And yet Governor Folk, who declared in favor of home rule, enforced the dramshop laws in the large cities, while under Governor Stephens and Governor Dockery, who were opposed to home rule, the dramshop laws in the large cities were not enforced. In taking his position with Stephens and Dockery, is Mr. Cowherd to be understood as commending their administration of the police departments in our large cities, and is he to be understood as condemning Governor Folk because he declared for home rule? I do not care what horn of this dilemma Mr. Cowherd takes, but let him answer these questions, and answer them specifically: Does he approve of the conduct of the police departments in Kansas City and St. Louis while Dockery and Stephens were governor? Governor Folk claims that they were both inefficient and corrupt. What does Mr. Cowherd say upon this question? I demand of Mr. Cowherd that he either repudiate Dockery and Stephens, or repudiate Folk. One thing is certain in reference to this question of home rule, and that is that the people of the large cities will not get it unless they clearly indicate that they want it. And if they want it, I have such confidence in their good citizenship and intelligence that I believe they will use it to enforce the law, and not to violate it. But Mr. Cowherd, who believes that we should forthwith give home rule to the Philippine Islands, with its mixed population of negroes, Malays and Chinamen, with its combination of ignorance, incapacity and superstition, would deny it to the intelligent, law-abiding people of Kansas City, St. Louis and St. Joseph. Perhaps Mr. Cowherd thinks that because he, as Mayor of Kansas City, did nothing to enforce the dramshop laws providing for the closing of the saloons on Sunday, that other city officials whom the people might elect would follow his example.

One thing is also certain in reference to this question of home rule, and that is that even if the selection of police, election and excise officials is given to the people of the large cities, the laws of the State providing for the regulation of dramshops will still remain the laws of the State until a majority of the people's representatives want them changed. At the request of Governor Folk, my office has enforced the laws regulating dramshops in St. Louis County by the orderly processes of the courts, and if I am elected Governor, that which I have accomplished as Attorney General in St. Louis County, I can accomplish as Governor, with an honest Attorney General, in the large cities of the State. But why is it, may I again inquire, if the Republican platform is in favor of lawlessness and the non-enforcement of the laws regulating dramshops, that all the lawless saloonkeepers in the State are supporting Mr. Cowherd and opposing me? There is nothing that Mr. Cowherd could say that would convince these men that they are making a mistake in supporting him, and there is nothing that I could say that would win for me their approval. But I want neither their approval nor their votes, for I have no favors to give to those who violate the law. The saloonkeeper who obeys the law is entitled to the law's protection, and an absolutely square deal from the State. All this he will have from me. But I here and now declare unrelenting opposition to the lawless saloonkeeper who seeks to nominate and elect our public officials for his own protection.

MY LABOR RECORD AND MR. COWHERD'S.

Mr. Cowherd had something to say in his opening speech in reference to my attitude upon questions of interest to the laboring classes. I have had no occasion particularly to deal with questions affecting the rights of organized labor, except as I have had occasion to decide questions and to conduct litigation in which they are interested. In the decision of questions for the various State Departments affecting the interests of the laboring classes, I have endeavored to render decisions in accordance with the law of the land, without fear or favor to any class. In the conduct of litigation, I have endeavored to sustain the laws that the people have written upon the statute books. And the fact that today those who work in underground mines do not work there more than eight hours in every twenty-four, is due to the provisions of the law of this State, the constitutionality of which I sustained in the Supreme Court of the United States. But Mr. Cowherd makes the statement that I did not go on the Committee on Resolutions of the Republican National Convention, because I did not desire to be involved in a contest over the injunction plank which was submitted to that convention. This statement is entirely lacking in truth, and I assume that Mr. Cowherd must have been misinformed or he would not have made it. My name was never presented as a member of the Committee on Resolutions, although it was considered in connection with that position. But when I found that Major Warner desired that honor, I withdrew in his favor in deference to his broader experience and knowledge on questions of national politics. For that act I have no apologies to offer to anybody. It was made public at the time, and I have no hesitation in saying now, that I was in favor of a more definite declaration as to the powers of the courts in the granting of injunctions than that which is contained in the National Republican platform. But there can be no question but that the declarations upon this subject in the Republican National platform mean far more to the laboring classes of this country than the declarations upon the same subject in the platform of the National Democracy. The statement of Mr. Cowherd that I dodged a vote upon this or any other question that came before the National Republican Convention is also entirely false. I voted upon every question that came before that Convention, and I voted in favor of the plank for campaign contributions, a subject upon which the people await with interest information from Mr. Cowherd and his St. Louis managers. The only time that I was absent from the Convention was upon the last day, when the candidate for Vice-President was nominated, and on that day I was absent because my official duties made it necessary for me to return to the State of Missouri. Perhaps Mr. Cowherd has been disposed to believe these statements in reference to my attitude upon questions affecting the interests of organized labor by reason of his own experience in the campaign of four years ago. At that time he brought upon himself the condemnation of the laboring classes of the Fifth Congressional District by refusing to answer any of their inquiries as to his position upon questions of national importance affecting their interests. And if Mr. Cowherd can show that, during the eight years that he was a member of the National Congress, he was as active in support of measures in the interest of organized labor as he was in behalf of legislation in the interest of the Beef Trust and the railroad companies, he will give to the people of Missouri a heretofore undisclosed chapter of his official service.

