# Speech of Hon. Herbert S. Hadley

## Republican Nominee for Governor of Missouri

## At the Opening of the Campaign for 1908, at Springfield, Saturday, September 19

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Four years ago the people of Missouri gave their electoral vote to Theodore Roosevelt and elected the entire Republican State ticket, with the exception of Governor. It now becomes necessary for them to consider the administrations of those whom they elected four years ago and to decide whether they wish to continue the policies and principles of government which those administrations have sought to enforce.

### THE WORK OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Never before in the history of this country has one administration accomplished so much for the happiness and welfare of our people at home, and the honor and glory of our Nation abroad as has the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. The Republican party has reached its highest service under his leadership. His administration has at all times and under all circumstances stood for a brave and impartial enforcement of the law; it has accomplished the correction of evils and abuses in our industrial system by the prosecution of trusts and monopolies; it has raised the standard of our public service by the punishment of evil-doers; it has made our railroads highways of commerce, open to all alike on fair and equal terms, by securing a discontinuance of preferences, rebates and discriminations; it has rendered a most signal service to the laboring men of the country by the enactment of laws for the protection of their lives, the securing of their rights and the advancement of their welfare; and, by enforcing a proper arbitration and adjustment of differences, has brought about a closer relation of confidence and inter-dependence between labor and capital; it has inaugurated the movement for the improvement of the vast system of inland water-ways of the country and the conservation of our natural resources, and has wrested from private greed and corporate monopoly the control of the great natural wealth of the country; it has at all times stood firm and true against the abuses of wealth and the evils of privilege, favoritism and monopoly. Never before in the history of the world has one man so impressed the force of his personality and the force of his principles upon the life and thought of a great people as has this modern apostle and prophet of righteousness.

### TAFT, HIS LOGICAL SUCCESSOR.

And now that he has blazed the pathway along which we must travel, we need a leader who will continue his work because his heart is in the work; who will have the courage to be right when it is popular to be wrong; who is brave enough and strong enough to refuse to make terms with politicians, even to be President; who thinks before he talks and investigates before he acts; who sees all sides of a question before he makes a decision and who knows the difference between a principle and a precedent; a leader who knows the rights of labor and of capital, and the wrongs of each; who will add the conservatism and the experience of the judge to the experience and the aggressiveness of the executive; who realizes that our trade and commerce should be large, but who also realizes that our trade and commerce must be honest and lawful; who has shown that he can successfully direct the prosecution of the greatest public work of the century and negotiate with fairness and satisfaction treaties affecting the lives and happiness of millions of people; who knows, as no other man knows, the conditions and necessities of our dependent races, and who has a heart that feels for their deficiencies and their hopes. One, in fact, who is able and willing to successfully carry forward the great work and destiny of the Republican party. Such a man and such a leader we have in him who was the trusted friend of William McKinley and who is the logical successor of Theodore Roosevelt, our candidate for the Presidency, William H. Taft of Ohio.

The controlling question in this campaign in national politics is the one question as to whether the people will continue the principles and policies of Theodore Roosevelt; and William H. Taft stands before the American people today as the representative of those principles and policies.

### THE WORK OF REPUBLICAN STATE OFFICIALS.

In State affairs, we challenge the attention of the people of Missouri to the records that have been made by the Republican officials whom they elected four years ago. They have performed the duties of their respective offices in a vigorous, efficient and painstaking manner, and there has been no suspicion of scandal or claim of inefficiency in connection with the record of any of these officers. The Republican State officials who were elected four years ago, and who are candidates in this campaign have, during the last four years, served as members of the State Board of Equalization, which assesses the value for the purposes of taxation of the property of the public service corporations of the State. In the performance of that work they have increased the assessments from $131,142,152.57 in 1904, to $163,134,896.78 in 1908, thus adding to the revenues derived by the people of Missouri from the taxation of the public service corporations of the State nearly half a million dollars each year. And even with this increase of assessment, the property of the public service corporations is not assessed at a higher proportion of its value than is the property of private individuals. And, in addition to increasing the taxable wealth of the State in this amount, these officials, as members of the State Board of Equalization, have also corrected many manifest inequalities in the assessments of public service corporations which existed under Democratic rule as a result of political influences and campaign contributions.

