

which class do you belong to, the well born or the not so well born?

I am afraid of this Hamiltonian doctrine, for if we ever had it in this country I am not sure that I could get into the well born class. They might be too strict for me. Down in New York if you want to get into the four hundred class you have to show three generations between you and any honest work.

Now, I don't know just what the limits would be if you had that Hamiltonian doctrine. My father had to make his own way. He was left without father and mother in his boyhood; he had to work his way through school; he worked on a farm; then he taught school and after awhile he was able to graduate at the age of 27 and then he studied law, and then he was on the bench, but I don't know whether he did enough to get him out of the not-so-well-born class.

I don't want to risk it. I tell you I don't want my right to participate in government to depend on a pedigree that I have to carry around with me to show who I am.

So I think you republicans had better take chances with us democrats on this subject. What other difference? Why, Jefferson said, "Let's have elections and let the people elect their representatives," and then knowing human nature as few public men have, he said: "Let's make the elections frequent, so the fellow in office won't forget who put him there."

Pretty good point. The trouble with our government is not in the people, but in those elected by the people betraying their trusts and misrepresenting the people, and Jefferson said, "Make the elections frequent so the voter can keep his hands on the man who acts for him and withdraw his authority if he disobeys or misrepresents or betrays his trust."

What did Hamilton say? Well, his was quite different and we are fortunate we have it in writing. I am afraid if it wasn't in writing republicans out here would deny Hamilton ever believed in it, but Hamilton prepared a form of government and it is on record and he tried to get it adopted; and what did it provide for? For the election of presidents for life; the election of senators for life and for the appointment of governors by the president for life. That was the Hamiltonian doctrine. How would you like to have presidents for life? Well, I wouldn't like it.

Why, President Roosevelt is only two years older than I and he is in good health. What chance would I have if he was elected for life?

But now I don't want the republicans to be too good about it. I don't want them to think that it would be a good thing to have the Hamiltonian doctrine so they could keep President Roosevelt until I died and shut me out, because if we had the ideas of Hamilton we wouldn't have had a President Roosevelt, for Grover Cleveland is still alive.

Now, republicans, don't you think it is good to have elections every once in a while? Don't you like that plan better than the Hamiltonian plan? Well, what about senators for life? Don't you think it is better to have a chance at them occasionally? Don't you think we can keep them under better control?

Why, my objection to the present election, or method of electing senators, is it smacks too much of Hamilton anyhow, and I have been trying for sixteen years to make Jeffersonians so the people can elect their senators by direct vote of the people.

What do you think of governors appointed by the president for life? If any of you think it is a good thing I can tell you how you can cure yourself. Go down into the territory where they have a taste of the Hamiltonian doctrine, where the president does appoint the governor, not for life, but a few years, and you find in every territory the people are so tired of this doctrine that they are rushing into statehood in order that they can have Jeffersonian doctrine and elect their own people in their own way.

Now, if republicans constantly praise Hamilton when his ideas were as they were, and democrats praise Jefferson when his ideas were as they were, is it not safe to assume that democrats are more in favor of letting the people run their own affairs than republicans are?

Now, remember, I am not saying that you republicans would like Hamiltonian doctrine, because nine-tenths of you people who call yourselves republicans are not republicans at all and your name is misfit and you ought to take it off and put on a name that fits.

Now, I tell you, I will give you a second evidence of the fact that the democrats are nearer to the people than the republicans and have more confidence in them. Take the election of senators

by the people. Nine-tenths of the republicans, yes, ninety-nine out of one hundred republicans, believe in direct elections. Now I want to ask the republicans, is there any significance in the fact that a democratic house was the first house to pass a resolution in favor of electing senators by direct vote? It was the fifty-second congress, it happened to be the first one in which I served—the congress before it was republican—but it didn't pass the resolution, yet the fifty-second congress, democratic, did, and the fifty-third, also democratic, did, and then we had two republican congresses and they adjourned without acting on this subject.

Republicans, why did the democratic house act favorably and then two republican houses ignore the subject? Was it not because the democrats had more faith in the people than the republicans? And yet I know some of you, if you have been reading or thinking, will say that after while even republican congresses acted favorably on the resolution.

Yes, that is true, but it was six years after the democrats had set the example, and yet I want to give the republicans credit for getting even within six years of the democrats on any good proposition.

More than that, we put it in our national platform twice, once at Kansas City and once at St. Louis, and the republican national convention has never acted favorably on it at all. Why is it that it is in no republican national platform, although 14 years ago a democratic house adopted it by two-thirds vote? I will tell you. It is because the great corporations exert such influence over republican leaders that they dare not make that promise of men running for office—and they dare not offend these great corporations and if you have any doubt who opposes the election of senators by the people let me remind you when the question was up in the senate the last time Chauncey M. Depew, a republican from New York, led the opposition; Chauncey Depew, the most popular banquet speaker in the republican party, and the man elected to the senate by the New York Central railroad to guard the interests of the trusts and corporations in the United States senate.