MIXED SCHOOLS AND THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. Cowherd, in his remarks upon the school question, would seek to leave the impression, without making the statement, that I am in favor of mixed schools. This statement is absolutely lacking in a suggestion of fact to support it. I am now, and have always been, in favor of the complete separation of the races, not only in the public schools, but also in our higher educational institutions. And if I am elected Governor, I pledge the people here and now that I will see that the policy which was inaugurated by the Republican party, when in control of the state government in 1865, of providing separate schools for black and white children, is maintained unchanged. I think all intelligent persons who have investigated this question will readily agree that it is for the welfare of both races that this policy should be maintained.

As announced in the Republican State platform, I am in favor of increasing the revenues for and raising the standard of efficiency in our public school system. While I believe, as does my party believe, that all fair, reasonable and necessary appropriations should be given to the State University and the State Normals, yet I am opposed to maintaining the present disproportion of revenue between the State University and the public schools, by which it costs $216.60 each year for every student in the State University, and but $1.59 each year for every pupil in the public schools.

HOW CANDIDATES SHOULD BE JUDGED.

I now want to offer some reasons why I should be elected Governor. The only way by which a candidate can be fairly judged by the people is by his party record of official service, the platform and promises upon which he invites the suffrage of the people and by the influences that surround his candidacy. I have already referred somewhat in detail to the influences that have secured the nomination for Mr. Cowherd, that surround him today and that will surround him in case of his election. Those influences consist of the representatives of a corrupt and a discredited machine; the representatives of those public service corporations which seek favors from the State and seek to prevent legislation in the people's interest; the representatives of those saloons and liquor interests which have tried to violate the law in the past and expect to do so in the future; representatives of those who would use men to violate the law who are sworn to enforce the law; who would use men to debauch the ballot who are sworn to protect the ballot. These are some of the influences that secured for Mr. Cowherd his nomination, that they are today fighting for his election and which will surround him if successful.

I owe my nomination to the people of Missouri alone. I did not desire to be a candidate for Governor, or for any other office, but I responded to the expressed will of the people of Missouri without reference to party. I number among my supporters the representatives of no public service corporations seeking favors from the state; the representatives of no law-breaking saloons and I want none of either. My nomination has come to me unpurchased and unsought. My election will come to me without the taint of illegality, or it will not come at all. If there is the slightest question as to the legality of my election, I will refuse to qualify as Governor until that question is removed. I want no tainted office. The only influences that will surround me as Governor are the influences that are represented by men as strong and clear and true as ever asked the suffrage of a people—my associates upon the Republican State ticket. If you ask me for my declaration of principles and the promises I offer to you, I refer you to the Reublican State platform, every plank of which I endorse and every word of which I approve.

THE RECORD OF OFFICIAL SERVICE.

And now as to the records of official service that Mr. Cowherd and I offer to the people as the promise of the manner in which we will discharge the duties of the great office of Governor. To an examination and comparison of those records, I invite the attention of the people of the State. Mr. Cowherd has held four official positions—Assistant Prosecuting Attorney of Jackson County, First Assistant City Counselor of Kansas City, Mayor of Kansas City, and Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District. He has held public office for fourteen years, and if he or his friends can point to a single instance in any office that he has held where he ever attacked an abuse, corrected an evil, opposed or defeated corrupt political influences for the benefit of the people of Missouri, I shall be glad to have that instance brought to the attention of the people of the State.

I have held the office of First Assistant City Counselor of Kansas City, Prosecuting Attorney of Jackson County and Attorney General of Missouri. And if my opponents can show wherein I have ever failed to do my entire duty to the best of my ability, I invite that criticism. For the purpose of this discussion, it is not important to refer to my record in the office of City Counselor of Kansas City or as Prosecuting Attorney of Jackson County. Four years ago, I was nominated for the office of Attorney General by accident and elected on purpose. And yet it was an office that I thought I did not want, though I endeavored to take hold of it as if I did. I soon learned that I could occupy my entire time with its ordinary routine duties, but I felt that as chief law officer of the State I should endeavor to correct some of the abuses and evils that existed in our commercial and industrial system to the injury of the people of the State.