### THE WORK OF WILLIAM W. WILDER

If time permitted, I should like to tell you something in detail as to what these officials have done in the performance of the duties of their respective offices. I should like to be able to give you a clear understanding of the exact, methodical and efficient manner in which these different offices have been conducted. I should like to make clear to you how your State Auditor, William W. Wilder, has saved for the schools of the State more than $45,000 in commissions on collateral inheritance tax collections by discarding unauthorized attorneys, appointed by Democratic Auditors, and by insisting upon the county officials in the various counties making those collections, as is provided by law. I should also like to explain to you, in detail, the care that he has taken in the examination and inspection of the various accounts submitted for his approval; the efficient manner in which he anticipated the receipts and disbursements of the State, and warned the last Legislature against its unwarranted extravagance. And it was only because his warning went unheeded that the State today is confronted with a deficiency of more than one and a quarter million of dollars of revenue as a result of the extravagant appropriations of the last Democratic General Assembly. And yet, notwithstanding this over-appropriation of funds, he has, by complying with the strict mandates of the Constitution, secured for the public schools, the penal and eleemosynary institutions of the State and the other necessary functions of government the funds necessary to carry on their various activities.

### THE RECORD OF THE STATE TREASURER.

The administration of the office of State Treasurer by Jacob F. Gmelich would also furnish a profitable subject for discussion for a much longer time than I am able to give it. He has, with a financial ability never before equalled in the discharge of the duties of this office, kept the funds of the State in the depositories as required by law and in three years and nine months of his term has collected as interest on balances for the benefit of the State $280,203.53, while his Democratic predecessors in twenty-seven years collected only $447,181.13. He has kept the books of his office in absolute harmony with the provisions of the law and has put into operation the highest possible efficiency in the conduct of its business.

### THE RECORD OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I should like to tell you much in detail as to the manner in which John E. Swanger has conducted the office of Secretary of State. How the routine duties of that office have been promptly and correctly performed to the complete satisfaction of every citizen. But what is more important, Mr. Swanger has made the banking laws of the State mean something to the people. And so long as he is in charge of the laws providing for the examination and inspection of our State banks, it will not be necessary to enact a law providing for the guarantee of deposits, compelling the honest and capable banker to be responsible for the dishonest and incapable one. While he has been careful and conservative in declining to take any action which would unjustly injure the credit of any men or banking institution, he has been fearless and courageous in the performance of his official duties when occasion required action on his part. And further, he and his examiners have not given a clean bill of health to any insolvent bank because it was owned by a man of political influence, and he has consistently refused to accept general reputation as satisfactory proof of solvency. In addition, he has compelled corporations which had long been transacting business in Missouri without license, to comply with the laws of our State, and has thereby turned into the general revenue fund many thousands of dollors to which the State was legally entitled; he has increased the receipts of his office without increasing its expenditures, and has in all particulars performed the duties of his office with economy and impartiality.

### MY OWN OFFICE.

I should like to tell you, if I had the time in which to do so, of that work of my own office of which you have never read in the newspapers; of the work that is done in the office and the library in attending to the ordinary, every-day routine duties of the office which results in the proper enforcement of the law, the prevention of abuses or the necessity for reform. It is this work, and not the work of my office, which has attracted public attention, in which I take the most satisfaction, for it is a careful attention to the performance of the details of official duty that insures the best safeguard of an honest government and an impartial enforcement of the law.

In addition to the work of those State officers elected four years ago, we point with satisfaction and pride to the honest and efficient services that have been rendered by the other officers elected at that time: Albert D. Nortoul of the St. Louis Court of Appeals, J. D. Johnson of the Kansas City Court of Appeals, Henry Lamm of the Supreme Court of the State, Frank Wightman of the Board of Railroad and Warehouse Commissioners, John C. McKinley, our Lieutenant-Governor, and also do we call the attention of the people to the high rank that has been secured for Missouri in the National Congress by our Representative elected in 1904 and 1906, and by our Senator, William Warner.

