

My dear Mr Lodge:

I'm leaving Washington the other day, & by some mishap the reporter's minutes of my remarks was mislaid. I had, however, looked them over and decided that I would write out some-  
thing more brief and tangible for your use, that is if you find anything in it worth using.

After a two hours talk with Speaker Reed who called upon me the night before I left, I see that he is somewhat troubled by the question of cost.

It is of course a serious one but I am not at all sure that he does much quite overestimate its ~~importance~~. Of course, as a

~~In the first place, I think there is~~ party-measure, this feeling need only be considered at the North: that is we should gain more than we would lose by it at the South.

\* Would the cost of a national election  
have be a serious matter at the  
North? I think not and for this belief  
I have three reasons to offer which I  
think deserve attention.

- 1- There is, as you know, a general feel-  
ing at the North, that better election  
methods are needed and a very  
large number of the North would hail  
such a law as a step toward con-  
vincing States to adopt better methods  
also.
- 2- A still larger number are humbled,  
fed and agrieved, and a great  
many alarmed at the condition  
of affairs at the South and are  
consequently willing to stumbe ex-  
pense for an actual ~~man~~ = parti-  
method of protecting the voter  
and making elections at least  
partly free.
- 3- A very active and essential part  
of the Republican Party think it is

on this subject. I wish you to fully understand that Mr. Kelley's bill is intended only to be a suggestion of a system and certain specific objects. I am sorry to say that I have not very much pride in the mere fact of originating such a thing. Perhaps I recognize more fully than some the fact that the man outside a legislative body, is at best only a suggester.

Whatever is done however, I hope certain things will not be omitted -

- 1 - The declaration of qualifications in the 1 & 2 sections of Mr. Kelley's bill. I shall send you a full argument on this point in my notes, except as to one feature of it to wit:

You have observed that the feeling is trending very strongly against foreign privilege and that feature will help the party that backs the bill.

imperatively incumbent on its Representatives  
to improve the present opportunity -  
~~Republican party~~ to make the most  
earnest and ~~frank~~ thorough ef-  
fort to at least remove the evils of  
a corrupted ballot and an intimidat-  
ed constituency at the South during the  
present session of Congress and if it is  
not done the party will suffer very  
severely from a lack of their co-  
operation. These embrace two classes

- 1 - The colored voters without whose  
help our enactment carry at least  
four northern states.
- 2 - Ex-soldiers who recognize the  
gravity of the situation and know  
that the most stringent federal law  
is cheaper than <sup>one day's</sup> the result which  
seems to be apparent unless a rem-  
edy is found.

I feel the more confident of this he-  
cause "The Bylandt's Notes" ~~in which~~  
~~have~~ two columns on the editorial  
page of the Inter-Ocean (Chicago) in  
which I have discussed for two years  
under my own name, every Sat-  
urday, ~~on~~ some phase of the South-  
ern question, have brought me  
thousands of letters from all  
parts of the country ~~so~~ that I  
feel myself better prepared per-  
haps, to judge the public feeling  
on this subject than almost  
any other man.

I do not believe we shall lose  
a single District at the North or

account of the adoption of a measure which in its terms and character shows that the constitutional powers of Congress have been exhausted to secure a free ballot and a fair count at the South. The people of the North will willingly submit to some inconvenience and considerable tax levies to secure this.

Upon looking over the list of Southern members I think there may be two districts in which it would be no advantage to us, while there are more than twenty districts which such a law would give us a fair chance to win with all the probabilities in our favor.

I have no doubt as to  
your, a supreme contempt for in-  
effective legislation, and do not be-  
lieve in a party hitting off more than  
it can show. I believe, however, that  
the universal <sup>and enthusiastic</sup> approval by Republicans  
of Speaker Reed's course in regard to  
the visible majority, indicates very  
clearly that the public sentiment of  
the North is ripe for what a little  
time ago would have been thought  
extreme measures.

I have no personal interest in the  
matter beyond that of every good citizen  
and sincere Republican. I believe,  
however, in "practical politics" that  
is, I believe in allowable rather

them were unavoidable good, and  
I think what can be done the true  
test of advisability in party action.

I think the government should give  
the citizen the best known weapons  
for achieving the most difficult  
task civilization has imposed —  
government by the people; and  
should put around the voter  
every possible safe guard; and  
if there is doubt about the ad-  
visability of a measure intended  
to secure such result, after care-  
ful scrutiny the doubt benefit of  
the doubt should be given to the  
attempt to do the right thing.