THE STANDARD OIL TRUST.

I found in the spring of 1905 that the price of the products of petroleum had not declined in this State for twenty years, although during that time there had been a great increase in the production of crude petroleum and a great decrease in its price. I found that in the Kansas and Oklahoma oil fields in 1900, there had been produced 81,000 barrels of crude petroleum for which the producers have received $1.20 a barrel; while in 1905 the production had increased to over 12,000,000 a year and the price had declined to 40 cents per barrel. And yet, notwithstanding this great increase in the production of crude petroleum, and notwithstanding the great decrease in its price, the price of refined oil in this state, less than one hundred miles distant, had increased during that time over two cents a gallon. I found that though there were a few independent oil companies in this State, they were permitted to do only a small portion of the business and that the price of refined oil to our people was absolutely fixed and maintained by the Standard Oil Trust. And when I realized the significance of these conditions, I realized that we had here in our midst a power greater than the power that was ever exercised by any tyrant or despot in all the history of the world. It was a power which could say to the producer what he should receive for his raw material, and could say to the consumer what he must pay for the finished product. It was a power dangerous to the existence of Republican institutions, for it meant that we had upon the one hand a master and upon the other hand its necessary corollary—a slave. I turned to the courts in an effort to secure relief for the people of Missouri from this tribute which the Standard Oil Trust had levied upon them for years. I instituted a suit against it and two of its puppet corporations, the Waters-Pierce Oil Company and the Republic Oil Company. At the time this suit was begun, there was not pending in any State of the Union or the United States Court a suit against this Trust. A suit which had been begun against it a short time before in the State of Kansas had been dismissed because it was claimed no evidence could be secured to sustain it. At the beginning, my efforts to disclose the secrets of the Standard Oil Trust were greeted only with derision and contempt; but I worked on. When I found that the evidence that I wanted could not be secured in the State of Missouri, I went to the City of New York, the home of the Standard Oil Trust, and subpoenaed its leading officers. They contemptuously refused to answer the simplest questions "on the advice of counsel." And again I turned to the courts for an order to compel them to disclose their secrets. It took me six months to fight out this controversy, and I fought it through the courts of two states and the Supreme Court of the United States. But at the end of the fight the judgment was in favor of the people of Missouri, and the officers of the Standard Oil Trust, for the first time in its history, bowed in humble submission before the law and the courts and disclosed the secrets of that great organization. It took me two years of constant work to secure my evidence and submit the case for decision, but when the decision was finally rendered, on the 21st day of May, 1907, by Judge Robert A. Anthony of Fredericktown, Missouri, appointed by the Supreme Court to hear and determine the case, it was in favor of the State upon every charge that I had made. And although the exceptions to that decision are still held under advisement by the Supreme Court of Missouri, let me tell you some of the results that have already been accomplished. The Republic Oil Company, a puppet organization of the Standard Oil Trust, which was maintained here for the purpose of crushing out competition, has been exposed and driven from the State; the Standard Oil Company of Indiana and the Waters-Pierce Oil Company of Missouri have been forced by order of the Circuit Court of Jackson County to obey our laws and sell to all who wish to buy. Competition in the oil business has thus been made possible and since March, 1905, when I began suit, thirty oil companies have been admitted to do business in the State, a larger number than had been admitted in its entire previous history. The result is that the price of refined oil no longer increases when the price of petroleum decreases. The result is that although the wholesale price of refined oil was 1½ cents a gallon at the time I began this suit, it is today 6½ cents a gallon, which means a saving of over $600,000 a year to the people of Missouri.

THE MORAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CASE.

But over and above the material advantages that have been accomplished is the moral significance and importance of this litigation. And it will always be a source of satisfaction to me and, I believe, to the people, that it was the State of Missouri which forced the officers of this great combination of wealth and of power, the greatest in the history of the world, to bow for the first time in humble submission to the law and the courts and to disclose its plan of organization and business methods. And this result was accomplished in a foreign jurisdiction, as against the persistent and untiring efforts of the ablest lawyers that money could secure. The evidence developed in this suit has since been used as the basis of suits against the Standard Oil Trust by five States, and by the National Government, and the arrogant and insolent disregard of the laws of the Nation and of the States and the rights of competitors and the public which once characterized the actions of this corporation have now become largely matters of ancient history. By this result there has also come to the American people a realization of the fact that no combination of money and of power is above the law and that none will be permitted to violate the law with impunity. It is a narrow partisan indeed who will refuse to be satisfied with results such as these.