### THE REAL ISSUE.

But, notwithstanding the satisfactory and efficient records that have been made by these officials during the last four years, the people of Missouri are asked in this campaign to restore the conduct of State affairs to that faction of the Democratic party which was driven from power in 1904. Even if there was but little in the records of the Republican State officials elected four years ago to deserve your confidence and approval, there is every reason and consideration of good citizenship why you should not restore to power that faction which is now in control of the Democratic party. From 1873 to 1904, the Democratic party was in unquestioned control of the offices of this State, and for twelve or fourteen years prior to 1904 the Democratic party was under the control of a certain crowd of politicians who were pleased to refer to themselves as the "Old Guard," but whom Governor Folk and his friends, with perhaps equal appropriateness, are pleased to call the "Old Gang." And what was the result of this thirty-one years of uninterrupted rule, and more particularly of that period of political supremacy during which the "Old Guard" was in the full bloom and blossom of its glory and its power? I do not want in this campaign to be partisan or unfair, and that which I will say should appeal with equal force to the good citizens of all parties. Therefore, I prefer to quote to you the statements of your present Democratic Governor as to the evils and abuses that existed under the rule of the "Old Guard," and for which that organization is directly responsible.

### GOVERNOR FOLK'S CHARGES AGAINST THE "OLD GUARD."

According to his repeated public statements and many of his supporters, the "Old Guard," while in charge of State affairs, used the police departments and election boards of the large cities as political machines to eliminate the element of chance from elections; they so prostituted the ballot to corrupt political purposes that elections in the large cities no longer expressed the free will of a free people; the police departments had under their management become both inefficient and corrupt, and those men who were sworn to enforce the law became violators of it; those men whose duty it was to protect life and property, protected neither life nor property; those men whose duty it was to prevent crimes against the ballot committed crimes against the ballot; those men whose duty it was to suppress and regulate vice became partners in vice and levied tribute upon its devotees. This condition of corruption in the elections and in the enforcement of the laws in the large cities was equalled, if not surpassed, according to the charges of Governor Folk and his supporters, in the corruption which existed in State affairs, for he further charged that for years the "bribe-giver and the bribe-taker had stalked through legislative halls and gone unwhipped of justice"; that legislation was bought and sold for favored corporations; that legislation in the interest of the people was defeated by the lobbyists and the bribe-givers of protected corporations; in fact, it was the charge of Governor Folk that the State government had been so conducted by the men in control of the Democratic party that the "restoration of the principles of common honesty had become the paramount issue in Missouri politics." How completely true were these charges can be read in the confessions of John A. Lee, the records of legislative investigations, the records of the boodle trials for legislative and municipal corruption, and the records of the grand jury and police investigations at Kansas City and St. Louis.

### PRESENT DEMOCRATIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS RECORD.

Now, in this contest, I say again that I do not want to be partisan, and I also want to be entirely fair. I want to do no man, and no party, an injustice. I do not mean to charge upon the rank and file of the Democratic party the responsibility for this disgraceful condition of police, legislative and executive corruption which existed prior to 1904. A political party is to be charged with responsibility for such a condition of affairs in its past record only as it endorses that record or seeks to place again in power the men under whose management and control such conditions were allowed to arise and continue. Now, upon that point, what are the facts? The last Democratic Convention, of which the present State candidates were members, gave to the administrations of Stone, Stephens and Dockery the very same endorsement that it gave to the administration of Joseph W. Folk. Name me a member of the "Old Guard" who was active in the affairs of the Democratic party for the twelve or fourteen years prior to 1904 who was not active in this campaign for the nomination of William S. Cowherd. Go to St. Louis and see there in the primary election returns as expression of "Old Guard" methods, evidences that the "Old Guard" has lost neither its cunning nor its power. Let me read to you the testimony of Ed Butler, convicted by Governor Folk of boodling and sentenced to five years in the State penitentiary, but saved by a technical decision of the Supreme Court:

"The only man I come out for before the election," said Butler, "was Cowherd for Governor. I wouldn't be surprised if my support made Cowherd ten thousand votes in St. Louis and five thousand outside the city."

"Then you came pretty near nominating Cowherd," the interviewer suggested.

"I am not saying that," was the cautious reply.

"My friends won, but that don't prove that I am back in politics; I don't have to be. I have friends all over town and they know me well enough to know what I want. If I had to tell them every time I wouldn't consider them worth much as friends."

"Whom will your friends support for Senator?" the reporter asked.

"Stone will win," was the answer, "even the preachers are getting on to Folk. His lid has made more drunkenness in St Louis of a Sunday than was ever seen before. Folk won't come within thirty thousand votes of Stone. For myself," continued Butler, "I gave the most attention to the candidates for Circuit Judge. I voted for Bass, Barrett and Werner. I didn't care to vote for Dillon, he goes to church too much."

