

an elaborate argument in favor of the injunction, but he does not meet the issue involved. The purpose of government by injunction is to enable the corporate employer to deny the laboring man trial by jury. The secretary says that trial by jury is not guaranteed in equity proceedings, but that is the very thing for which the constitution of Oklahoma provides. It is true that in other states and in the United States courts the judges have sometimes used the equity side of the court in order to deprive the laboring man of his constitutional guarantees. According to the criminal law, a laboring man is liable to punishment if he destroys property; according to the common law, he is liable to damages if he injures property, but the corporations have fallen into the habit of depriving the laboring man of the protection thrown about him when charged with a crime, or when prosecuted under the common law, and it is to restore to him the protection of trial by jury that this provision of the constitution was inserted, and I submit that, as long as a convicted criminal, when charged with another crime, is entitled to a trial by jury, a laboring man ought not be denied a trial by jury when he has never been convicted of a crime. Before leaving this subject I may add that the president in his last message referred to the abuses that have grown up in the use of the writ of injunction, and suggested that it would be necessary to take some action to restrain the use of the writ if the abuses continue. It is to be regretted that these abuses have not impressed Secretary Taft as they have the president, for he sees nothing but good in the writ. Additional proof of his prejudice against the laboring man is found in his objection to the provision compelling corporations to consent to arbitration.

The secretary complains that the railway commission can fine a railroad for disobeying an order and that trial by jury is not provided in such a case. I think I can guarantee that a democratic legislature will provide for trial by jury in such cases, if the railroads want it, but trial by jury is the one thing that the railroads do not want.

Another objection upon which Secretary Taft places great stress is that the state has been so districted that the republicans might have a majority of 30,000 in the state without electing the legislature. I do not know how accurate the secretary's statement is, but I know that there is scarcely a state of the size of Oklahoma in which it might not be possible for one party to carry the state by 30,000 and the other party control the legislature. I know that in the republican states of Connecticut and Rhode Island it is practically impossible for the democrats to elect the legislature even though they have a large majority in the state. In Rhode Island, for instance, we have elected the governor several times within recent years but can not get the legislature, the reason being that their legislative districts are arranged on the basis of area rather than population. Little towns of a few hundred population elect as many representatives as great cities with many thousands of population. The legislative districts of Connecticut and Rhode Island are far more unfair than the legislative districts of Oklahoma, and yet Secretary Taft has not raised his voice in favor of justice in these republican states. The congressional districts of Ohio are more unfair than the legislative districts of Oklahoma, and the districts from which the delegates to the constitutional convention were elected in Oklahoma were more unfair and partisan than the legislative districts. Unfairness in districting a state can not be defended, no matter what party is guilty of it, but it is inconsistent in Secretary Taft to make the objection in Oklahoma when he does not make it in other states and when he did not make objection to the partisan districting that preceded the constitutional election. As a matter of fact, the constitution compels justice in districting when the population is ascertained.

I can not speak as to your school taxation, but I am sure that your people are so much interested in the education of their children that they will correct any mistake that the convention has made. It is not necessary that statehood should be delayed in order to secure educational facilities, for these can be easily provided by an amendment to the constitution, if the constitution does not already make adequate provision.

But Secretary Taft says that, if you insist on having statehood and are determined to adopt the constitution, you ought to have a republican government to amend the constitution. He certainly has forgotten the argument he made in Ohio recently, that the tariff ought to

be reformed by its friends. If he applies his logic to this constitution, he ought to insist that the constitution should be reformed by its friends, rather than by its enemies, and surely there is little to induce confidence in the republican party when that party has delayed statehood for so many years, and delayed it for purely partisan reasons. The republican party to secure partisan advantage admitted several western states that were not nearly so well fitted for statehood as Oklahoma, but your people have long suffered the disadvantages of a territorial government merely because they did not approve of the policies of the republican party. Now they are asked to reward the republican party for the punishment it has inflicted upon them. But if this argument appeals to republicans who oppose the constitution, the democrats and the many republicans who favor the constitution will find in the president's speech additional reasons for supporting the democratic ticket and thus rewarding the party which has submitted a constitution so good that even the republican convention of Oklahoma did not dare to express disapproval of it. The secretary has shown a good deal of boldness in asking you to repudiate a constitution that a republican convention was not willing to condemn.

The secretary, after picking out everything that seemed objectionable and ignoring every provision of the constitution that seemed good, proceeded to make an argument in favor of republican policies in the nation. He asked you to cast your lot with the republican party rather than with the democratic party. If he had been frank with you, he would have told you that the only popularity the republican party has is due to its adoption of a part of the democratic platform. But if he told you that, you would have replied that it was better to join the democratic party and lead a reform than to join the republican party and follow hesitatingly after the democratic party has pointed out the way.