INSURANCE TRUST.

I want to tell you the result of the proceedings that I conducted against another combination of corporate interests doing business in this State. In 1899 my predecessor, Mr. E. C. Crow, began a suit against a number of insurance companies on the charge that they were violating the anti-trust laws of this State. The Supreme Court sustained his action and assessed a fine of $1,000 against each of the corporations charged. But during the last two years, by reason of complaints as to the rates of insurance, I began an investigation from which I became satisfied that the former suit conducted by Mr. Crow had not resulted in a correction of the abuses incident to the fire insurance business here; that fire insurance rates had not been reduced and were arbitrarily fixed and maintained with but slight, if any, reference to the hazard of the risk. And so I began proceedings against some 70 of these companies, charging them with the violation of our anti-trust laws. But before the testimony was completed the representatives of the insurance companies opened negotiations looking to an adjustment of this litigation and offered to reform their business so as to comply with the laws of the State and to treat the people fairly in the matter of rates if the prosecution against them was not continued. I informed them that if they would re-rate all of the property of the State on a scientific basis, giving to each building the benefit of any protection from fire that it might enjoy, I would hold in abeyance the suit that I had begun. This proposition was accepted and the work of readjustment of insurance rates in this State is now in progress, and will probably be completed within the course of the next sixty days. In the City and County of St. Louis, I am informed that there has been, since the beginning of this suit, a reduction in rates on business property of from 30 to 40 per cent, and from the reports received of the new rates established in some fifteen or twenty towns in different parts of the State, it can be confidently stated that the average reduction in insurance rates thus secured will be between 10 and 15 per cent. As the annual amount paid in premiums by the people of Missouri to fire insurance companies, other than mutuals, is approximately $8,000,000 a year, this reduction will amount to a saving to the people direct of, at least $800,000 a year for an indefinite period. Where is the man not blinded by partisan prejudice who would hesitate to admit that this is a better plan of procedure than to secure the imposition of a fine which the defendants could in a few months recoup by an advance in charges.

OTHER ANTI-TRUST PROSECUTIONS.

In addition to these suits brought under the provisions of the anti-trust laws of the State, I have also conducted a suit against the Traders' Live Stock Exchange of Kansas City, which was sustained by the Supreme Court of the State; a suit against the Lumber Trust, in which I secured an injunction against the further consolidation of that combination; a suit against the Harvester Trust, in which the testimony will soon be completed and submitted to the court for decision. In this last case it is worthy of note that the defendant offered to pay a fine in order to escape the notoriety and trouble of litigation. I informed the attorneys who submitted this proposition that the question of punishment was a question for the courts, and not for the Attorney General to determine; that no company could pay a fine to escape the trouble of litigation and continue what I believed to be practices in violation of the laws of the State; that if it was not guilty of violating our laws, it should pay nothing, and if it was guilty, it should make way for others who would comply with our laws. And it is also worthy of note that during the taking of testimony in this case Cyrus H. McCormick, the president of this $120,000,000 corporation, a relative by marriage of John D. Rockefeller, came to Jefferson City at my request and freely answered all questions that I asked him as to the plan of organization and the business methods of the International Harvester Company. This same officer recently refused to pay any attention to similar processes issued against him by the Attorney General of our neighboring State of Kansas. It thus appears that the orders and the decrees of the courts of the State of Missouri are now respected by the trust magnates of the country. This is some advancement, at least, from the time when H. H. Rogers and his associates were with arrogant insolence declining to answer the simplest questions on "advice of counsel."

WHAT I HAVE ENDEAVORED TO ACCOMPLISH.

In these anti-trust suits that which I have endeavored to accomplish is to relieve the people of the oppression and evils of monopoly by giving them the benefit of free competition. My efforts have been to accomplish a correction of existing evils and abuse, rather than to inflict punishment for past offenses and leave uncorrected the evils and abuses which constitute those offenses. In this work I do not claim to have been entirely successful. I do claim, however, to have accomplished something. And today the people of Missouri have fairer conditions of trade and freer competition in practically every important article of commerce than they had when I was elected to office. If I was the notoriety seeker which some of my Democratic opponents assert, who cared nothing except for his own glorification and advancement, I could easily have settled the Standard Oil litigation three years ago for an amount far in excess of all the fines imposed against corporations for the violation of our laws during the entire history of the State. In my conception of the duties of my office, I did not think it right to license the Standard Oil Trust or the Harvester Trust to levy tribute upon the people of Missouri any more than I would have thought it right to license the gambler or the burglar to levy tribute upon the people by plying their avocations. If I am not badly mistaken, I am in this particular, at least, in entire accord with the great majority of the people of the State. At all events, I will continue so long as I am in public office to act upon the theory that what the people want, and what my oath of office requires is fighting against and not compromising with lawlessness.

