

wheat. He said that some came from the hill and some along the river route but that when they reached the mill, the miller did not ask them which road they came by but whether the wheat was good. I have thought of this story a good many times, and it often applies to politics. When I first went to Washington as a congressman I had an idea that all virtue was to be found in the democratic party and that all vice was to be found in the republican party; but after I had been in congress awhile, I found that there were some bad democrats and that there were many good republicans, and this made me a little more charitable in my opinions. When I became a candidate for the presidency some of the democrats left me and some of the republicans came to my support, and after careful consideration I made up my mind that I would rather look a republican in the face than a democrat in the back.

Among members of parties you will find the same distinctions that are to be found between parties. In every country where there is a free expression of public opinion one party will be found going toward the people and the other either going away from the people or obstructing the progress toward reform. These distinctions, though not so aggravated, are to be found within the different parties. In every party you will find some more advanced than others who are considering remedial legislation. The two great parties of this country are the republican party which is in power in the nation and the democratic party, which by all considerations ought to be in power. One of these parties must necessarily be nearer to the people than the other, but you will also find among the republicans reformers and conservatives; and in the democratic party there are radical democrats and democrats not so radical, so that it is sometimes difficult to draw the line between the conservative democrat and the radical republican.

When I was in Japan I found that they had what they called Korean lions before the doors of the temple, one on each side. These Korean lions are rather interesting animals; they do not look ferocious like the Numidian lion but are rather comical in appearance. What struck me, however, is that one of these lions has his mouth open while the other has his mouth shut. We are told that they represented an idea—the eternal conflict between the positive and the negative. One says Yes—the other says No, and progress lies between the two.

The reformer asserts something and the timid man says "No, it is not wise." Or he may simply say "I am not convinced. I am not sure." It is necessary to have both of these elements in society, if it were not for the conservative the radical would go too fast, and if it were not for the radical, the conservative would not go at all. So, when I speak to a body like this even though all belong to an opposing party, I know that there will be differences of opinion among them. In this country we could by unanimous consent dissolve all parties and create one great party, to be known as the republican party or the democratic party, or by any other name, but it would last just one day. The next day there would be two parties organized within this one party and they would represent the radical and the conservative elements. This is not only necessary but it is for the best.

I desire to present some thoughts to you, and I do not know how I can better show my appreciation of the courtesy extended to me by you as members of this legislative body and by His Excellency, the Governor than by presenting some things which I believe to be worthy the consideration of law-makers and of citizens. I do not draw a very great distinction between the law-maker and the citizen, for the citizen of today is the law-maker of tomorrow; and every citizen ought to be sufficiently informed upon public questions to be able to respond at any time to the call of his associates and become a law-maker. However, before entering upon this subject I desire to say a word about your approaching exposition. I hope to attend it in 1909. You have made such wonderful progress since I was here nearly seven years ago that I am anxious to come when I can see your progress represented in a great exposition. I am a believer in the exposition. It is entirely in accord with my idea of economy and the expenditure of public money. I am opposed to subsidies to individuals or corporations for the aid of private enterprises, but I am in favor of appropriations for educational work and for experiment. If the government spends money in experimenting, the whole public get the benefit of the experiment, and it is a legitimate use of public money. Money spent for educational purposes is spent for the general good, and I believe that an exposition is a great educational institution. I favored appropriations for expositions when in congress. I believe that the federal government should have an exhibit wherever there is an exposition. Not one in a thousand of your population could visit the

city of Washington and see the workings of the government, but if you have an exposition here, the government can have an exhibit and thus bring its work before many times as many citizens as can get a glimpse of what is being done in Washington. Wherever there is a local interest sufficient to organize an exposition, the government should make an exhibit. It is bringing the government to the people because the people cannot go to the government. Then, too, expositions enable us to exchange opinions; the more we mingle together, the better we understand each other and the less danger there is of disagreements. The East and the West should fraternize with each other more; the people of the North and the South should become better acquainted.

An exposition has another advantage. It lowers rates; if you cannot get lower rates in any other way, you are sure to get them through an exposition.

But to my subject. There are three matters which I desire to present to you briefly. One is the position of the representative; there are two theories which prevail among us, and they are to be found wherever representative government exists. One is that the representative is elected to think for the people; the other is that the people think for themselves and elect representatives to act for them. The difference between those theories is clearly marked although it may not be easy to separate those who follow one theory from those who believe in the other. Every representative, however, leans in opinion toward one theory or the other, and it makes a great deal of difference which way he leans. I am a believer in the second theory, namely—that the people think for themselves and elect representatives not to think for them but to act for them. This theory is consistent with our ideas of government, and I will give you two or three reasons which lead me to believe that it is generally accepted among the people. In the first place we have the constitution. By whom is the constitution adopted? By the people. And what does the constitution do? It regulates the legislative body, directs, limits and controls, and why? Because there is more virtue in the people than finds expression through their representatives. In our organic law the people seek to put a grip upon the representatives, they hedge them about to prevent misrepresentation. This is proof that the representative is expected to represent.

