

that will express what I mean I will say that we must be careful and not allow BOSSOCRACY to take the place of DEMOCRACY. If democracy is the rule of the people, then bossocracy is the rule of the boss, and one of the things against which I desire to warn you this morning is the substitution of democracy for bossocracy in the state of Indiana.

When I say this I do not mean to apply to Indiana a doctrine that is not applicable elsewhere. States do not differ much. When the opportunities are the same, I find that human nature is much alike wherever you find it; in politics a republican and a democrat are quite likely to yield to the same temptations. Bossocracy has been substituted for democracy wherever the machine became omnipotent, and it has been as true in the republican party as in the democratic party. A machine is necessary, but the political machine, like all other machines in use, is a means to an end and not an end in itself. If a political machine is used by the people to advance the interests of the people it is as useful as is the engine when the engineer is there to control it. But the political machine when not operated for the benefit of the public, may be as disastrous as an engine with no one in charge.

I come today to speak of the primary, and I come to speak of it because I love the democracy of Indiana. The democrats of Indiana have been so good to me that I have confidence in them. I have confidence in the rank and file of the party in Indiana, and I believe that it is just as important that the democratic voters of Indiana shall control the democratic party in Indiana as it is that all the voters of Indiana should control the government of Indiana.

I know of no argument that can be made in favor of the selection of public officials by popular vote that does not apply to the selection of the party candidates by popular vote in the primary, and the man who says he can not trust the democrats of the party to absolutely control the party—the democrat who says so says that democrats are not equal to republicans, for he is willing to have republicans vote in the selection of the officers who are to control the government. There would be no objection to a primary but for the advantage that some secure through the old system that allows boss control; I remind you that the primary is so democratic in principle that it has now been adopted in most of the states, democratic and republican. I believe the primary idea originated in Georgia, but it has spread and where it has not yet prevailed it will prevail. It would be an insult to the intelligence and virtue of the people of this state to say they are not willing to put the control of the party in the hands of the voters of the party.

How extensive should the primary be? As extensive as politics. I believe that the primary principle can be applied with safety and should be applied from the smallest unit to the largest unit. Should the people of a precinct be allowed to use the primary in party management as well as the ballot in government control? Yes. Should the people of a county be allowed the use of the primary to control the party, as well as the ballot to control the government? Yes. Should the people of the state be allowed to use the primary for the control of the party organization, as well as for the control of the government? Yes. And should the people of a nation be allowed the use of the primary for the nomination of a president as well as to use the popular vote for the election of senators and congressmen? Yes.

I know of no unit, great or small, in which the people are not more trustworthy than anyone who would try to act for the people against their wishes.

There is more virtue in the people than finds expression through their representatives, and I apply it to party management as well as to government.

I have great respect for members of the legislature and yet I have never flattered them by telling them that they were better than those whose servants they are. All that I can say of a representative is that he is a necessary evil. We have him because we can not get along without him. If we could get along without him we would never think of using him for a moment.

But when the people are numerous it is necessary for them to act through representatives and the representative is good in proportion as he can be controlled. I believe, therefore, in the primary as the means of controlling the men who serve the people, for the democratic idea of gov-

ernment is that the people are the master and the officials the servants. So much for the extent of the primary.

There is another thing about the primary to which I wish to call attention. The primary is in an experimental stage, and primary laws in different states are not the same. But we are comparing and imitating, and year by year we are removing the defects and adding improvements. One of the improvements suggested is a provision that permits the expression of a second choice as well as a first choice. And I would go further and allow a third choice, and I would not object to a fourth choice. Why? Because, if you only express one choice you must either nominate by a plurality, or you must provide for a second primary. A second primary is expensive. Experience shows that even at the first primary you do not have the full vote out, and if you have a second primary you will probably have a less vote than at the first primary. The system should not be cumbersome; it should not be expensive; it should not occupy more time than is necessary.

If a plurality only is necessary to a choice there may be a number of candidates and the one who receives the plurality may not be the one favored by a majority of the voters. And there is another objection to the plurality test, namely, that a man who has money may be able to multiply the candidates of the opposition and thus by dividing the opposition win when he does not have a majority.

If you allow a second choice and a third choice, and even a fourth choice, you make it possible to find out at one primary whom the people really prefer, and when you find out whom the people want, then you find out whom the people ought to have.

I am glad to say this in favor of the primary. I would say it even if your platform had not declared for it, but I can not understand how men elected upon a platform promising the primary, can fail to keep faith with the people who voted for them upon that platform. And I will venture the assertion that no man who violates the platform on this subject can go back to his constituents and convince them that the reason he cites them is the reason that led him to do what he did.