This anti-trust litigation, to which an undue prominence has been given, has in reality constituted but a small part of the work of my office. In the conduct of and in the securing of testimony to sustain these cases, I have had no assistance except that which was furnished by my regular assistants.

THE RAILROAD RATE LITIGATION.

The litigation over the Maxim Freight Rate Laws of 1905 and 1907, and the two-cent passenger rate law of 1907, with the eighteen railroads of the State, has been a much greater and more laborious undertaking, and, in fact, has been the largest and most difficult piece of legislation in the history of the State. It has been necessary for the attorneys for the State to fully acquaint themselves with the methods and system of railroad construction and operation, the method in which the railroad rates are fixed and established, the methods and details of railroad accounting; in short, with every phase of the railroad business from the standpoint of operation, as well as from the standpoint of litigation. The expense of expert accountants who have spent months in the examination of the books and accounts of the railroad companies, has been considerable, but I believe it has been money well spent. This work has enabled the people of Missouri as well as the people of other States, for the first time, to know the truth as to the reasonableness of railroad freight and passenger rates. It has disclosed to the people of this State the enormous tribute that they have by inaction permitted the railroads to levy upon them for years.

It has shown, for instance, that the Burlington Railroad Company makes a net profit of $5,000 each year for every mile of road that it has in the State of Missouri, while it makes an average of $2,500 a year for each mile on its entire system; that though it has but 11 per cent of its mileage in the State of Missouri, that 11 per cent produces over 22 per cent of its income. While this condition may not exist in the case of all the roads of the State, it is probable that every road in the State receives a much larger revenue for every ton of freight that it hauls one mile in the State than it receives for every ton of freight that it hauls one mile in interstate traffic. This evidence has also shown that the people of Missouri pay the railroad companies freight rates from 25 to 35 per cent higher than do their neighbors of Iowa and Illinois. For instance, the Missouri farmer has to pay $60 to have a carload of wheat hauled 100 miles to market, while in Iowa and Illinois it costs the farmers of those States but $40 for the same car the same distance; while the stock raisers in Missouri have to pay the railroads $24 a car to have their cattle hauled 100 miles to the stockyards at Kansas City, St. Louis and St. Joseph, in Illinois the farmers of that State can have their stock carried to the Chicago stockyards, the same distance, for $20 a car; that in Missouri the railroads charge the farmer and implement dealer $24 to have a carload of agricultural implements hauled 100 miles, while in Iowa it would cost for the same car, the same distance, $18; that while it would cost the Missouri housebuilder, according to the rates established in this State $32 to get a car of lumber hauled a distance of 100 miles, it would cost the Iowa home-builder $25 for the same car the same distance. A similar condition exists in the freight rates in Missouri and the freight rates in Illinois and Iowa upon other commodities and for other distances. These facts and many others important to the people of Missouri, have been developed in the course of this litigation. The testimony in these cases has finally been completed and is now ready to be submitted to the decision of the United States Circuit Court. I cannot but view with confidence the final result of this litigation.

But in this litigation, as in the anti-trust litigation already referred to, substantial results have already been secured. The facts developed as to the value of railroad properties enabled the State Board of Equalization to increase their assessments last year over $10,000,000, thus adding $175,000 to the State's revenues each year.

THE TWO-CENT FARE FIGHT.

Further, Governor Folk in his St. Joseph speech in his present campaign for the United States Senatorship said, in speaking of this litigation:

"A great deal of testimony was taken to determine the fairness of these rates, and as a result of these investigations into the cost of freight and passenger service, the conclusion was arrived at, both by myself and the General Assembly, that passenger rates could be materially reduced without doing any injustice to the corporations. Believing that the passenger business of the railroads justified it, I recommended the reduction of the passenger rate from three cents to two cents a mile."

