

lator. In most states he is spoken of as a representative, and it is an appropriate term, for he represents those for whom he speaks. Sometimes he is called a delegate, and I am not sure but that even more accurately describes his position, for he is a delegate chosen by those who send him to the legislature to act for them. If there can be a distinction then the word delegate would more clearly than the word representative imply that the one who speaks is to say what they want done, to vote as they would vote if they were there instead of he. And this is my idea of a representative. It is not my idea alone, but the idea entertained by the great majority of the people in a free government. There are two theories of representative government—one is an aristocratic theory, and the other is a democratic theory—and I am sure that those who call themselves republican will not for a moment think that I use the word democrat in a partisan sense. I have long since learned that the democratic sentiment in this country, is much larger than the democratic party, or than any party. (Applause.) It is an overwhelming sentiment in this country, and, in fact, it becomes the dominant sentiment in every country long before the people have a chance to express themselves. The aristocratic idea is that the representative is selected to think for the people and that he has a right to think for them, whether he thinks as they think or thinks what they want him to think. That is the aristocratic idea of a representative.

The democratic idea is that the people think for themselves and elect representatives to act for them and to put their thought into execution. I think this distinction between the aristocratic idea and the democratic idea runs through the world. And, after all, the only permanent distinction between men is a distinction between an aristocrat and a democrat. Jefferson, the most wise of all our statesmen, the one who stands in a class by himself because no one before or since has been able to approximate him in the matter of constructive statesmanship—Jefferson said, that in all countries there were naturally two parties, and that wherever speech was free those two parties would manifest themselves. And these two natural and universal parties he described as the aristocratic party and the democratic party. He said the aristocratic party would naturally draw to itself those who did not believe in the people and did not trust them, and that the democratic party would naturally draw to itself those who did believe in the people and did trust them. And this distinction, drawn by Jefferson more than a century ago, was true then, it is true now; it is true here, it is true everywhere. You may go where you will and you will find this distinction clearly drawn, and you will find that one party of some name is trusting the people more than the other party; is more anxious than the other to do what the people want, while the other party is obstructing every step toward popular government.

ELSEWHERE ALSO

And this distinction not only runs through matters of government, it runs through society as well. There is the aristocratic view of society just as there is aristocratic view of government, and there is the democratic view of society, just as there is a democratic view of government. The democrat believes that society rests on the masses, the aristocrat believes that society is constructed from the top. The democrat believes that the effort should be to help all of the people and he believes that when good comes to the masses it finds its way up through all of the classes that rests upon the masses. The aristocrat says provide for the wealthy and let their property leak through on those below. That is the fundamental distinction in society, and I can tell you in just a few minutes' conversation with a man whether he takes the democratic view or the aristocratic view. If there is any man whose position I am in doubt about I engage him in conversation, and I gradually tell him that story of Lazarus and Dives, how Lazarus ate the crumbs that fell from Dives' table, and if he takes the democratic view of society he says that it is too bad that we have to have anybody like Lazarus who has to live on crumbs and then he goes around and organizes a movement to increase the number of tables, if possible, so that everybody can have a table of his own and nobody have to live on the crumbs that fall from any one's table. But if he takes the aristocratic view of society, what does he say? He says that a lucky thing for Lazarus it was that there was a Dives

near. That is the distinction. You will find this everywhere. (Applause.)

There is this fundamental difference between the aristocrat and the democrat, and I have elaborated this distinction because the first thought that I desire to leave with you is that the democratic idea of representative government is the idea held by a vast majority of the people of this country and the idea that is spreading throughout the world.

There is such a thing as an embezzlement of power, and the representative who misrepresents, the representative who uses the power for his own private advantage or against the interests or wishes of those for whom he speaks, is as much an embezzler, measured by any moral standard, as the man who appropriates to his own use money left in his care, and I hope the day will come when we shall punish embezzlement of power as severely as today we punish embezzlement of money, for power is more important than money. Men have given their lives, millions of them, that representative government might be a reality, and all this blood has been shed in vain, if when the people elect a man he is not under obligation to do what they want done.

MAN'S CONSCIENCE

Do not misunderstand me. I do not mean to say any representative should go contrary to his conscience. No one will go beyond me in emphasizing the duty of a representative to follow his conscience. I believe that a representative is not worthy of respect who does not act conscientiously, and I will not defend any man who, as a representative, does what he believes to be wrong, merely because his constituents want it done. But there is a way in which an honest representative and a conscientious representative can yet be a faithful representative. If his constituents want him to do something that he does not want done, let him resign and let them select somebody to carry out their will who can do what they want done. (Applause.) In other words, while I believe that a representative ought to be conscientious, I do not believe that his conscience ought to be dormant during the campaign and come out only after the election is over, when he wants an excuse to betray his constituents. (Applause.) He must recognize that his constituents have consciences also, and that they have as much right, aye, more right, than the servant who speaks for them. They have that conscientious right, and it is a higher right than the right of the representative, to misrepresent them merely because he does not agree with them.