I have been in public life a good while, and sometimes after I have heard a man's speech explaining his vote I feel like asking him for his REAL reason. I have found that the reasons given are not always the reasons that influence the one giving them.

When I was a young man I read in a paper a little item like this—that the distillers, at a national meeting, had passed a resolution against prohibition and that the reason they gave was that it would interfere with the use of wine at Sacramento.

That was the first instance that I remember of reading of a reason that I knew to be insincere; but since that time I have heard many reasons given that were insincere. I do not know the constituents of these men, but I know the democracy of Indiana well enough to know that they will question the sincerity of every reason given by those who violate the platform and deny to the people the right to select their candidates.

And, my friends, I have such a high opinion of the intelligence of the people of Indiana that I think they will not only question the sincerity of the arguments given against the primary but they will know the real reasons that lie behind the opposition. And I suspect that in every case you will find that some special interest has had more influence with the representative than have the wishes of the people whom he misrepresents. I hope I have made myself plain. And if you do not understand what I mean you will understand what your constituents mean when they leave you at home and select democrats to speak for those who believe in the right of the people to think for themselves and to control their own government.

And, now, let me take a step forward and speak of another thing that I desire to present to this assembly.

A constitution is an important thing. We believe in constitutions in the United States, and if you have read constitutional history you have found that the tendency everywhere is toward making it easier to amend constitutions; the later constitutions are more easily amended than the earlier ones. I will give you an illustration.

In New Mexico they recently adopted a constitution, and that constitution, according to its provisions, was very difficult to amend; when it

was submitted for ratification, an amendment proposed by congress was also submitted, and the people repealed the clause of the constitution making it difficult to amend, and so changed the constitution as to make it easy to amend.

Our federal constitution is difficult to amend. To amend it a resolution proposing it must be submitted by a two-thirds vote of both houses; then the amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the states. A majority, you see, can not change it; it takes two-thirds of both houses, and if they represent their people it means that it takes two-thirds of the union, and then, when it is submitted, the amendment can be defeated if you have one more than one-fourth of the states.

They were afraid, in those early days, to fully trust the people, and as a result we have labored along with the constitution that permits a minority to obstruct the will of the majority; it takes quite an overwhelming sentiment to secure a change. It took us twenty-one years to amend the constitution so as to elect senators by direct vote of the people. It passed the house of representatives five times before the senate would let it pass the senate; but when it once reached the people it was ratified by three-fourths of the states in a very short time.

It took us something like sixteen years to amend the constitution to authorize an income tax. It took that long to get two-thirds of both houses; but when it was submitted to the states, three-fourths of them ratified it in a short time. I believe that we need a change in the constitution at Washington, an amendment that will make it easier to amend that constitution in order that reforms may go forward, and not be stopped by those who have an interest in abuses that need correction.

Your constitution is hard to amend. As I understand it, your present constitution can only be amended when the amendment has twice passed both branches of your legislature, and then it must be ratified by a majority of the electors. I suppose your courts would decide, as most courts have, that that means not a majority of those voting on the proposition but a majority of those voting at that election; that gives those opposed to the change the benefit of all the ignorant and all the indifferent. It gives the conservative forces of society an undue advantage.

In one of the amendments that you propose, you have attempted to remove this difficulty, and I think that the change you propose is a desirable one. This is the amendment to which I refer: "An amendment, or amendments, to this constitution may be proposed at a regular session in either branch of the general assembly, and if the same shall be agreed to by a majority of the members elected to each of the two houses, such proposed amendment, or amendments, with the ayes and nays thereon shall be entered on their journals, and it shall be the duty of the general assembly to submit such amendment, or amendments, to the electors of the state, at the next general election, and if a majority of such electors voting on the amendment, or amendments, shall ratify the same, such amendment, or amendments, shall become a part of the constitution. But if a majority of said electors do not ratify the same, such amendment, or amendments shall be defeated."

That is a great improvement, although I am not fully informed as to why the last sentence was added to it—"A new constitution shall be submitted to the people of the state for ratification, or adoption, or rejection, only by virtue of an act of the general assembly, a majority of the legal voters of the state have declared that a constitutional convention"—etc.

I do not know why that is added. If I am fully informed as to the conditions in this state, it seems to me that with such a constitution you have and with so many amendments needed, it would be easier to call a constitutional convention to frame a constitution that would be modern and be more easily amended than the present constitution, and it would be done more quickly.

But, my friends, that is not the point that I desire to emphasize. I mention the difficulty of amendment in order to call your attention to a modern invention in government, to my mind the greatest that has been proposed in several generations. It is known as the INITIATIVE and REFERENDUM. I do not know how much you have thought about it. In going over the country I have found quite a difference in the amount of information on the subject. I recall that in Nebraska when we first proposed it eighteen years ago last summer, they made fun of us; the