

and their environment. In the east, the common man is over-shadowed by concentrated wealth that he has not the freedom of expression or action that he has in the west, and then, too, he is the victim of a press that publishes the truth by accident and falsehood by consistently cultivated habit. When I look back over twenty years, and see four hundred thousand democrats in Pennsylvania, and more than that many in New York, and democrats also in every New England state, fighting and fighting and fighting with a courage never surpassed, I wonder how we have ever been able to keep our splendid army together with the poor means we have of furnishing them the information so necessary for their fight. In campaigns, extending over twelve years, I polled almost the same number of votes three times. It was practically six millions and a half of votes three times, and in all that time I never had the support of a predatory corporation or of a newspaper that was under obligation to them. And yet, in spite of all misrepresentation, these men walked up to the polls and voted the democratic ticket year after year. I am grateful to the democrats of the south and west, but I love them no more than I do these brave men of the east who answer the description the Bible gives of those who "come up through great tribulation."

There is no appropriation of money more clearly and fully defensible than an appropriation intended to inform the people of the country in regard to the matters upon which they are to vote. I would like to see the democratic party—a party that believes in discussion, is the champion of free speech, and an advocate of intelligence among the voters—I would like to see that party become the champion of a measure that would put into the hands of every voter a government publication, issued at intervals between campaigns and at shorter intervals during campaigns, with editorial space divided between the parties in proportion to their respective representation in congress, so that every group represented in congress would have a chance to present its principles and its policies to the voters for their judgment at the polls. If in the last campaign we had had such a paper to present our cause to all the people, it would have been worth more to us in votes than our entire campaign fund.

Someone has made a suggestion—I am not at liberty to give the name of the author of it—that appeals to me, namely, that the newspapers, in return for the valuable privileges that they are given by the post office department, be required in return to give a certain percentage of the space devoted to reading matter to the government for the spread of information among the people who read the papers.

The first need, I repeat, is a means of informing the public, and I suggest to you that a national bulletin would be in keeping with the spirit of our times; this is a reform imperatively demanded by the present situation.

#### DEFECTS OF ELECTORAL SYSTEM

The second: We never consider remedies until we are convinced that we are sick; but every such experience as the one through which we have just passed reveals some evil that needs to be remedied. No democrat can look back to the anxious hours between midnight on election night and the time when they heard from the west without understanding how clumsy the electoral college is now, and what a menace it contains to the safety of the people, and the security of elections. When we vote for electors, if the vote is as close as it was this year in several states, we run the risk of having some electors run behind, because they are personally unpopular, or run ahead because they are popular. When you remember that every elector nominated upon a ticket is pledged to the candidate, and has no discretion whatever, and when you remember that people vote for him, almost all of them, because of the candidate he stands for and whom he must support, and not because of his name or personality, I think you will agree with me that it is not fair to have the result of the election changed by the accidental popularity or unpopularity of one or two men who happen to be nominated as electors.

The electoral system was established before we had telegraphs or railroads, on the theory that the people selecting these electors whom they knew would trust them to meet and select a president, after they had time to canvass the

merits of the various candidates. That used to be the theory. It is gone, and if the theory upon which it is built is gone, the system ought not to be continued, unless some new reason has come into existence. I hope congress will consider the dangers that are embodied in our present electoral system, and give us some reform that will give assurance that the will of the people expressed at the polls will not be defeated by accident or chance.

Now my own opinion, although I state it with hesitation and am open to conviction on the subject,—my own opinion is that it would be better to have direct voting for the candidate, than to vote for electors committed to the candidate. But that does not mean that it would be wise to adopt what is called a popular vote. There are objections to that, the chief objection being that it would offer such a temptation to fraud in communities where the sentiment was overwhelmingly one way, no matter which way, that it would call into use means of prevention that might create more evils than the existing ones from which we are trying to escape. My mind has been gravitating towards a plan by which we would vote by congressional units, the states reserving the election of electors at large. By this plan every voter would vote for the candidate of his choice, and yet we would elect by units, each state representing two, and each district one. This plan would give us more assurance than the present plan that the popular majority and the electoral majority would go to the same candidate.

In the last campaign, a few votes would have changed the result in the electoral college, and yet Mr. Wilson had a popular plurality of over some five hundred thousand. The electoral college is so faulty that a man whom the people rejected at the polls was almost chosen in the electoral college. This is a matter worthy of our consideration.

