

ment can take the son from the mother, the husband from the wife, the father from the child, and stand them up in front of an enemy's guns; but in an hour of danger it cannot lay its hand upon the accumulated wealth and make that wealth bear the expenses of the government that protects it. Why? Because it puts the dollar above the man. (A member: "It is a shame.") Mr. Bryan: It is a shame, but it will not be long. In New York it came near being ratified. The senate ratified it by a large majority, but in the house it was defeated by one vote, and that one vote was secured against it by the promise that a contested seat would be decided in his favor if a man would violate the promise of his platform and vote against it. That is how near it came to passing in the state of New York, where there is the largest concentration of wealth, and if that amendment can be ratified, as it will be in the state of New York, what other state can justify delay in ratifying it? I believe it is only a question of time when this almost universal sense of justice among the people will find expression in this amendment to the constitution, and when that amendment becomes a part of our organic law, then congress can levy and collect an income tax, and neither one judge or nine judges can build a legal bulwark around the fortunes of the great and throw the burden of government upon the backs of the struggling poor of this country.

ELECTION OF SENATORS

Another reform that has grown is that which has for its object the election of senators by direct vote of the people. I remember that this fight began eighteen years ago. Not the fight—the fight began earlier than that. It was a citizen of Tennessee who, if my information is correct, was the first prominent public man to suggest this amendment to the constitution. Andrew Johnson, in one of his messages to congress, suggested this amendment to the constitution, but that was away back yonder, and very few paid any attention to it. And then Mr. Weaver of Iowa introduced, ten or fifteen years later, a resolution proposing the amendment, but they did not pay much attention to it. For one hundred and three years after the adoption of our constitution the people submitted to the present method of electing senators without a protest that arose to the dignity of a resolution passed by congress. But in 1892 the house, by an almost unanimous vote passed a resolution proposing the necessary amendment and the senate pigeonholed it. The next house did the same thing—the senate refused to report it. And since that time three other houses have followed the example of the fifty-second congress and that resolution five times has been presented to the senate, and five times it has not been reported. This year, for the first time, it has been reported favorably in the senate and there have been test votes that indicate a majority of the members of the senate in favor of that resolution. That is the first time in the eighteen years' fight when we have on record a majority apparently in favor of the adoption of the resolution. And the man in charge, Senator Borah, of Idaho, has given notice that it will be pressed, and if possible, a vote secured upon it before this session closes. It requires two-thirds of both houses to submit an amendment to the constitution. I do not know whether they have two-thirds now or not. I think it is going to be pretty close. But I don't feel so much concerned, because after this senate there is another, and if this senate does not submit it Senator Lea will have the privilege of voting for it in the next senate. I think there is no doubt that the next senate will submit it, and then, after a struggle of twenty years we will see this amendment submitted to the states, and state after state will ratify it and it will not be long until the necessary three-fourths will have spoken and then the constitution will be changed, and then the people will have the right to put upon the ballot the name of the man who is to represent them in what ought to be the highest legislative body in the world. The gate will be opened and remedial legislation will be possible. And if, in the twenty years during which this fight has been made, if in that twenty years nothing else had been accomplished except this change in this method of electing senators, the result will justify all the effort expended.

In times past it has required war, bloodshed, lives of thousands to secure a reform less important than this, but we are making progress, we are substituting agitation and parliamentary reform for those reforms won upon the battlefield. During the last eighteen years the people have been increasing their demand and making

it more urgent until two-thirds of the states of the union have demanded it and their voice has at last reached the senate.

NEARER THE PEOPLE

This is an evidence that the government is being brought nearer the people and that the democratic idea of government, that representatives are to speak for the people and say what the people want said, that this is the growing doctrine in this country.

We have also had growth in the public sentiment in the matter of railroad regulations. I can recollect how, twenty years ago, there were respectable people who resented the idea that the voters, speaking through their legislatures, should have any right of control over railroads. We were told that people did not have sense enough to deal with these intricate problems; that they must leave these questions to those, who, while they had plenty of sense, had a pecuniary interest that made it impossible for them to use their sense for anybody but themselves.

But sentiment grew and state after state demanded regulation. I remember that for ten years, yes, for more than ten years, the United States interstate commerce commission asked for legislation enlarging the scope of that commission. But year after year the railroad lobby in Washington was more potent than the wishes of the people who sent senators and representatives to congress, and year after year the house and senate adjourned without doing anything. And I remember one day seeing a railroad president, who had just been elected to congress, coming and occupying his position there under the privilege of the house and directing a railroad fight on the floor of the house. But those days have gone, and today the people of this country understand that there are no corporations created by law so big that they shall not be regulated by law. Our people are a Bible-reading people, and I think that they are prepared now to say that every corporation, railroads among others, ought to have a motto upon the wall, a Bible motto, "Remember Now Thy Creator in the Days of Thy Youth."