With the enactment of the two-cent passenger rate law in 1907, the railroads announced that they proposed to enjoin its enforcement in the Federal Court, as they had two years before enjoined the enforcement of the freight rate law of 1905. They also announced that they proposed to make Missouri the battle-ground in their contest against the two-cent fare. I had learned something in the two years of litigation I had had with the railroad companies as to their methods of legal warfare, and I decided to use the same methods in fighting them that they had used in fighting the people of Missouri. I decided not to let them select both the form and the forum of litigation, and on the day that they announced that they would ask for an injunction in the United States Court to restrain me from enforcing the two-cent fare law against them, I went into the State courts and asked for an injunction enjoining the railroad companies from disobeying this law; and I went into the State courts a few hours earlier than the railroads went into the Federal court. Judge Matt W. Reynolds of St. Louis, and Judge John G. Park of Kansas City, issued the injunctions I asked for against the railroad companies, and the railroads then prepared their papers for an application to have me adjudged guilty of contempt of the United States Circuit Court. This question was argued on the 5th day of June, 1907, before Judge McPherson of the United States Circuit Court at Kansas City, but before the decision was rendered the railroads weakened in their fight, abandoned their plan to have me adjudged guilty of contempt and agreed to put into effect, for ninety days, the two-cent fare as an experiment. The result of the experiment was an increase in earnings for the railroad companies until the business depression last winter affected unfavorably the railroad business along with all other lines of industry. The railroads have recently endeavored again to secure a temporary injunction against the two-cent passenger rate law, but their application was denied by the United States Circuit Court, and the entire controversy, including both the freight and the passenger rate laws, is now set down for final hearing on the 5th of next October.

In this controversy with the railroads over the two-cent passenger rate law, it has not been my intention or desire to do injustice to the railroad interests. I do not want to see the railroad companies of the State compelled to carry passengers at two cents a mile if by so doing they will lose money. But I contended that this question could not be intelligently determined until the railroad companies had actually carried passengers at two cents a mile and ascertained by actual experience whether or not the decrease in the rate would result in an increase in the number of passengers. The results have vindicated the correctness of my insistence that the railroad companies should comply with this law. And while it has not resulted in any substantial reduction in passenger earnings, it has resulted in a saving to the people of Missouri of $1,100,000 each year in the rates paid for passenger service. Or, in other words, it has enabled the people to travel at a smaller cost.

THE REGULATION OF FREIGHT RATES.

The conclusion that I have reached as a result of this litigation over freight rates is that the fixing of a schedule of such rates ought not to be undertaken by a legislature; such work cannot be successfully accomplished by such a body in the haste, confusion and inaccuracy which usually attend the deliberations of a state legislature. Such work should be undertaken and accomplished by an intelligent commission composed of men who by training and study are competent to deal with this question.

During the progress of this litigaton a chance was offered through the initiative of Judge O. M. Spencer, one of the attorneys of the Burlington Railroad, to accomplish what I regarded as a satisfactory compromise of this litigation. He offered to put into effect for his road, which would have necessitated that the other roads do likewise, all of the rates fixed by the acts of 1905, with the exception of the live stock schedule, and in that instance he offered to establish a rate as low as that existing in any contiguous state. Mr. Frank Wightman, one of the Railroad Commissioners, and a co-defendant with me, agreed with me that this would be a satisfactory compromise, and Governor Folk was also disposed to favor it. But through the opposition of the democratic members of the Board of Railroad and Warehouse Commissioners, and particularly that of John A. Knott, this compromise was rendered impossible, and the litigation still continues.

THE DISCONTINUANCE OF PASSES.

Another instance in which I feel that I have accomplished a result without litigation which is of value and importance to the people of Missouri, is by securing a discontinuance of the issuance of railroad passes. Since 1875 the laws of this State have made it a misdemeanor for a railroad company to give or a public official to receive railroad passes. There has, however, been no law prohibiting a railroad company from giving free passes to a person other than a public official. Although the Constitution and laws of the State prohibit all discriminations in railroad charges, the legislature has, for some inexcusable reason, failed to prohibit the issuance of free passes, though an act of Congress prohibits such discriminations in interstate commerce. A law prohibiting passes to public officials is of little consequence or value so long as all the politicians who nominate and help to elect those officials have their pockets filled with passes. At the last session of the Legislature I drew and had introduced a bill prohibiting the railroad companies from issuing passes to any person other than employes and those engaged in works of religion and charity. This bill was opposed by the railroad lobby, and by using the argument among Democratic members of the Legislature that its passage would advance my political fortunes, its defeat was accomplished. The Legislature having failed to do its plain duty in this regard, I undertook to see what I could accomplish without the assistance of the Legislature. I called the attention of the railroads to the fact that they were, under the Constitution and laws of this State, common carriers and prohibited from making any discriminations in their charges for transportaton. I called upon them to discontinue the issuance of free passes to persons other than employes and those engaged in works of religion and charity, and advised them if such action was not taken I would institute suits to secure a judicial determination of the question. I did this because I knew that for every politician who rode on a railroad train free of charge that it was necessary for the railroad company to impose an additional burden upon those who paid for their transportation. And I believe with Theodore Roosevelt that the railroads of the country should be highways of commerce open to all alike and upon fair and equal terms. After some delay and some grumbling, every railroad company in the State informed me that it either had or would discontinue the issuance of free transportation. And there has been witnessed during the last year in this State, for the first time since railroads were constructed, four State Conventions of the two leading political parties to which, according to newspaper reports, no one came on a railroad pass who was not entitled to ride on one. Thus, there has been produced the successful result of reduced railroad transportation to all and special favors in railroad transportation to none. And the discontinuance of the issuance of fee transportation has resulted in a saving to the railroad companies of nearly $500,000 a year in State passenger earnings alone. The discontinuance of the railroad pass has also tended to a correction of the evils of bossism and corruption in politics and legislation. In bringing about this discontinuance of the issuance of free transportaton, I wish to freely acknowledge the credit that should be given men like Wells H. Blodgett, James L. Minnis, Gardiner Lathrop, James and Frank Hagerman, Samuel W. Moore, Sam B. West and a number of other attorneys of the railroad companies of the State who have actively co-operated with me in bringing about a correction of this long established evil.