The next is an amendment to the constitution, making the constitution itself more easily amendable. Our constitution provides that in order to amend it, there must be a resolution passed through both houses by a two-thirds vote submitting the amendment, and then the amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the states. The progressive element of the country is sufficiently handicapped when it is required to control a president, senate and house. The progressive has to have all three; the reactionary only needs one. Now that is a sufficient handicap; when you add to that a constitutional provision that gives the minority such an advantage that the majority must carry both houses by a two-thirds vote, and then control three-fourths of the states, it is an unfair burden to place upon those who want to go forward. Those who want to hold back do not deserve so much favoritism at the hands of the government. When you remember that thirteen states can defeat any constitutional amendment, then remember that those thirteen states may contain a popular vote of less than one-tenth of the entire vote of the country, you will see that in the matter of a constitutional amendment, it is possible for less than one-tenth of the people to defeat the wishes of the other nine-tenths. I propose, therefore, a change that will bring our constitution up to date, and make it possible for the people to rule. I suggest an amendment that will make it possible to submit an amendment to the constitution when a MAJORITY of both houses approve ONCE, or, if you prefer TWICE. I would much rather have it possible for the majority in two successive congresses to submit an amendment than to have it necessary for two-thirds to concur once. Then let it be ratified by a majority of the states, PROVIDED, a majority of ALL the people, voting on the proposition in all the states, vote in favor of the change. This plan would preserve the rights of the states, and preserve the rights of the people also. I believe the time has come when we ought to seriously consider making our constitution reflect the spirit of confidence that we today have in the intelligence of the people.

There is another reform, the need of which has been brought out by the war across the sea. When our constitution was framed, we took the power to declare war out of the hands of the executive, and deposited it in the most popular branch of the government, that is, in congress. We went as far as human wisdom had then pointed the way to protect the people from be-

ing carried into war in excitement or passion; but in the time that has elapsed since then, we have discovered that the real safety of our nation lies in the people themselves, and not in their representatives. We are increasingly referring questions to the people for their vote. In nearly every city now, before bonds can be issued, the question must be submitted to the people at the polls, and we are more and more submitting to the people the selling of franchises in cities. The initiative and referendum have been adopted now in a number of states; and I believe the time has come to amend our constitution and submit every declaration of war to a referendum of the people, EXCEPT IN CASE OF ACTUAL INVASION OF THE COUNTRY. The men who must give their lives, if need be, and the people who must bear the burden of taxation however oppressive it may become—these men should have a voice in saying whether we should resort to the arbitrament of the sword, or seek some method in which reason and not force will be employed. Beneficial as such a provision would be to this country, I believe it would be even more beneficial to the people across the sea.

We are now discussing how we can help the people of Europe; how, when this war is over, we can aid them in making sure that no such war will ever come upon the world again. The only method that seems to find large support among our people is a method which, to my mind, is stepping down instead of stepping up. They ask us to join Europe in the ENFORCEMENT OF PEACE. Why, my friends, it is force that has been the cause of war across the ocean. Talk about our being an international policeman! I would not surrender the moral prestige of this nation for all the glory that brute force can give us. What the world needs is not that we shall step down to their level, but that we should lift them to a higher level. And how shall we lift them? There is only one way to lift, and that is the way that is given us by the Author of our religion—"And I, if I be lifted up, will DRAW all men unto me." It is the drawing power of example. That is the difference between the philosophy of force and the philosophy of love. Love is a drawing power; force is a coercive and compelling power. Because Europe has worshipped force, they are writing their history in blood. If we can convince the world that the individual citizen who must give his life upon the battlefield has a right to a voice in the declaring of war, we will do more to protect the people of Europe from the ambitions of their monarchs than we can do in any other way. The principles of real democracy, put into practice in a republic, will be more potent for peace than all the armies we could send across the Atlantic, more than all the warships we could build.

#### TWO IMPORTANT REFORMS

Now, my friends, I have spoken of several reforms; the need of some has been made known by the experiences of the last few years, and some by the experiences of the last few months, I have left for the last two reforms that are more important, and upon which I expect there will be more division of opinion.

Let me say, however, in advance that none of you need agree with me at all. It has been so long since I said anything that nobody objected to that a little opposition does not embarrass me. But, my friends, I would not be living up to what I regard as my duty if I did not tell you what I think lies before us, and give you my views, and I am, I assure you, as anxious to receive yours as I am to give mine. I believe the time has come to invite the women of this country to share with men the responsibilities of suffrage. This reform has made progress more rapidly than any other great reform we have seen in our life time. I have told you that it took us twenty-one years to secure the election of senators by the people, and yet that reform only affected the method of electing the members of one branch of the federal government. Here is a reform that practically doubles the voting population of this country, and brings into the arena of politics an element whose influence will be felt in the settlement of every ethical question that shall arise hereafter. And yet before this reform had ever received an endorsement by either house of congress, it had become the one thing upon which all the parties agreed in the last campaign. We differed