Do you want that kind of a man to nominate your candidate for Governor? Do you want your Governor under obligations to that kind of a man for his nomination?

Now let me read to you the testimony of Lawler P. Daly, the Chairman of the Democratic City Central Committee in St. Louis, as to the part that money played in securing for Mr. Cowherd his nomination:

"Each ward committeeman who favored Cowherd," said Daly, "was given one thousand dollars for ward expenses." (There are twenty-eight wards in St. Louis.) "In addition to that sum," said Daly, "the committeemen were augured with individual contributions. For example, in one ward the committeeman, whose name I will not mention, was allowed one thousand dollars for campaign expenditures, and also an equal amount for his own personal use. At least $35,000 was employed by the Cowherd managers to carry St. Louis. These are facts. It is true that I was for Dave Ball for Governor, and induced my friends in the Twenty-second Ward to vote for him. Now there is no use asking me who gave this money or who collected it, because the fight is over and I am not yelling."

"How much were you and your associates on the Democratic City Committee offered to support Mr. Cowherd?" Daly was asked.

"Oh, I don't know," he replied, "the amount was so much that perhaps the public would not believe it. Things didn't go just right to suit me, but that is no reason why I should have a grievance. If I was Colonel Ball, I would go home and take a rest. It might be all right to contest the primary, but if I were Colonel Ball I wouldn't do it. The cards have been played and there is nothing for him to do but take his medicine. But they tell me that in Kansas City one ward which had registered 350 gave Cowherd a majority of 1,500. If that is true, it beats our Indian methods all hollow. I am not squealing; in fact, I am perfectly satisfied with things as they have happened. But what could any leader do when he run up against that $35,000 slush fund? The ward committeemen won't deny that they got theirs. In one ward the committeeman was paid $1,200 for campaign expenses; besides that sum, he was allowed $500 for individual expenses. I refused to take a cent. Ball was a poor man and there was nobody back of him who gave a dollar, so far as I know. There was no deal on the State ticket; it was a straight out fight and the cash won."

Now let me read you some of these election returns themselves in Kansas City and St. Louis, in order that you may see what a wonderful system it is that has been invented in Kansas City and St. Louis for the purpose of nominating and electing for the people their public officials:

In the Third Ward of St. Louis, Mr. Cowherd was credited with 1,542 votes and Mr. Ball with 31. In 1906, upon the same registration at the general election, Judge Woodson, who polled the highest vote upon the Democratic State ticket, received only 1,179 votes. A canvass of this ward by the police department, under the direction of Governor Folk, showed that not more than 15 per cent of those who were recorded as having voted for Mr. Cowherd really voted for him. Practically the same vote was returned for the other candidates upon the machine ticket as was returned for Mr. Cowherd. The St. Louis "Republic," the State Democratic organ, on Friday, August 7, 1908, says, in speaking of this vote:

"The vote of 1,542 for Cowherd and 31 for Ball in and of itself is not incredible. But when we pass to the office of Lieutenant-Governor, we find the same disparity. Here were 1,552 votes for Mr. Painter of Carroll County, and 15 for Kelley, the blind lawyer of St. Louis. Then we have 1,547 for Roach of Jasper County and 45 for McGrath of St. Louis for the office of Secretary of State. A sorry showing this for the Kellys and the McGraths in a ward dominated by a Miles. And so, going through the list, we have 1,540 for Gordon as Auditor, 1,544 for Winters as Railroad Commissioner, 1,555 for Graves as Supreme Judge, 1,531 for Bryan as Judge of the Court of Appeals, 1,559 for Walsh as Circuit Attorney, 1,552 for Morrissey as Sheriff, 1,546 for Overall as Public Administrator, and 1,532 for Parker as Coroner. Here are eleven different offices, selection for which was to be made among seventy or more candidates on essentially personal grounds, and out of about 1,580 votes there were 1,531 who agreed as to the entire eleven. How does the Third Ward manage to get itself into such a state of unanimity as to so many candidates for so many offices? It is not the work of the candidates themselves, for some of them, we venture to say, were never in the ward and never saw or spoke to a voter of the ward."