The senate has become the bulwark of wealth and the men who have filled the senate with their representatives of trusts and corporations have so strong an influence over the republican leaders that they don't put this plank in their platform. Now, republicans, is this any evidence the democratic party has more faith in the people than the republican leaders? But, my friends, I want to go farther than that. I want to show these young republicans that this difference of opinion about the government, this difference in faith in the people, manifests itself in other ways and even in the opinion that people have of the formation of society. (Interrupted by noise in the audience.)

They act as if there were pickpockets over there. The pickpocket always attempts to start the people to moving in order that they may pick their pockets while they try to keep their balance. Let me ask, are there seats there where those people are standing?

Now, my friends, I want to call your attention to the difference. If two or three of you tall men would step over into that crowd and stand awhile—no, you needn't take any club, all they need to know is that they are disturbing others and they will either stop or go away where their conversation will not disturb.

It is very easy, I think, to reach the people if they understand they are doing wrong. The great trouble with republicans is that they are innocently doing a great deal of wrong and we can't make them understand it. Now, there is this difference in the ideas in regard to the construction of society.

The democrat says that society is built from the bottom and the republican thinks that society is suspended from the top. The democrat says, make the masses prosperous and then all who rest upon them will share in the prosperity, but the republicans say, make the well to do prosperous and their prosperity will leak through on those below.

If I could bring a republican and put him on the stand here beside a democrat, not one of you republicans, because you are not republicans at all, but I mean a sure enough one—one who really is in sympathy with the dominant policy of his party—if I could bring such a republican here and put him beside a democrat and question the two, I could find out which was a democrat and which was a republican by just telling a Bible story and asking them what they thought about it.

I would tell the story of Dives and Lazarus, when Lazarus had to eat the crumbs that fell

from Dives's table, and the democrat would speak up and say it was too bad that Dives had to live on crumbs and he would try to find some way to so change conditions that every one could have a table of his own and no one have to hang upon the charity of another.

But what would the republican say? He would say it was a lucky thing for Lazarus that there was a Dives near so he could get some crumbs.

If you doubt it let me give you a familiar argument that will show you the truth of what I say. Go and hear the speech of some great republican and you will come away with the idea that the important men are the men who give employment to laborers. That the laborer ought to be constantly grateful that he has a job. This man insists that the laboring man wouldn't have any work if there wasn't somebody who employed him and, therefore, the employer is the important man and not the laborer, and yet you go into a factory and you will find that no manufacturer employs men to work for him unless that man can not only produce enough to pay his own wages, but a surplus over as a profit to the employer besides, and the great trusts will give you their reports showing they pay in dividends sometimes as much as they pay in wages and that means that the employes not only earn what they receive, but 100 per cent profit for their employer.

Now, my friends, have you not heard men talk as though all you had to do was to make the employer prosperous and all the rest of the people would be prosperous. The democrats insist that the man who works for wages is as much entitled to consideration as the man who pays his wages.

The democrats insist that the man who toils on the farm and in the factory and in the mine and produces wealth is as important a factor in society as is the man for whom he works. This is democratic doctrine and you will find this difference runs all through the legislation of this country, and republicans will do things in national politics that no republican would think of doing in his own home affairs. For a quarter of a century we have been running this government—I don't say we in a partisan sense—I mean those who run it have been running it on the theory if they just give enough money to the employers that the employer would take care of the laborers. No republican would follow that principle in his own family. Go into your courts and look at the wills made by republicans and you will find that they know too much about human nature to act in their own affairs like they permit their leaders to act. What republican, who is about to die and had an estate to leave, would leave it all to one child and just say in his will, I have confidence that this child will deal justly with all the rest of the children.

Now, why wouldn't you do it?

You would not dare to trust your own child to deal justly with those who are of his own flesh and blood, and therefore when you make your will you give each child what you think that child ought to have and do not leave your fortune to the mercy of even a brother of the blood! And yet for a quarter of a century we have been voting \$10,000,000, \$50,000,000, \$100,000,000 to the employers of this country and leaving it to them to be just and generous to their employes. These employers will trust men whom they never saw, when they won't trust their own children to be just with their brothers and sisters. And what is the result? We have been building up fortunes in the hands of the few while the wealth has been drained from the pockets of the many.

Now, my friends, I want to show you that our doctrines have received vindication from several directions. When I was a candidate I had a majority in this county. I think I had a better majority than usual, if I am not mistaken. (To Mr. Hackney): Didn't we do pretty well here in '96?

Mr. Hackney: Over 2,000.

Mr. Bryan, continuing: My friends, our opinions and our positions at that time have been vindicated. We said the people needed more money. We said more money would make better times. We said if the farmers could sell their product for more money they would have more to spend at the stores, and when the stores had customers they could buy of the factories better, but our opponents said we had plenty of money and didn't need any more, and yet, when they refused to give us the money the country needed, God took pity on us and opened the gold mines and from them there poured forth a yellow stream.

It went into the channels of trade and we have 50 per cent more money in circulation