He appeals to you to stand by protection, although he did not enter into any argument on the subject. Have you read his Columbus speech? If so you will find in it an arraignment of protection as we have it today—an appeal for a revision of the tariff, but he paralyzes the force of his own speech by postponing the tariff reform until after the election. Tariff reform is never undertaken by the republicans just after a republican victory because the victory is taken as an endorsement of the policy, and is never undertaken before an election for fear it will interfere with another republican victory. The people of Oklahoma have no interest in the maintenance of a purely protective system, for they sell in the open markets of the world and buy in the restricted markets of America. The cotton raised in Oklahoma sells for the same whether it is made up into cloth in the United States or in Europe, for the foreign price fixes the price here, and the same may be said of the wheat, the corn and the cattle produced by the farmers of Oklahoma. And yet, when the farmers attempt to invest their income in the things which they need, they not only find prices increased by the protective tariff but still further increased by the combinations which manufacturers have formed to take advantage of the tariff. The farmers of Oklahoma will find little consolation in the fact that, while American manufactures sell abroad cheaper than at home, republican leaders like Secretary Taft are insisting that no reform shall be attempted except through the republican party and with the consent of the tariff barons themselves.

Secretary Taft did not discuss the trust question; he wisely avoided it because he favors taking a backward step on that question.

Secretary Taft also made a plea in favor of imperialism. Well, the people of Oklahoma have had enough experience with carpet-bag government to know something about a colonial policy. If officers appointed by the federal government are so unsatisfactory, what must be the feeling of the Filipinos against officials of another race sent across the ocean to administer a government? I am glad that Secretary Taft has referred to the Philippine question, for his discussion shows that he believes in a colonial policy and that he disputes the doctrines set forth in the Declaration of Independence. While he himself seems disposed to acquiesce in the suffrage amendments adopted in the south, he overlooks the fact that the black man of the south is treated much better than the brown man of the Philippines. The black man of the south has the protection of the constitutions, state and national, while the constitution is denied to the Filipino. The black man of the

south has also the protection of living under laws which the white man makes for himself, while the Filipino lives under laws which the white man makes for the Filipino, laws under which the white man would not himself be willing to live.

Then, too, the secretary confuses two questions that are entirely distinct. The question in the south is not whether the black man is capable of self government; it is whether he is capable of conducting a government under which the white man as well as the black man must live; in other words, whether he is capable of governing the white man; while the question in the Philippines is whether the brown man is capable of governing himself. For the white man of the south to insist, as a matter of self-preservation, on administering the government under which both he and the black man must live is one thing; for the white man to cross the Pacific ocean and fasten a government on an alien people is entirely another proposition, and the secretary is confused on fundamental principles if he can not see the distinction. Imperialism costs us more than one hundred millions a year, weakens us by exposing us to foreign attack and lays us open to the suspicion of having abandoned the idea of self government.

I am glad that you have had the benefit of Secretary Taft's advice, for if anything was needed to convince the voters of Oklahoma that the constitution is a good one, the proof has been furnished by the fact that Secretary Taft's criticisms have been aimed at the very parts which protect the people against predatory wealth, and the people of Oklahoma ought to show their appreciation of the splendid constitution submitted to them by giving an overwhelming endorsement to Mr. Haskell and his colleagues upon the ticket. Mr. Haskell and several of the other state candidates played an important part in the shaping of the constitution, and the party which has placed them in nomination can claim the credit of inaugurating a government, republican in form, democratic in spirit and in harmony with the sentiments of the people.

Speaking of the democratic candidates in Oklahoma Mr. Bryan said:

"I find an especial pleasure in saying a word in behalf of Mr. Haskell, your candidate for governor. He was a friend in the days when I needed friends. Two years before the Chicago convention he was chairman of the committee on resolutions in his congressional district and voted for the adoption of the money plank that afterward presented the paramount issue of the campaign of 1896, and when I was a candidate in 1896, his county, largely through his efforts, gave me 2,600 majority. That being one of the strongholds of the democratic party the gold democrats sought to divide our vote by selecting two electors for the gold ticket from that county. But they succeeded in securing only eleven votes in the whole county for the Palmer and Buckner ticket.

"I am glad to be able to pay back in this campaign a part of the debt that I owe Mr. Haskell for his services when I needed friends. And, aside from my gratitude, I rejoice that your state is to be launched upon its career under the guidance of so strong, so able, and so faithful a democrat.

"Surely those who have given you your constitution and placed you among the foremost of the reform states of this union are deserving of your gratitude. Many states have constitutions satisfactory to the representatives of predatory wealth. Oklahoma's constitution ought to be satisfactory to the producing masses. The democrats have selected five members of the constitutional convention for places upon the state ticket, and the other candidates are all in sympathy with the constitution and its aims.

"As I have mentioned my personal appreciation of Mr. Haskell, I might add that I have also been brought in contact with Mr. Williams, one of the candidates for the supreme bench. He is a member of the democratic national committee and my acquaintance with him has led me to admire more and more his intellect, his moral courage and his broad sympathy with the people. Unless I am mistaken in measuring character he will prove himself entirely worthy of the great responsibilities that will rest upon him.

"It is important that the senators from Oklahoma shall represent the masses rather than the great corporations. We surely need such men in the senate. The democratic candidates, Mr. Gore and Mr. Owens, measure up to the requirements. In the house the five demo-

(Continued on Page 6)