Continuing, the same paper, on the same day, says editorially:

"It is entirely natural that Ball and other candidates who were not so fortunate as to be put on the slate which was railroaded through the Third, Sixteenth and probably other wards of St. Louis, should feel eager desire to get back of the extraordinary returns received from these wards. When more than fifteen-sixteenths of the voters who vote the Democratic ticket in a big city ward vote solidly for the same slate, picking exactly the same ten names from a list of more than seventy, we face a political phenomenon that calls imperatively for investigation. No wonder that the candidates who were crushed beneath this marvelous ward roller should want to know a good deal more about it. They are justified in making inquiry about the man or men who managed the roller and the methods adopted to guide it to so singularly perfect an accomplishment. There are many pertinent queries that may be asked. How was the selection of the Third Ward slate influenced? What inducements got the candidate's name on the list of favorites? How were individual voters brought under such disciplined control? When did they get the training that enabled them to vote with such mechanical exactness? Perhaps it is well to remember that the criminal provisions of the general election laws apply to primary elections as well. Contests are not provided for, but frauds are punishable."

It has further been developed by the police investigation of the vote in St. Louis, conducted under the direction of Governor Folk, that votes were counted for Mr. Cowherd which were cast for Mr. Ball, Mr. Stapel and Mr. Wallace, and seeing that I had no opponent and did not need them, they counted votes for Mr. Cowherd that were cast for me. Votes were counted for Mr. Cowherd that were even cast for Mr. Garver, the Socialist candidate. Many votes were counted twice and three times for Mr. Cowherd. Voters were recorded as voting for him who were out of the State; who had moved to other precincts; who had not voted at all, and voters were counted for Mr. Cowherd who had been long since dead. Voters were recorded as voting for Mr. Cowherd in alphabetical order, all the A's before all the B's, and so on throughout the alphabet. The same conditions as disclosed in the Third Ward have been disclosed in the case of other wards, where the vote has been investigated. And yet, in the face of these facts, developed by an investigation conducted by Democratic officials under the direction of a Democratic Governor, Mr. Cowherd and the Democratic State platform say "that IF frauds were committed in the City of St. Louis," etc.

In order that you may understand something more as to the result of Butler methods, and the use of $35,000 in the primary election, let me read you the testimony of one of the judges of election as to the manner in which the voting was done:

Two days after the primary, M. M. Reynolds, of 217 North Ninth street, St. Louis, who was acting as a judge in the Fourth Ward, Seventh Precinct, the polling place for which is located at 817 North Tenth street, said:

"Shortly before seven o'clock Tuesday morning, a crowd of about fifteen men came into the room and asked for ballots, giving the name of a man I knew to be dead, as well as my own name and those of other persons I knew. I requested the police to arrest them, charging that they were repeaters; but they ignored my requests. They left the place then, but returned before four o'clock, when I gave orders that only four should be admitted at a time. These orders also were ignored by the police. When I renewed my protests, the crowd, with concerted action, jumped on me and beat and kicked me, knocking me on one of the tables. Ten minutes later I left the place to telephone for some more police protection, but when about one hundred and twenty-five feet away from the place, the same crowd came up behind me and renewed their attacks. After going home to apply remedies to my injuries, I came back, and under additional police protection, served throughout the remainder of the day."

It should be said, in fairness to Governor Folk and his Board of Police Commissioners, that the police who permitted this assault have been discharged from the department.

In this primary election, according to the returns received from the judges and clerks, David A. Ball carried eighty of the 114 counties of the State and Mr. Cowherd carried 31. In that part of Missouri outside of Kansas City and St. Louis, Mr. Ball had 12,000 more votes than Mr. Cowherd, but in Kansas City and St. Louis, according to the election returns, Mr. Cowherd was credited with approximately 24,000 more votes than was Mr. Ball. In the entire State Mr. Cowherd was credited with 96,691; David A. Ball with 84,317; William H. Wallace with 47,595 and Henry F. Stapel with 17,214. 53,345 more votes were cast against Mr. Cowherd than were credited in his favor. So, even upon the face of the returns themselves, Mr. Cowherd is the minority nominee of the Democratic party. Not only is Mr. Cowherd the minority candidate upon the face of the returns, but is there a man of sense in the State of Missouri who believes that Mr. Cowherd would be the nominee of the Democratic party today if only honest votes had been counted in his favor?

