

and wrong he is not the man we want to speak for us. We want him to be on our side.

Politics is not a difficult matter to understand; nothing complex about it. People sometimes try to make it mysterious, but it is easily understood. After the campaign of 1896, I met a man on the train who introduced himself, and said, "Mr. Bryan, I voted against you but my gardener voted for you"; and he added, "Maybe, you would like to know why." I replied that I would, and then he went on to tell me how just before the election he said to the gardener, "I understand you are going to vote for Mr. Bryan," and he answered, "Yes, sir." Then the employer detailed their conversation. He had inquired about different questions, and he did not seem to think that the gardener's answer displayed a great amount of information or knowledge of the subject. Finally he had asked, "Why, then, are you going to vote for him?" and the gardener's reply was, "Because he is on my side." That is why we vote for people, if we vote intelligently. It is important that the president of the United States shall be on our side.

And what do we mean by that. There are just two sides in this world. Just two points of view from which people look at public questions. One is the aristocratic standpoint and the other is the democratic. There are two conceptions of society; one the democratic, that society is built from the bottom, and the other the aristocratic, that society is suspended from the top. There are two ideas of government, one that governments come up from the people, and the other that they are forced upon the people by a superior power. The man who believes that society is built from the bottom will tell you that when you legislate you must legislate for all the people, and he believes that their prosperity will find its way up through all the classes that rest upon the masses. But the man who believes that society is suspended from the top, says, "Legislate for the well to do, and then be patient and wait while their prosperity leaks through on those below."

This is the struggle everywhere between the many who petition for justice, and the few who demand privileges. And it makes all the difference in the world whether the president stands for the people or stands for the few. The first question Woodrow Wilson asks when a new proposition comes before him is, "What are the interests of all the people?" We have a line on him; he is a conscientious man, whose heart is with the people—a man who has a conscience, and dares to follow it; a man who believes that the people have the right to govern themselves, that they may use the government for the protection of their rights and the advancement of their welfare. This is the man who leads us out into a new era.

When he entered office he could, according to the constitution, have had the time from the 4th of March until December to get acquainted with the office and enjoy himself in the White House. But when he sat down at his desk, he said, "Where is the pen?" and when they gave him the pen, he called congress together in special session. He lost no time; he took upon himself the burden of staying there through the hot months that he might begin at once the work of a nation's emancipation from bondage. When he got his message ready, he said to that splendid private secretary of his, Joe Tumulty, "Let's go down to congress." And when they heard in the house and the senate that the president was coming down to read his message, the timid ones said, "That is revolutionary. That is an innovation." And they were afraid that precedent would be shattered, but what is a bad precedent for except to be shattered? What use can you make of a bad precedent except to overthrow it? When the president finished reading his message, they said, "That is what everybody should have done," and nothing more has been said about its being dangerous for the president to read a message to congress.

He said to them in substance: "We are sent here by the people for a purpose. Ours is a cooperative government, and we must act together if we act at all. Now come, let's keep the pledges that we made." And then he helped to prepare a tariff bill which was a much better bill than I expected could be prepared. I am sanguine, if not sanguinary, and I have always believed, since I began talking tariff thirty-three years ago, that the time would come when we would have tariff reduction. Some twenty years ago I helped to pass some bills that I thought

were good, but this bill is the best bill that has been written on the subject of import duties since the war, and it has already accomplished something. It has disappointed the gloomy prophets who said that the Lord was in partnership with the republican party and would ruin the country if the republican party did not write the tariff. And how surprised some of these honest and well meaning advocates of protection must have been the next morning, after the president signed the bill, when they found that the sun rose in the same place, that the climate had not changed and that the fertility of the soil had not disappeared under the influence of tariff reduction.

He has emancipated ninety millions of people, and made it possible for every citizen to vote as he pleases without being terrorized by an employer. Gentlemen, I care not what your views on the tariff may have been, if you are worthy of the name of citizen, you believe that a man's vote is his own, and that nobody has a right to take it from him. None of you can justify what you have seen in this country in the campaigns through which we have passed, when they have put up notices in their factories, "Don't come back on Wednesday if the republican party is defeated." Not one of you dares to indorse what you have seen in this country when the employer has gone to men who have nothing laid up for the winter and given them their choice between surrendering their citizenship and their bread and butter.

If Woodrow Wilson never does anything else, he has made it possible for the laboring man to stand erect and assert that his vote is his own.

And this new tariff law had an income tax in it. I suppose I have been called an anarchist for advocating an income tax more than for any one other thing. I have been called it for several things, but more for this. I have been described as a demagogue and a disturber of the peace. I have been accused of being envious of the rich. That was when they accused me of being poorer than I was. Now they charge me with being richer than I am. They said I was trying to stir up the passions of the multitude. Well, when I look back at the little law we had in 1894 laying two per cent on incomes, with no graduation—just a flat rate on all incomes above four thousand—and then look at the present law, I am ashamed of my moderation.