OTHER RAILROAD CONTROVERSIES.

There is another condition in the railroad affairs of this State which I have believed to be in violation of our Constitution and laws, and which I have undertaken to correct by suits which have been finally submitted for decision in the Supreme Court of the State. For years the Missouri Pacific Railway Company has owned and conducted coal mines and elevators in this State as private business enterprises, and in company with the Wabash Railroad Company, has owned and operated the Pacific Express Company. But recently, the Missouri Pacific, together with the Iron Mountain, a subsidiary company, acquired a controlling interest in the stock of the Wabash Company, which is a parallel and competing line of the Missouri Pacific. As the Constitution prohibits the consolidation of parallel and competing lines, and as the laws provide that railroad companies shall furnish the same facilities to all express companies and confine their business solely to that of transportation, I believed that these conditions were unlawful and I instituted a suit to bring about their correction.

RAILROAD OPPOSITION TO MY CANDIDACY.

I am advised by men who pretend to know that on account of these controversies that I have conducted on behalf of the people of Missouri against the railroad companies of the State, that the railroad companies are opposing me and favoring Mr. Cowherd for governor. I do not know whether this statement is true or not, but I say here and now that if Mr. Cowherd, or any of his railroad friends, can show wherein I have ever done or tried to do a railroad company a single act of injustice, I will withdraw from the race and request the people of the State to vote for Mr. Cowherd. All that I have tried to compel the railroads of the State to do is that which each and every citizen of Missouri has to do—obey its laws. I do not want to see a railroad company deprived of a single cent to which it is legally entitled; I do not want to see any railroad company treated with injustice or unfairness. And if I am elected Governor of this State, I will as unhesitatingly veto a bill which treats a railroad with injustice as I would veto a bill which treats the people with injustice. Nor do I think that the railroads should be compelled to reduce their charges for transportation, unless it can be shown, or seems reasonably certain, that under the rates proposed they can make a fair return upon the value of their investment. But when the evidence exists which shows that their charges are too high and that they are levying an unfair tribute upon the people of Missouri, in such a case I will fight them until they treat you fairly.

OTHER MATTERS OF LITIGATION.

If time permitted me to do so, I should like to review other important and interesting matters of litigation which my office has conducted during the last four years. In the fight that was waged by the people of Missouri against race-track gambling, I took an active part at the request of Governor Folk, not only in the Supreme Court of Missouri, but also in the conduct of prosecutions in the Circuit Court of St. Louis County. And at my own instance I began a suit in the Supreme Court of the State to forfeit the charter of the Delmar Jockey Club which, protected by official and political influence, had long defied the laws of Missouri. This suit was bitterly contested by the ablest lawyers, through the Supreme Court of Missouri and the Supreme Court of the United States, and within the last six months, a decision was secured from the highest tribunal in our land ending the existence of that notorious, but once powerful, organization.

Another important matter of litigation that is deserving of mention, in view of the plank in the Democratic platform in reference to lawlessness in St. Louis County, are the prosecutions that have been conducted by Mr. Kennish and myself to suppress the lawless saloons and liquor clubs in that county. And by the use of the ordinary processes of the law in the courts of that county, these saloons and clubs which were conducted not only to the injury of the licensed saloon, but which were also the cause of frequent disturbances and lawlessness, have now been practically suppressed. At all events, the laws regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors, through the active efforts of my office, are as well enforced in St. Louis County today as they are in St. Louis and Kansas City, and it is a significant fact that every one of these saloons and lid clubs which furnishes the occasion for this plank in the Democratic platform, were open supporters of Mr. Cowherd for the nomination and are today actively supporting him for election. Further comment upon this situation would be superfluous.