Platforms are becoming more and more the rule. And why ought we to have platforms? It is that the representative may know what his people want, or, if the platform is of his own writing, that the constituents may know what to expect from him if he is elected. I desire to emphasize this idea of representative government because the evil that cries for remedy today in government is misrepresentation by unfaithful representatives. It is the embezzlement of power by people who are trusted by their constituents and who violate their obligation to the people who elected them. It is too often the case that the man in the legislature has an interest to serve that his constituents do not know of. It is too often that the man in the legislature sits at one end of a telegraph wire and some man in the dark sits at the other end, who, because he helps to elect him, tells him what to do. I like the wireless system of telegraphy better, as its effectiveness rests upon the theory that the two instruments are attuned to each other, so the representative ought to be attuned to his constituency and so in harmony with them that their will will be communicated to him. Thus he will be the instrument for carrying it out. This is the fundamental thought that I desire to leave with you—the first thought.

GOVERNMENT AN EVOLUTION

And then I want to suggest that government is an evolution, that it is a matter of progress—a continuous thing. None of us know everything and few of us know today as much as we will know tomorrow. It is unfortunate for a man when he reaches the position where there is no further room for growth or information. When a man gets ripe he begins to rot. It is only when he is green that he grows, and so it is with civilization, and so it is with society. And it is no discredit to a man that he has an idea today that he did not have yesterday. It would rather be a discredit to him if he did not appropriate every good idea as soon as he found it, no matter where he found it. We are constantly appropriating ideas. Some of us

see a thing a little earlier than others. That may be a matter of circumstances. But the important thing is not so much that we shall see a thing as soon as some one else, but that we shall make good use of every good thing we see as soon as we see it. And if you will look back over the last fifteen or twenty years you will see a great growth of ideas.

Today I desire if I can make such compensation as possible for your generous invitation, by pointing out the growth of certain ideas and I may suggest some others in harmony with that growth; ideas that will, some day, in my judgment, be universally accepted and universally applied. But that I may convince you that there is this growth, let me refer to what has been done, and then your faith may be strengthened in my prediction as to what will be.

We have a very interesting history for the last twenty years. I know of no similar period in which the evidences of a forward movement and all toward more popular government, are to be found. I know of no period when these evidences have been more apparent. My own connection with public affairs dates back about twenty years, and I take this period because the things I speak of are the things I have been able to observe. And what I say will simply refresh your memories, because the facts I shall present are facts, undisputed facts, that everyone will recognize.

INCOME TAX

Sixteen years ago we had a contest over the question of an income tax. I recall that contest very well. At that time it was my good fortune to be a member of the ways and means committee and a member of the sub-committee that drafted the income tax bill. I remember, also, that one of the members, I will say the leading member of that sub-committee was one of your own citizens, ex-Governor McMillin. (Applause.) And it was when I was a member of that committee that I became well acquainted with him, and it has been a pleasure to renew that acquaintance from time to time whenever opportunity offers. I remember what opposition there was to the income tax. I remember how bitterly everybody was abused who believed in the income tax. I remember how, in one section of the country, we were assailed as demagogues and disturbers of the peace. I see here one who was in congress at that time and who was with us in all of those fights, Mr. Enloe, who can testify also that there was a fight. ((Applause.)) We were told by some from the east how disastrous it would be to the party if we dared to frame an income tax bill; a bill that would make people bear the burdens of government in proportion to the benefits received under the government. Well, the income tax passed. It went before the supreme court. At the first hearing the court was equally divided, four and four, one member absent. Upon a rehearing one of the members who had voted for the income tax voted against it and it was declared unconstitutional, declared unconstitutional by a majority of one, and that one man had changed his opinion between the two hearings. Thus does the constitutionality of a question sometimes change in a very short time. From that time there has been a struggle to secure an income tax, an effort to secure an amendment to the constitution because there was a possibility that in any form that subject was presented it might again be declared unconstitutional. And the demand grew, and finally, less than two years ago, the president of the United States asked congress to submit a constitutional amendment specifically authorizing an income tax and it went through the senate without a dissenting vote. It passed the house with only fourteen votes in the negative and only three of those were west of the Allegheny mountains. And now that amendment is before the states for ratification, and state after state has ratified it. Has Tennessee acted yet?

A Member—There is a bill before the legislature now.

Mr. Bryan—Is there any doubt of its passage? Let me venture a prediction. If it is not passed, those responsible for its defeat will not participate in the next legislature. Those who can see the masses of the people bearing a burden of unjust taxation, those who are willing that people of great income shall bear less than their share, that people of small income shall bear more than their share, will not find many associates in the expression of that opinion. No, that will pass, if not now, it will pass. Today our government is limited when it deals with property, but unlimited when it deals with the citizen.

Today, and in an hour of danger, the govern-