We passed that law, and the supreme court declared it unconstitutional. A supreme court by a majority of one nullified it, and that one majority was secured by persuading a judge to change his opinion as to the constitutionality of the law between two hearings of the case. The law was not unconstitutional when it was passed. It was not unconstitutional the first time they heard it. Nobody knows when it became unconstitutional, for nobody knows the exact time when that judge changed his mind. But, my friends, one majority was enough according to our constitution, and the law failed, and from that day until we secured a constitutional amendment, our country in the presence of peril was powerless to lay its hand upon the accumulations of the rich, but it was always able to draft the citizen and make him give his life for his country.

The fight lasted for nineteen years, and at the end of that time a nation had rebuked a court, and specifically authorized an income tax. Two-thirds of the members of both houses had voted to submit the amendment, and three-fourths of the states of the union had voted to ratify it, and among them was the state of New York, where the largest concentration of wealth is to be found. When this democratic congress met, there was no doubt about its carrying out the mandate of the people, given when that constitutional amendment was adopted. When they got through with that bill in the house, I was amazed to find that instead of having a two per cent rate flat, they had graded it from one to five, and I hoped the senators would not notice it, for I was afraid they would lower it, but lo and behold, when the senate got through the rate had been raised from one to five to one to seven, and some of the senators wanted to make it ten. There it is, a law, and, my friends, I want you to give me credit for one thing,—you who thought I favored an income tax, because I was poor, and would not have it to pay, I want you to know I am for it now, and ready to pay my share.

A change has come in the people of this country. Men who nineteen years ago denounced those who favored an income tax now say that

it is all right and that they are ready to pay it. I was talking to a man the other day who had had a conversation with a rich democrat, just after this law was signed by the president. This democrat had an income of \$400,000 a year,—there are not many democrats who have that—and he was never afraid to let the people make the laws that regulated his property. This man who reported the conversation to me asked him, "How do you like the law?" "Well," he said, "My share will be about \$30,000 or \$35,000, but why shouldn't I pay it? Why shouldn't we pay it if we have the income?" What a change is going on in this country.

One of the evidences of the new era in this country is that the tax dodger who used to fight justice in taxation has in many instances come around to understand what is justice and seems to be willing to bear his share of the expenses of the government. It would be good enough to pass such a law as that by a majority and compel payment, but it is far better to have them willing to pay, and the fact that they do shows what a revolution has taken place.

When the president affixed his signature to the tariff-income tax bill, he called the leaders about him in the White House, and said, in effect, "Well done, thou good and faithful servants, one good law deserves another; I would like to have you commence on the currency bill tomorrow." Then they commenced on the currency measure, and, again I will admit that they did better than I expected anybody to.

I knew something of the depth of the difference of opinion on the currency question. I knew there were two groups of people who, if they discussed this subject intelligently, took widely divergent views. The members of one group said that the issuing of money was a function of the government, and that the banks should go out of the governing business. The other group said that the issuing of money was a function of the banks, and the government should go out of the banking business. There were the two views, and the line between them was very distinct. I thought that the president had had an easy time on the tariff compared with the time he would have when he brought congress face to face with a currency measure. That currency bill is a marvel of constructive statesmanship. Let no man hereafter say that the republican party has a monopoly on the brains of the country, for the republican party did not prepare that bill. For more than fifteen years the republican leaders have talked currency reform, but they have never dared to put their party behind a law or a bill presenting what they wanted. But when Woodrow Wilson started out as a candidate for the nomination he gave the country to understand what was coming. He made a speech at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, not far from Wall street, and in that speech, months before the nomination, he said that the greatest menace to this country was the money trust. The papers printed it and the next day every big financier was convinced that Woodrow Wilson was a dangerous man, the more dangerous because he lived down east where he ought to know better. But he went on and in the campaign he told the people that, when we came to currency reform, we must prepare the bill with a view to protecting the rights of all the people, and so this law was prepared, and, in my opinion, it will stand out as a monument to the political wisdom, and the moral courage of those who participated in its preparation and passage.

It grants privileges more advantageous than the banks have ever enjoyed before. This bill enables banks to get money from the government without putting up bonds as security. Heretofore the banks had to put up bonds and in order to get the bonds they had to send more money out of the community than they could bring in on the bonds. Therefore a bond security never could be an emergency measure: instead of meeting the emergency it had helped to create it. But this bill gives the bankers an opportunity to use the security they have, and bring new money into their community. The old plan had been better for the banks than for the community, for the old plan enabled them to draw interest on the bonds, and then get money from the government on the bonds and draw interest on that. Because they could profit, although the community suffered, they never changed the law.

But Woodrow Wilson has given us a law that puts a banker in a position where he can help the community in time of emergency by adding