Another proof is found in the fact that we have platforms. When we go into a campaign we present candidates who are pledged to certain platforms. Now, why is a platform adopted? Surely that the people may know what the representative will do if elected. And this information is given to the people in order that they may decide which candidate to support. If we accepted the doctrine that the representative should think for the people, we would not hamper him or direct him with the platform. When we adopt a platform we indicate that we believe that the representative is bound by the will of the people. In other words, the adoption of a platform establishes the fact that the representative is the servant and not the master of the people.

The faults of our government are not in the people themselves but in the representatives of the people; and it is not because the representatives lack intelligence, for I am not flattering this legislative body when I say that all over this union the members of the legislature are not below the average of the people in intelligence. I might even say without exaggeration that the representatives are above the average in intelligence. Their faults, I repeat, do not come from lack of intelligence but from the fact that they sometimes yield to the temptation to put their own interests above the interests of the people whom they serve. This is the weakness of legislative bodies, and therefore it is always necessary that the representative should remember that he is the servant of the people; that they may speak through him and have their wishes respected.

We have for a great many years had the telegraph system. A man can stand at an instrument here and talk to a man many miles away by means of a wire stretched between the two instruments. In legislative bodies we have sometimes seen the principle of the telegraph illustrated. The man in the legislature is at one end of the wire and some influential corporation at the other end. The man in the legislature is sometimes not free to do his own will but accepts directions from the hidden man at the other end of the wire.

More recently we have been using the wireless system of telegraphy, and it illustrates what we ought to have in the legislature. In the wireless system there is no communication by wire but the message is transmitted through the air. There are two instruments attuned to each other, and the message sent by one is taken by the other. It would be a great improvement if we could substitute the wireless system for the system that we

have had, and have the legislator so attuned to the people as to be able to catch the message from them and be a real representative of his constituents.

This then, in the conception of a legislator's duties, manifests itself in various changes suggested in the methods of government. If you believe in a theory you naturally endeavor to make everything conform to that theory. Consistency is a powerful thing and has a great influence upon the human mind. Show me a man who really believes in a principle, and I will show you a man who will endeavor to apply that principle to every subject to which it can be applied. For instance, if a man believes in the doctrine that it is wrong to steal, he not only applies it to chickens and to horses and to money, but he applies it to every other kind of property; if the man really believes in the doctrine that it is wrong to steal, he applies the principle so as to include grand larceny as well as petty larceny.

I fear that the commandment has sometimes been amended so as to make it read "Thou shalt not steal—on a small scale." If the scale is large enough, it is a different matter. I am not violating any confidence when I tell you that it is safer to steal a million dollars than it is to steal a hundred. If a man steals a small amount, he is just a common, ordinary thief and no one has any respect for him, but a man who steals a million dollars displays so much genius that he excites admiration; his cunning and his talents are so much admired that his crime is sometimes overlooked.

If we believe that the representative is really the servant of the people and bound to carry out the will of the people, we will try to make the machinery of government conform to this principle. There is one reform of this kind in which I have been interested for years, but it has now become so popular that I can mention it without seeming radical. It is the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people. When I first entered congress that question had never been acted upon. Forty years ago Andrew Johnson recommended the change in a message to congress. Back in the early 80's Gen. Weaver, then a member of congress from Iowa, introduced a resolution submitting the necessary amendment. About 1892 such a resolution passed the House of Representatives for the first time. The next congress did the same thing, and then two congresses adjourned without action, but the sentiment grew until finally a third, a fourth and a fifth House of Representatives submitted the resolution; twice the House was democratic and three times it was republican. If any republican, however, boasts that his party has the advantage in the number of times that the resolution has passed the House, let me say that while three republican congresses have acted favorably, they acted after the two democratic congresses had acted. I cannot, however, claim originality for the democrats because the populists advocated this reform before the democrats did. A large majority of the people of both parties are in favor of this reform, and something like two-thirds of the states have endorsed it. Why? Because among the masses there is a deep-seated belief that the representative ought to be the servant of the people, and many of the members of the United States senate do not now recognize their duty to the people.

There is another reform which has for its object the bringing of the government nearer to the people. It is what is known as the initiative and referendum. I do not know how much you have discussed the matter out here. Ten years ago we embodied in our state platform a plank demanding the initiative and referendum. An opposition paper tried to make fun of us; it said that when the plank was read at the convention the democrats looked at each other in surprise. According to this paper one democrat said "What is that?" The other replied, "Oh, that is a new kind of democratic drink," and then it was adopted unanimously. Now this is the account given by an unfriendly paper but the doctrine is better understood today. The theory underlying the initiative and referendum is that the people have a right to rule, and this reform is proposed to correct the evils which have grown up in representative government. It is not used except where it is needed. If the representative body does its duty, it will not be called into use at all, but if the legislature refuses to act upon some question upon which the people desire to act, they can bring that question before the voters by the initiative; if the legislature enacts a bad law the people can veto it through the referendum. The initiative and referendum are consistent with our theory of government, because if the people want a thing, they have a right to have it. If you say that the people will make mistakes, I admit that they will, but the minority will make mistakes as well as the majority, and there is one important difference between their mistakes. The majority never intentionally make a mistake, and when they