I suppose, of course, you will make  
~~up a bill out of this report~~ some bill



2 - The protection of the voter, not only at the polls, but going, returning, in public meeting, etc., through Federal Courts.

The Democrats are afraid to have this embodied in a statute covering the whole field of Congressional elections as they see it will do away with the constitutional objection to existing laws.

3 - The personalization of ~~some~~ responsibility and extended liability to punishment for failure to do is also important.

4 - The Special Registry System seems to me important as fixing responsibility in this way on Postoffice Officials.

5 - I think the <sup>apparent</sup> expense might be lessened by reducing the Commissioner of Elections salary to \$600, or \$800 and giving him fees as a U.S. Commissioner. I don't like fees, however, and think a fed officer is apt to grow unpopular. It would be better to leave it \$1,000, except for the first time. The fees would make it seem cheaper.

6 - One Commissioner in each state would seem better but then there could be no really and elastic supervision by the U.S. Courts. The Circuit Judges could not do it and one man cannot be made a member to two or three ~~several~~ District Judges.

7 - The supervision of the judges by necessary orders seems to me very important because what is adopted to one district may need explanatory orders to make it applicable to another.

measures when there is anything needed to be done.

Take for instance the very pronounced public sentiment, throughout the North, in favor of the Australian system, which in my judgment and no doubt in yours also, is the weakest of all the English Election safeguards. Our people cared little about it when the simple principle of occlusion of the voter so that he might change his ballot was introduced into California and made the basis of the best Australian system. But when we came to change the whole thing, furnish ballots and revive the whole system of voting, it began to get a hold on the public sentiment not at all justified by the prospect of its efficiency.

The same was true of Civil Service Reform: very few had any conception of its real character or operation. I am not so sure that we know much about it now; and it certainly does not at all meet the general expectation. But it was curious, cumbersome and altogether. If it did not change everything it was expected to do. If the change had been less radical there would have been <sup>few</sup> little, if any chance of success. It would be easy to name hundreds of instances in which

the same principle has applied. Indeed, outside of Prohibition, I do not know an exception to this rule and I doubt if that is. Taking the last sixty years last past, together I am inclined to think that the extreme of restrictions has not even warranted popular approval much oftener than the means of regulation.

This consideration makes me the more confident, that a thorough, ~~to~~ radical and even startling change of system of electing Congressmen, having broad incidental effects upon in the direction of free speech and the protection of popular assemblage, will have the effect to give the party a stronger popular support next Fall than a more moderate one.

It will also force popular discussion of the question which is certain to redound to our advantage because we have both right and reason on our side. It won't do for them to assail it as oppression because it can do no honest man or party any harm. As with the "visible majority" the enormous

of the situation is with us.

This seems to me, ~~to~~ a fair estimate of its immediate effect upon our party press = feels. This fall will be the crucial time with us and without something to stir the public sentiment we are likely to lose. Off = years are probably bad years for Republicans. I know there is a general idea that this is because it is hard to raise money there. But public interest and approval will at least help to remedy the lack of this generally accepted  sine qua non  of success.

Now, as to its future effects, upon the party, & arena. It will either effect a perceptible improvement in further election methods, or an extended and violent resistance to the law. — Either result will be a full vindication of the party's course. Under the Kelley bill evidence will be abundant and avoidable instantly ~~and~~ in case of avoidance or resistance while if it succeeds the gain in Members will justify the policy of the act.

You are quite at liberty to make  
such use of this letter as you may  
see fit. I have taken the liberty  
to say some things to you which  
I could not well say before  
the full committee, and  
was unable to get around to  
say to you personally.

Yours, ~~to~~ respectfully  
E. J. M.

In regard to the apprehension which Speaker Reed seems to entertain in regard to so sweeping a change, it is not well to remember the maxim of any lord of Verulam "It is a secret of nature as well as of state that many things may be changed more easily than we."

I take it that the philosophy of this "secret," as he terms it, is that men are naturally favorable to change, especially when everything is surging and are more inclined to a radical change embracing an entire system than to a cautious, half-way, over-at-a-time sort of remedial policy. There is, unquestionably, something in human nature inclining one to extreme rather than middle