

people of the state, and often, the people of but a part of the state. And third, it is much more difficult to change a national policy than it is to change a law in which only the state is concerned.

I shall speak later of some questions upon which a senator will be called to act. I shall not discuss these questions immediately, but shall refer now to two or three. Your senator will be called upon to act on the question of the national incorporation of railroads, and if railroads are given national incorporation, it will take a generation to change the law. Your senator will be called upon to act upon the question of ship subsidy; and a ship subsidy, once established, could not be withdrawn for many years. Your representative will be called upon to act upon the question of a central bank, and a central bank, once established, could not be dis-established in a life time. These are some of the questions of national importance upon which your representative in the senate will have to act. And for the reasons I have given I believe that in electing a legislature you should first remember that that legislature elects a senator, and let your vote on the legislature represent your desire on the senatorship. That is the first thought that I desire to submit for your consideration.

DEMOCRATS SHOULD STICK TO KERN

The second thought is for the benefit of those democrats who may be asked to vote for Mr. Beveridge on the ground that he is a progressive republican. I want to show you that there is no reason why any democrat should prefer Mr. Beveridge to Mr. Kern, if that democrat desires progressive legislation. I recognize that when I use the word "progressive," I am dealing with what we knew in school as "X"—which is used to represent the unknown quantity in algebra; for, so far, the word "progressive" when applied to republicans, has defied definition. There are about as many different kinds of progressiveness as there are progressives; and sometimes one progressive exhibits a large variety of progressiveness. Take, for instance, Mr. Roosevelt who, in this state at least, we can recognize as the leader of the progressive republicans. I have been trying to locate him for some weeks. When he was in Kansas and gave a sweeping endorsement of the Kansas platform, I thought I had him located, but when he got back to New York he slipped away from me; for in New York he appointed a committee to write a platform, and when the committee brought back that platform he sat in the convention and saw it adopted, without raising his voice in protest, and as he talks so much about moral courage, I must assume that he would have had the courage to say something, if it had not agreed with him, or he with it. And yet that was directly opposed to the platform in Kansas. He comes here and tells you to elect Mr. Beveridge because he is a progressive. He goes to Nebraska and urges that Mr. Burkett should be elected, and he is a standpatter; and then he will go to Massachusetts and make a speech for Senator Lodge, who is the near-friend of Aldrich and his most conspicuous ally in forcing the Payne-Aldrich bill through the senate. Now when a man differs in his own position, so much, in different sections, it is hard to tell just how to describe him. It seems that when he gets into his progressive automobile and starts for a ride, he carefully observes the speed limits of the different sections that he traverses. When he is out upon the broad plains of Kansas he is a joy rider; but when he comes to the crowded thoroughfares of New York City he slows down until one must get behind the machine to be run over.

MEANING OF "PROGRESSIVE" REPUBLICANISM

What is progressive republicanism? He did not define it out here; but he did describe your campaign out here. Did you read the speech he made at Crawfordsville? I am not sure whether I can read this small print tonight, or not, but I have it almost by heart. Yes, I can read it. At Crawfordsville he said: "I have not been very long in Indiana today, but I have been here long enough to catch some of your spirit, and I feel as if I were taking part in a republican campaign of half a century ago. Then the republican party won because it appealed to the people on straight, clean-cut principles."

I have, in the heat of passion, said some unkind things about the republican party, but never yet have I said that you had to go back fifty years to find a republican campaign that was run on straight and clean-cut principles. What an astounding confession! And it is entirely in harmony with the statement of a prominent Indianan, who said that it was the first republican campaign in which he ever took part, that he didn't feel like he was handling gold bricks. What kind of campaigns they must have been having in these later years! And to think that Mr. Roosevelt should turn state's evidence, after having been elected in several of these campaigns! And yet that was his statement, when he came into this state. Well, it helps me out again. You know I am so conservative in methods of thought and statement that whenever I want to say anything harsh I always quote what somebody else has said, and fortunately somebody has said worse things on every subject than I have cared to say. When I want to criticize a standpatter I quote what an insurgent says, and when I want to criticize an insurgent—I am ashamed to quote what a standpatter says. But of all the quotations that have been given me by political opponents, there are none that I prize so highly as the voluntary contribution that Ex-President Roosevelt made to my vocabulary when he spoke at Crawfordsville.

