued to grow, and the third republican congress acted favorably and then another and then another. Five times the popular branch of congress has, by more than a two-thirds vote, proposed an amendment that will make this change, and nearly two-thirds of the states of the union have declared for it. I am in favor of it. It has been in the democratic national platform twice, and it will be in the next democratic platform. I believe in it. Why?—because I believe a senator should be the representative of the people, and that the people, and not the corporations, should decide who shall occupy the seats in this highest legislative body in the world.

Now, so far, I know I am not going to encounter any opposition for I know that the man who opposes the popular election of senators will not have time to attack me; he will be busy defending himself.

But there is another proposition, and I am going to venture to mention it. You may not agree with me, but one advantage about living in this country is that even when people do not agree with you, they let you live. Some people have expressed regret that I have been defeated, or that I have not seen all the reforms carried out, but it is much better than it used to be; they used to hang reformers; now they simply defeat them. My Virginia father taught me something that has been worth more to me than if he had left me all the wealth Mr. Rockefeller will leave his children. He taught me that I could afford to be in the minority, but that I could not afford to be in the wrong on any subject. Do you believe that the representative ought to represent? Do you believe that representatives should follow the wishes of their constituents? I think you do. If you do you are willing to go a step further, and give the people a method by which they can control their representatives.

I am willing to go that far. I referred in New York to the initiative and referendum, and some of the editors acted as if they had never