In addition to the suit against the Delmar Jockey Club which I prosecuted against able counsel to a successful decision through the Supreme Court of Missouri and through the Supreme Court of the United States, I have also conducted through both of these courts the Barrington case and the Spaugh case, and a case which involved the constitutionality of the law limiting the hours of labor in underground mines to eight hours in each twenty-four. For my efforts to sustain the constitutionality of this law, which resulted in a unanimous decision from the Supreme Court of the United States, I received the thanks, not only of the Western Federation of Miners, but also of a number of associations of miners in the State of Missouri.

In addition to these matters of litigation, I participated during the last year, at the request of the State of Minnesota, in the argument of the most important question affecting our system and form of government which has been submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States in the last twenty-five years. That was the question as to whether it was the right of a public service corporation to enjoin in the United States Courts an officer of a state from enforcing a state law in its own courts. I assisted in this case at the request of the State of Minnesota, because the same question was involved in important litigation in which the State of Missouri was interested. It was my contention in that case that it was a violation of the Constitution of the United States and an infringement upon the sovereignty that belongs to the several States to deny to the officers of the State the right to prosecute in its own courts suits to determine the constitutionality of its own laws. Though this case was by a divided court decided adversely to this contention, it was some satisfaction to me, and some satisfaction, I believe, to the people of Missouri to know that this State took an active and an aggressive part in this important controversy which arose from the efforts of the people of the several States to regulate the charges of public service corporations.

And, yet, notwithstanding this record which I have but briefly and imperfectly reviewed for you, I understand that it is the contention of the Democratic orators that while I have endeavored to discharge the duties of my office with an honesty of purpose, I have failed in the accomplishment of results. And it was the statement of my distinguished opponent, Mr. Cowherd, that the office of Attorney General, under my management, had reached "its maximum of efficiency in advertising" and "its minimum of efficiency in results." I should be very much pleased if Mr. Cowherd would call to the attention of the people of Missouri that portion of his public record which, in his opinion, represents "the maximum of efficiency in results" and "the minimum of efficiency in advertising."

WHAT I CLAIM FOR MYSELF.

This is the record of service that I offer to the people of Missouri as a promise of the way I will endeavor to serve you if elected to the office of governor. I do not claim that I have done anything as Attorney General beyond my plain duty. I do not claim that I have accomplished all that I would like to have accomplished. I do claim that I have endeavored to do that which was best for the people of the State, and that I have accomplished something in the way of practical results. I do claim that today Missouri stands in the lead in that great nation-wide movement for honest business and the correction of the evils and abuses of our industrial and commercial systems, and that to Missouri not only do the States of the Union turn, but also the National Government for assistance and advice in the carrying forward of this great work of reform.

It is claimed by some of my political opponents that there are violations of law by corporations in this State that I have not brought suits to correct or punish. That may be true. There is a limit to what one man or one office can accomplish in three years and six months and then it is always easy to criticise. I have endeavored to do first what I considered most important. I have consistently refused to commence any suit in response to popular clamor for political effect, or in any case where I did not believe a useful public purpose would be subserved, in case the suit was successful. And I have tried to so conduct the affairs of my office that in so far as I could accomplish, and in so far as I could prevent, no man and no corporation, however strong and powerful, could feel that they were above the law, or that they could violate the law with impunity. And if I have succeeded in putting the fear of the law into the minds of men who never felt that fear before, then I can feel that my official efforts have not been in vain even though they do not satisfy the Democratic politicians.

CONCLUSION.

Just a word more and I am done. I have been told that there are men in this community who do not agree with me on questions of national politics, but who will vote for me for governor. I do not know that this is true. But if it is, I wish to say to those men that there is not a man upon the Republican State ticket who is not as worthy of your support as am I. And if you have sufficient confidence in me to vote for me, I ask you to have sufficient consideration for me to give me men as my associates in the State government who will work in harmony with me for the protection of the people's interests. And if you entrust to us the conduct of the affairs of this great State, we promise you here and now upon every consideration of party and personal honor that we will not enact useless laws to restrict the liberty of the citizen or to interfere with business affairs; but that we will enforce all its laws, without fear and without favor; that we will conduct the business of the State with economy and efficiency, and that we will, above all things, at all places and at all times, secure to every citizen, rich or poor, weak or strong, black or white, the right to cast one ballot and have it counted as cast. To the people of Missouri, irrespective of party, we submit this record of the past and this promise of the future, and await with confidence your verdict.