KERN IS A PROGRESSIVE

Now let me prove to you that Mr. Kern is a better progressive than Mr. Beveridge; let me prove to you that whenever Mr. Beveridge has insinuated once, Mr. Kern has insinuated many times; that he began insinuating earlier, has kept it up longer and has insinuated on more questions. Let me give the history of the last eighteen years that I may show you something of the progress in this nation, of several great reforms. I am astonished that Mr. Roosevelt, in speaking to you, did not mention the great questions that the people have had under consideration and have today. You may be astonished at the record that I shall present to you. If you are republicans you doubt-

less think that the republican party has been in power for the last fourteen years. But you are mistaken; the republican party has been in OFFICE, but the democratic party has been in POWER for fourteen years; the republicans have drawn the salaries, but the democrats have moulded public opinion and led the way. I would rather belong to a minority party that leads the majority than belong to a majority that is led by a minority. They used to say that the republicans led and the democrats followed; they used to even accuse us of camping where the republicans had camped the day before. It is not true today; we are in front and they are behind. Now when a republican wants to be a reformer he looks around until they find democratic tracks and then he says "come on, boys, they have been here."

Take the election of senators by direct vote of the people—compare that, as a reform, with the things Mr. Roosevelt discussed. It is the gateway to other reforms; it is a thing that we must secure before we can hope for effective remedial legislation. The democratic party began to fight for this reform eighteen years ago. Don't tell me that it was suggested before that; don't tell me that Andrew Johnson suggested it in a message forty years ago. It is true, but no republican will claim credit for his party on that account, because they tried to impeach Andrew Johnson. Don't tell me that General Weaver suggested it in congress thirty years ago, he did, but the republicans can not claim credit for that, for General Weaver has supported me in three campaigns. Eighteen years ago the democratic party favored this, and in the house of representatives, by nearly unanimous vote, adopted a resolution submitting it. It did the same in the next congress, sixteen years ago. Then two republican congresses met, adjourned without action, and then a congress met that was republican, and it followed the democratic example, eight years after the example was set; and then two other republican congresses acted likewise—five altogether. Some two-thirds of the states of the union have acted favorably—about as many republican as democratic states. It is a universal sentiment; you are all in favor of it. I will prove it to you. I am going to ask you to hold up your hands, if you are in favor of this and when you put your hands down I will see if any are opposed to it. Those in favor of electing senators by direct vote of the people, let me see your hands. (A multitude of hands went up.) Now are there any who are opposed to electing senators by direct vote of the people? Let us see your hands. I see no hands. If there are any they are so few that they need scarcely be counted against the tremendous vote in favor of the proposition.

DEMOCRATIC HISTORY ON SENATORIAL ELECTIONS

Now let me give you a little more history. The democratic party has three times, in national conventions, declared in favor of the election of senators by direct vote of the people—in 1900, in 1904, and in 1908. The republican party has never declared for this reform in a national convention. Will you explain to me why it is that a republican congress can act in favor of this, when a republican convention will not? I will give you my explanation. If you have a better one, give it to me after the meeting, and I will use yours next time, instead of mine. Here is my explanation: In a republican congress they have a democratic minority, and that democratic minority coerces the majority in doing some good things. Sometimes the democratic minority can get a few republicans to help, and thus some good will come out of a republican congress. The last congress, for instance, had a number of republicans who joined the democrats and put the speaker off of the committee on rules. The democratic minority can, I expect, sometimes compel the majority to concede something to public opinion; but a republican national convention has no democratic minority in it, and you can not, therefore, expect so many reforms of it.

But the case is even worse than I have stated. I told you that no republican convention had ever declared for it. Now let me tell you that the last republican convention declared against it. Mr. LaFollette, the leader of the progressive republicans of the United States, made a fight in that convention, through his friends, and one of the questions specifically submitted was the election of senators by the direct vote of the people, and they voted it down by a vote of seven to one, in the last republican national convention; and Senator Beveridge was in that convention as a delegate, and he did not help LaFollette in his fight for that reform.

John Kern ran upon a platform two years ago, that demanded the election of senators by the direct vote of the people, and when you remember that Mr. Kern has fought for this doctrine in at least three campaigns and stood on a platform that declared for it two years ago, and then remember that Mr. Beveridge sat silent in that convention and saw this proposition voted down by a vote of seven to one, you can not deny that on the question of the election of senators by the people, John Kern is the man to be preferred.

INCOME TAX QUESTION

Now let me take up another great reform. We have before the country today, the income tax proposition. Mr. Taft asked congress to submit an amendment specifically authorizing an income tax, and the senate responded and endorsed the resolution without a dissenting vote. The house passed it with only fourteen votes in the negative, and only two of those from west of the Allegheny mountains. Several states have already ratified it, and New York came close to it. The senate of New York acted favorably in spite of adverse recommendation by the governor of the state, and in the house only one vote was lacking to carry it. If that resolution had had one more vote in the house, New York, the state with the largest concentration of wealth, would have ratified the amendment; but that one vote was lacking, and it was lacking because a man who had been pledged to it in his platform, agreed to vote against it in return for a promise that he would be given his seat in an election contest. It came that near to passing in the state of New York. You are all in favor of the income tax. At present we are hampered when we attempt to collect revenues in the hour of danger. In an hour of peril, the government can draft