NO TURNING BACK

This progress in the matter of railroad legislation is in the interest of the people and there will be no turning back of this reform. When you once establish a truth it stands. Truth is the only omnipotent thing, and there is truth back of the demand of the people that no fictitious person called a corporation shall be permitted to trample upon the God-made man, who was placed here to carry out the will of his Creator.

I remember, a few years ago, it was thought entirely proper for great corporations to contribute to campaign funds. As recently as fourteen years ago last fall quite large contributions were made. Investigation showed that even insurance companies became deeply interested in politics, and some of them contributed as much as fifty thousand dollars per year of money that did not belong to the man who contributed it—money taken from the policy-holders, from the widows and the orphans—and it was turned into a campaign fund. But an awakened public sentiment demanded that there should be no more contributions, and we now have a law making it a real offense for any corporation to contribute to a national campaign fund. These respectable men who stand high in business and in society, and even in the church, who, thought it was not only perfectly proper, but highly patriotic to use other people's money for the advancement of their political views will find punishment awaiting them if they exercise now what they thought was their right.

BOTH FOR PUBLICITY

But the public was not satisfied with the passage of these laws. There was a demand for publicity as to individual contributions, and that demand grew until, in the last campaign, the two leading parties stood for publicity; one party demanding publicity before the election, and the other party demanding publicity after the election, and when the election was over, the house of representatives passed a bill providing for publicity before and the senate passed a bill providing for publicity afterwards, and the house had to concede that point to the senate in order to get any kind of publicity. But we have that much now, and I am rejoicing that there is a public sentiment that is sufficient to compel publicity even after the election. Having secured that reform I believe the people will go forward now to secure that reform in a larger measure by providing that there shall be publication before the election, as well as after, so the voter may know who is taking a deep

financial interest in the election of party or candidate.

And on this subject I want to say to you that I believe that there is progress in ferreting out corruption. I believe that public sentiment today is stronger against corruption than it has ever been before, and I congratulate the senator from this state, who presented a minority report protesting against corruption in the election of a United States senator. I think that Senator Frazier represented the awakened conscience of the American people and I think he complimented the senate, too. We cannot tell yet whether he complimented the senate more highly than it deserved when he said a man, in order to be a senator, ought to have a title above suspicion. We can't tell yet what the view of the senate will be as to the height necessary for a man to reach before he shall be a senator.

This fight against corruption is a very important fight, for we have no representative government if the representative is not really the choice of the people.

ELECTION LAWS

I do not know what your election laws are, and possibly it is just as well I do not, because I am careful when I do know not to say anything that might seem like criticising the sentiment that is strong in a body that invites me. I do not know what your laws are, but it seems to me that this is a very opportune time for you to amend your election laws, if they need amendment. You have a situation here which I think rather lends itself to the establishment of things that are just in a higher than party sense. You are so mixed up and divided that possibly anything you can agree upon would be unquestionably accepted as just by the people. (Applause.)

Possibly you may not have so good a chance again to combine all elements in favor of honesty of elections. If a republican governor and a legislature whose position I have been unable to define (applause) if they can agree upon an election law, I am sure that it would be one that would commend itself to the people. I say I do not know what your election law may be, but I know that sometimes the dominant party in a state insists that the election board, although nominally partisan, shall be made up of people who are appointed by one party. Now I am speaking as an individual. I have no party authority for what I say, and nobody needs to believe me unless he wants to, but my observation is that a partisan board, where all members are appointed by one side, is more or less of a fraud. And, while the conscientious appointing power may make it better in some cases than in others, still it is too frequently the case that the representatives of the minority have been selected either because they have betrayed their party or are willing to do it under proper persuasion. There is only one way to secure an honest election board, and that is to make it not only representative of both parties or all parties, but that the minority shall select the people who represent it, and that they shall not be under obligations to the majority for their appointment upon the board.

PARTIES SHOULD CHOOSE

And I say here, in this democratic or republican or democratic-republican or republican-democratic state, what I would say in any state that was democratic or republican, namely, that we shall never build our election laws upon a sound foundation until we recognize human nature to the extent of giving to the parties the choice of the people who are to represent them on the board, and when, throughout this union, in all of the states, republicans and democrats alike shall insist that election boards shall be composed of people representing really, and not simply ostensibly, the different parties, so that fraud will be uncovered and never concealed— not until then will we have elections that will be above suspicion, not until then will those elected to office have the respect officials are entitled to when they are known to be the choice of the people of their state.

But there are so many of these questions that I must hasten on. I have spoken of the tendency toward popular government. I cannot pass over the great victory that has already been won for the doctrine of representative government, the victory in the house of representatives. The first skirmish occurred something like a year ago, and it was a fight won by a union of members of two parties. The democrats and insurgent republicans insisted that the committee on rules should be made larger.

That was a good move, but it was not the most important part of it. They insisted that