

the election is past? Why should the locking of the door be delayed until the horse is gone?

#### AN ELECTION A PUBLIC AFFAIR

An election is a public affair. The people, exercising the right to select their officials and to decide upon the policies to be pursued, proceed to their several polling places on election day and register their will. What excuse can be given for secrecy as to the influences at work? If a man, pecuniarily interested in "concentrating the control of the railroads in one management," subscribes a large sum to aid in carrying the election, why should his part in the campaign be concealed until he has put the officials under obligation to him? If a trust magnate contributes \$100,000 to elect political friends to office, with a view to preventing hostile legislation, why should that fact be concealed until his friends are securely seated in their official positions?

This is not a new question; it is a question which has been agitated—a question which the republican leaders fully understand—a question which the republican candidate has studied, and yet he refuses to declare himself in favor of the legislation absolutely necessary, namely, legislation requiring publication before the election.

#### DEMOCRATIC PARTY PROMISES PUBLICITY

How can the people hope to rule, if they are not able to learn until after the election what the predatory interests are doing? The democratic party meets the issue honestly and courageously. It says:

"We pledge the democratic party to the enactment of a law prohibiting any corporation from contributing to a campaign fund, and any individual from contributing an amount above a reasonable maximum, and providing for the publication, before election, of all such contributions above a reasonable minimum."

The democratic national committee immediately proceeded to interpret and apply this plank, announcing that no contributions would be received from corporations, that no individual would be allowed to contribute more than \$10,000, and that all contributions above \$100 would be made public before the election—those received before October 15 to be made public on or before that day, those received afterward to be made public on the day when received, and no such contributions to be accepted within three days of the election. The expenditures are to be published after the election. Here is a plan which is complete and effective.

#### POPULAR ELECTION OF SENATORS

Next to the corrupt use of money, the present method of electing United States senators is most responsible for the obstruction of reforms. For one hundred years after the adoption of the constitution, the demand for the popular election of senators, while finding increased expression, did not become a dominant sentiment. A constitutional amendment had from time to time been suggested and the matter had been more or less discussed in a few of the states, but the movement had not reached a point where it manifested itself through congressional action. In the Fifty-second congress, however, a resolution was reported from a house committee proposing the necessary constitutional amendment, and this resolution passed the House of Representatives by a vote which was practically unanimous. In the Fifty-third congress a similar resolution was reported to, and adopted by, the House of Representatives. Both the Fifty-second and Fifty-third congresses were democratic. The republicans gained control of the house as a result of the election of 1894 and in the Fifty-fourth congress the proposition died in committee. As time went on, however, the sentiment grew among the people, until it forced a republican congress to follow the example set by the democrats, and then another and another republican congress acted favorably. State after state has endorsed this reform, until nearly two-thirds of the states have recorded themselves in its favor. The United States senate, however, impudently and arrogantly obstructs the passage of the resolution, notwithstanding the fact that the voters of the United States, by an overwhelming majority, demand it. And this refusal is the more significant when it is remembered that a number of senators owe their election to great corporate interests. Three democratic national platforms—the platforms of 1900, 1904 and 1908—specifically call for a change in the constitution which will put the election of senators in the hands of the voters, and the proposition has been endorsed by a number of the smaller parties, but no republican national convention has been willing to champion the cause of the people on this subject. The subject was ignored by the republican national convention in 1900; it was ignored in 1904, and the proposition was explicitly repudiated in 1908, for the recent republican national convention, by a vote of 866 to 114, rejected the plank

endorsing the popular election of senators—and this was done in the convention which nominated Mr. Taft; few delegates from his own state voting for the plank.

#### PERSONAL INCLINATION NOT SUFFICIENT

In his notification speech, the republican candidate, speaking of the election of senators by the people, says: "Personally, I am inclined to favor it, but it is hardly a party question." What is necessary to make this a party question? When the democratic convention endorses a proposition by a unanimous vote, and the republican convention rejects the proposition by a vote of seven to one, does it not become an issue between the parties? Mr. Taft can not remove the question from the arena of politics by expressing a personal inclination toward the democratic position. For several years he has been connected with the administration. What has he ever said or done to bring this question before the public? What enthusiasm has he shown in the reformation of the senate? What influence could he exert in behalf of a reform which his party has openly and notoriously condemned in its convention, and to which he is attached only by a belated expression of personal inclination?

#### THE GATEWAY TO OTHER REFORMS

"Shall the people rule?" Every remedial measure of a national character must run the gauntlet of the senate. The president may personally incline toward a reform; the house may consent to it; but as long as the senate obstructs the reform, the people must wait. The president may heed a popular demand; the house may yield to public opinion; but as long as the senate is defiant, the rule of the people is defeated. The democratic platform very properly describes the popular election of senators as "the gateway to other national reforms." Shall we open the gate, or shall we allow the exploiting interests to bar the way by the control of this branch of the federal legislature? Through a democratic victory, and through a democratic victory only, can the people secure the popular election of senators. The smaller parties are unable to secure this reform; the republican party, under its present leadership, is resolutely opposed to it; the democratic party stands for it and has boldly demanded it. If I am elected to the presidency, those who are elected upon the ticket with me will be, like myself, pledged to this reform, and I shall convene congress in extraordinary session immediately after inauguration, and ask, among other things, for the fulfillment of this platform pledge.

#### HOUSE RULES DESPOTIC

The third instrumentality employed to defeat the will of the people is found in the rules of the house of representatives. Our platform points out that "the house of representatives was designed by the fathers of the constitution, to be the popular branch of our government, responsive to the public will," and adds:

"The house of representatives, as controlled in recent years by the republican party, has ceased to be a deliberative and legislative body, responsive to the will of a majority of the members, but has come under the absolute domination of the speaker, who has entire control of its deliberations, and powers of legislation.

"We have observed with amazement the popular branch of our federal government helpless to obtain either the consideration or enactment of measures desired by a majority of its members."

This arraignment is fully justified. The reform republicans in the house of representatives, when in the minority in their own party, are as helpless to obtain a hearing or to secure a vote upon a measure as are the democrats. In the recent session of the present congress, there was a considerable element in the republican party favorable to remedial legislation; but a few leaders, in control of the organization, despotically suppressed these members, and thus forced a real majority in the house to submit to a well organized minority. The republican national convention, instead of rebuking this attack upon popular government, eulogized congress and nominated as the republican candidate for vice president one of the men who shared in the responsibility for the coercion of the house. Our party demands that "the house of representatives shall again become a deliberative body, controlled by a majority of the people's representatives, and not by the speaker," and is pledged to adopt "such rules and regulations to govern the house of representatives as will enable a majority of its members to direct its deliberations and control legislation."

"Shall the people rule?" They can not do so unless they can control the house of representatives, and through their representatives in the house, give expression to their purposes and their desires. The republican party is committed to the methods now in vogue in the house of representatives; the democratic party is pledged to such a revision of the rules as will bring the popular