the citizen, but it can not draft his pocket book; in an hour of peril the government can take the son from the mother, the husband from the wife, the father from the child, and stand them up in front of the enemy's guns, but in an hour of danger it can not lay its hands upon accumulated wealth, and make that wealth bear its share of expenses of the government that protects it. Why? Because they have put the dollar above the man, and make money more precious than blood. You are in favor of the ratification of this amendment. I shall prove it. I ask you to hold up your hands, all who want to see this amendment ratified. How many of you? (All hands went up.) Put your hands down. Now any of you who are opposed to having this amendment ratified, let us see your hands. If it is not unanimous the opposition is invisible. I knew you would vote that way; and yet the democratic party began its fight for an income tax sixteen years ago. We put the income tax in our tariff bill, but the supreme court, by a majority of one judge, declared it unconstitutional, and that one judge changed his mind on the question between two hearings of the case. But we put the doctrine in our platform in 1896; we fought for it again in 1900, and two years ago our platform demanded the submission of the very amendment that is now before the country. When Mr. Taft wanted to act upon this subject he could not find a republican national platform that endorsed the income tax, so he came to our platform and took the plank that Kern and I ran upon. Mr. Kern has been fighting for those platforms all these years. Find out when Mr. Beveridge made his first speech in favor of an income tax, and then you will learn that Kern was a pioneer on this question. I knew you were with us. The strange thing is that people who are with us so unanimously can ever vote against us at all.

I was over in Missouri in a republican county a few weeks ago, and the man who introduced me told the audience that he knew that it was a republican county, and that the people in the audience were republicans. He said: "You are republicans 365 days out of the year ordinarily, and 366 days leap year." And then he introduced me to that audience, and I told them that the chairman was mistaken; that they were not republicans every day in the year—that they were republicans simply on election day, and that the rest of the time they were democrats, and did not know it.

And so you are democrats up here—although some of you may call yourselves republicans. Over there at that Missouri meeting I told them an experience I had some years ago. I was advertised to make a speech in a town in which a republican lady was visiting in a democratic family. They invited her to attend the meeting, and she said she didn't care to hear me, that she didn't believe in me; but they finally persuaded her to attend the meeting, and when I was through with my democratic speech this republican lady turned to the democrat and said: "Well, either he is a republican or I am a democrat; for that is what I have believed all my life." And when I was through a lady in the audience came up to shake hands, and she said: "I am like the lady you told about. I am a republican, but I endorse everything you say." And so, my friends, you endorse these things for which the democratic party has been fighting.

DEMAND RAILROAD REGULATION

Now let me speak of another reform. Mr. Roosevelt said that Mr. Beveridge helped him in his fight for railroad regulation. I remind you that we had a plank demanding railroad regulation, in our platforms of 1896, 1900 and 1904. There was no such plank in the republican platform of those years, although Mr. Roosevelt ran for vice president in 1900, and for president in 1904. When he started out to get railroad regulation, there was nothing in the republican platform to justify him in doing it, or to order him to do it; but three democratic platforms contained a demand for such regulation. In the fight in the house and senate the democrats stood by him better than the members of his own party. Yes, the democrats supported a president of the opposition party better than the members of his own party did even when he had the patronage at his command. And the bill that passed at the last session of the present congress—every good thing in it was put in there with the aid of democrats. If it had passed as the attorney general drew it, it would not have been defended today on any stump west of the Allegheny mountains.

Mr. Kern has been fighting all these years for these platforms that contained these demands, when Mr. Beveridge was fighting against our platforms and for platforms that were silent on this subject.

Let me taken another proposition. Take the matter of campaign contributions. You heard a good deal the other day about "decency" and "purity" and "honesty," and you might have supposed that they were new terms that had just been invented, and for which a patent had been applied, but the truth is they have been used many years in this country, by people of some respectability. In fact, my friends, the demand for purity, honesty and for decency, grew out of the fact that the republicans, in their campaign methods, had been dishonest, impure and indecent. It was found, in an investigation as to contributions that had been made, that great insurance companies had given as much as fifty thousand dollars apiece to the republican campaign fund and some men of high business standing barely escaped the penitentiary on nice decisions. It was found that one corporation in New York City gave five hundred thousand dollars in a single year. It was found that Mr. Harriman, at the request of President Roosevelt, had gone out and collected two hundred and sixty thousand dollars to use in one state. The people finally became so indignant at what had been done by republican leaders, that a sentiment was aroused and a demand arose for purity, honesty and decency in politics. One proposition that received support, called for publicity as to campaign contributions, and before the last campaign began the democrats tried to secure the passage of such a law through congress, but they failed, and then the republican convention met at Chicago. It met after the democrats had tried to get this law, and had failed, and in that convention the platform did not call for publicity. Why not? Mr. Beveridge was there. Why didn't he fight for decency and purity and honesty in