Let me read you upon that question the testimony of William W. Wallace, Judge of the Criminal Court of Jackson County, for whom over 48,000 Democrats got their votes counted in the last primary election. Judge Wallace says:

"I do not accept the election returns of the recent primary as a correct verdict. I do not accept it because there were between five and six thousand votes cast for me in Kansas City that were never counted. There were votes counted that were never cast. Because the returns indicated my defeat, it does not mean that my stand for the enforcement of the law was repudiated. In Kansas City there have been vile elections, crooked elections, wicked elections, thieving elections, and monstrous elections. There is a great deal of talk about corrupt elections in St. Louis. We have crooks in Kansas City who can teach those in St. Louis things about stealing elections that they never heard of."

Now let me read to you the testimony of David A. Ball of Pike County, former State Senator and Lieutenant-Governor of your State, as to how he was robbed of the nomination for the benefit of Mr. Cowherd:

### MR. BALL'S EVIDENCE.

Two days after the primary, Mr. Ball said:

"I am convinced that I was sold out in Kansas City and St. Louis. I am led to believe that wholesale frauds were committed in those cities, and if I can fix the responsibility for these methods, I am going to do it."

Five days after the election, Mr. Ball said:

"My object is not to contest the election, but to secure the punishment of the men who stole the election."

On the next day he said:

"All I want is to send to the penitentiary the crooks who robbed me of a well earned nomination."

In Jefferson City, on September 7th, after all the disclosures as the result of the police canvass and the grand jury investigation, and after he had time for examination and reflection, Mr. Ball said:

"You can say for me that I would rather put in jail the thieves who robbed me, no, I will not say me—who robbed the Democrats of the State—of the nomination for Governor, than to be Governor of this State, and I am going to do that very thing, too, if it takes all the rest of my days. I know," continued Mr. Ball, "that I was honestly nominated at the Democratic primary. We have already indicted twenty-five judges and clerks who stole that primary. When the trail leads into the upper tendom, I am going to take a direct hand in the game myself. Say this, further, in your paper," added the man who thousands of Democrats in Missouri believe today should be their candidate for Governor, "say for me that I have positive information that relatively the frauds against me were as great and as flagrant in Kansas City as in St. Louis, and I am going to get at the bottom of them, too. A man who was in those boxes," Mr. Ball added, "would, of course, not like to have them opened, but the Democrats of Missouri believe, as I believe, that thieves who steal honest men's votes ought to be prosecuted and put in the penitentiary, and that is what I am going to see done if there is law and justice in Missouri."

Following the primary election, George Creel, coal oil inspector in Kansas City, by appointment of Governor Folk, charged in his paper, "The Independent," that frauds had been committed in the primaries, and published an offer of $5.00 apiece for 175 men who were recorded as voting in the Second Ward, if Jim Pendergast, Mr. Cowherd's North End representative, would produce all or any one of them. Up to the present writing, no part of this offer has been accepted, and yet Mr. Cowherd, in his opening speech at Sedalia, stated that I would be rebuked for slandering the people of Kansas City because I had charged that there was dishonesty in the primary election there. I have only repeated the charges made by William H. Wallace, David A. Ball and the representative of Governor Folk. So if I am to be rebuked, let it be for that for which I am really guilty, namely, repeating the charges of these well known leaders of democracy.

### A RECEIVER OF STOLEN NOMINATION.

Consider all of this evidence, honest citizen, whatever may be your politics; consider the vote itself in these two cities; consider the testimony of Ed Butler and of Lawler Daly, Democratic machine politicians; consider the testimony of William H. Wallace and David A. Ball, high-minded, honest Democrats, and then answer in your own conscience as to whether Judge Wallace and Dave Ball are right when they claim that money, fraud and violence, typical "Old Gang" methods, have foisted upon the Democratic party the candidacy of William S. Cowherd. If it is true, as charged by David A. Ball, that he was robbed of the nomination, the beneficiary of that robbery was Mr. Cowherd, who thus stands before the people of Missouri in this campaign charged by his principal opponent with being the receiver of a stolen nomination. Do you wish to give to such methods the approval of your vote? Do you wish to endorse a candidacy made successful by such crimes against the ballot? And although Mr. Ball and Judge Wallace may not openly oppose the election of Mr. Cowherd, they never have, and they never will, so long as they retain their own respect and their respect for the truth, tell the people of Missouri that Mr. Cowherd was the honestly nominated candidate of the Democratic party.

### WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

Now what is the significance of these crimes against the ballot and this lavish use of money to nominate Mr. Cowherd and to defeat Mr. Ball? Why is it that the representatives of special interests in the City of St. Louis would subscribe $35,000 to defeat Mr. Ball and to nominate Mr. Cowherd? Both of these men profess to believe in William J. Bryan and his principles, and to favor the same general theories of government. Then, why was one worth $35,000 more to these men than the other? Why was it that men would commit crimes against the ballot, rivaling those which were committed under the rule of the "Old Guard," to nominate one Democrat and to defeat another? Both Ball and Cowherd had declared in public speeches for the enforcement of law and for honest elections, and yet men were willing to commit crimes and to place themselves within the very shadow of the penitentiary to nominate one and to defeat the other. What private assurances had these men received that in case of Mr. Cowherd's election no harm would come to them and that all would be well? These are questions which each voter in Missouri must answer for himself when he casts his ballot on the 3rd of next November.

### RALLY 'ROUND THE FLAG.

In the early part of this campaign, Mr. Cowherd made some speeches that he has since tried hard to forget and tried harder still to have the Democrats of the State forget. He charged, in substance, that the Democratic party in Missouri had gone off after false gods and had taken up with newfangled ideas, and he called upon the Democrats of the State to "rally 'round the flag" with him. When Mr. Whitecotton, Dave Ball, Judge Evans and Judge Wallace promptly asked Mr. Cowherd what flag he meant, he suddenly abandoned that battle-cry and shibboleth of victory. The flag, however, which Mr. Cowherd asked the Democrats to rally 'round was known then and is better known now. It was the flag of the "Old Guard." It was the flag that Mr. Folk and his supporters drove from power in the Democratic party in 1904, and the flag that the people of the State drove from the State capitol in that election.

### DO YOU WANT TO GO BACK?

So, today, the issue is clear: Do you want to go back? Do you want to go back to the conditions that existed in 1904? Do you want to go back to padded registration lists, stuffed ballot boxes and forged election returns? Do you want to go back to police corruption in the great cities and have the protectors of lives and property partners with those who practice vice and commit crime? Do you want to go back to the sale of legislation to the highest bidder; to assessments purchased by campaign contributions; to the wholesale bribery of public officials; to the time when the bribe-giver and the bribe-taker will again "stalk through legislative halls and go unwhipped of justice"; to a condition in which the "restoration of the principles of common honesty will again become the paramount issue in Missouri politics?" If you do, you can rally 'round that flag with Mr. Cowherd and those who stole his nomination for him in St. Louis and Kansas City.

### IN FAIRNESS TO MR. COWHERD.

Now there may be those who may think that I am unfair to Mr. Cowherd, who will claim that he is a man of personal integrity and legal ability, who would not himself participate in anything dishonest or corrupt. I do not want to do Mr. Cowherd even an apparent injustice. I freely admit both his personal integrity and his legal ability and join with him in the expression of the hope that our political controversies will not affect the pleasant personal relations that have existed between us for years. But is there one among you who will say that aught of personal integrity can be claimed for Mr. Cowherd which could not with equal force and fairness be claimed for Alexander M. Dockery? Is there one among you who can fairly claim for Mr. Cowherd the experience in state affairs of Lon V. Stephens? And yet, under the administrations of these two men police corruption, election frauds, sale of legislation and bribery in legislative affairs, reached the very heyday of its rule. The experience of Lon V. Stephens did not prevent the purchase of a law from the legislature for the consolidation of the street railway systems in St. Louis, and the other crimes which were exposed in the Cardwell case. The personal integrity of Alexander Dockery did not prevent the scandal of the alum deal, the crimes confessed by John A. Lee, and police corruption and election frauds in Kansas City and St. Louis. If there is aught in the public service of Mr. Cowherd during the fourteen years that he drew an official salary that would give to the people of Missouri reason to believe that Mr. Cowherd would prevent a return to the conditions that Stone, Stephens and Dockery could neither prevent nor correct, I will be very glad indeed if that evidence can be submitted to the people of Missouri.

### CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

There is another question that I should be glad to have Mr. Cowherd and his friends enlighten the people of Missouri about. Mr. Cowherd is in this campaign loud in his praise of William J. Bryan and the national Democratic platform. But up to the present time, I have failed to note wherein he has mentioned that plank of the Democratic platform which declares in favor of the publicity of campaign contributions, and a careful reading of the Democratic state platform, in the preparation of which Mr. Cowherd actively participated, fails to disclose any mention of this interesting subject. I should like to know where Mr. Cowherd stands upon this question. Is he in favor of the publicity of campaign contributions in the Nation alone, and not in the State? Is he in favor of the publicity of campaign contributions at an election and not in favor of those which are used to secure a nomination? If he is in favor of the publicity of all campaign contributions, I suggest that he make public the names of the men who subscribed the $35,000 which Lawler P. Daly, the Chairman of the Democratic City Central Committee of St. Louis, says he knows was used in Mr. Cowherd's interest in the City of St. Louis. I do not ask Mr. Cowherd to make public all the money that was raised and used in his favor throughout the State. I only ask that he secure the publication of the contributions made for him in St. Louis, and the manner in which those contributions were expended. Let him tell the people how much was subscribed by the representatives of public service corporations. Let him tell you how much was subscribed by those saloons and liquor interests which have violated the law in the past and hope, in case of his election, to violate the law in the future. Let him tell you how much those men who were in control in St. Louis during the period of police and election corruption gave to bring about his nomination. If Mr. Cowherd is not himself in possession of this information, I ask him to call upon his managers in St. Louis to make this information public. When, and only when, Mr. Cowherd secures the publication of these facts will he convince the people that he is sincere in his support of the candidate and the platform of the national democracy.

### HOME RULE AND SUNDAY CLOSING.

In order that I may not be subject to the criticism of asking questions while answering none, I wish to deal briefly with some of the propositions that were discussed by Mr. Cowherd in his opening speech at Sedalia. Mr. Cowherd charged in that speech that the home rule plank in the Republican platform was put there to counteract the declaration in favor of the enforcement of the laws regulating dramshops, and he calls upon me "to repudiate the home rule plank, or admit to the people that I do not propose to enforce the law as to the closing of saloons on Sunday."

In answer to this challenge, I inform Mr. Cowherd that I will not repudiate the principle of home rule for which my party has consistently stood for the last sixteen years, and that I will not repudiate the principle of the enforcement of the law for which it has consistently stood since its birth. The Republican platform declares in favor of enforcing all laws regulating dramshops, including the closing of saloons on Sunday. And if I am elected Governor I will make this plank of the platform mean exactly what it says.

But let us see what is the real significance of Mr. Cowherd's statement. He charges, in effect, that the people of the cities of the State would, if permitted to elect their own police and excise officials, choose those who would violate their oath of office by not enforcing the laws of the State. I deny the truth of this statement, and I resent the slander in the name of the people of those cities. What right has any one man, and particularly Mr. Cowherd, to claim that he can better select the officials to enforce the laws in the great cities than can the people themselves? What capacity has he shown for selecting honest and capable men for office that should cause him to arrogate to himself this important power and privilege? His record as Mayor of Kansas City, the only executive office he has ever held, certainly does not warrant such an assumption. For, as Mayor of Kansas City, he appointed a North End saloonkeeper, the Republican boss of the Second Ward, as Superintendent of Streets, one of the most important positions in the city government. And a few months after the expiration of Mr. Cowherd's term of office, he was called upon to defend his Superintendent of Streets upon the charge of ballot box stuffing. And a number of other appointees in Mr. Cowherd's administration participated in the election frauds that occurred in Kansas City at that time, which have never been equalled in the history of election crimes in the State of Missouri. With such a record in the selection of public officials, is it not a little presumptuous in Mr. Cowherd to claim that he can better select the police, and election boards, for the people of the great cities of the State than can the people of those cities themselves? But let us examine the Democratic record upon this question of home rule, and see what it discloses. But four years ago the Democratic platform declared:

"We favor the right of the people of each locality to select their own officials."

And Governor Folk, in his inaugural address, unqualifiedly endorsed that principle when he said:

"I believe that the people can be trusted to govern themselves and that if the large cities are given the privilege of selecting their own officials, the people there will give attention to the political affairs. If it be wrong to give local self-government in the selection of local officials to any part of the State, then it would seem that the entire theory of our government is wrong. If the people of those cities do not take enough interest in public affairs to secure good government for themselves, then they ought not to expect to secure it from the outside. Local self-government would compel them, in self-protection, to attend to the public business, which is their own business, after all."