

NULL, O. E.

CANADIAN VALLEY ECHO.

9204

423

HISTORICAL COLLECTION FORM
WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

424

Indian-Pioneer History Project for Oklahoma

Field worker's name Linnaeus B. Banck.This report made on (date) November 15, 1937. 19371. Name of person owning collection O. E. Null.Address Arnett, Oklahoma.2. Name (if any) of collection Canadian Valley Echo.

3. This collection contains the following types of material _____

General news of Old Day County.4. Amount of material One Issue.

5. Material deals with _____

6. Approximate period (dates) material is for Fall of 1902.

7. Locations of the collection (where it is kept) _____

8. Condition of storage place _____

Condition of collection _____

9. What does the owner intend to do with this collection Keep it.Would he be willing to part with it? No.

10. Any other information about the collection, including its history _____

11. Does this owner know other people who have or might have collections.
Give names & addresses _____NOTE: In the event that any of the above questions cannot be answered fully
in the space allowed, attach blank sheets firmly, and give all available in-

NULL, O. E.

CANADIAN VALLEY ECHO.

9204.

Linnaeus B. Ranck,
Investigator,
Nov. 13, 1937.

An Interview with O. E. Null,
Arnett, Oklahoma.

The Canadian Valley Echo was a weekly newspaper founded at the old town of Grand in old Day County about the turn of the century:-

Likely it is that the large majority of Oklahoma's present day population never heard of "The Herd - Law Ticket" in the politics of the state. Going back 35 years, however, in the state's history and many who were living in Oklahoma that long ago can vividly recall that the Herd-Law question was a very vital political issue during those days in many parts of the state, at least. In the fall election in old Day County in 1902 the Herd Law people had a full ticket and the issue was being spiritedly pressed in the county. I quote from the CANADIAN VALLEY ECHO of October 30, 1902:

THE HERD LAW COLUMN: Harvey Culp,
EDITOR.

AN INFAMOUS PLOT DEFEATED: Wednesday,
October 15th.

-2-

The Herd-law candidates met and presented their petition to place the Herd-law ticket on the official ballot to the county board of election commissioners. Two of the board told the candidates in express words, (and the third member acquiesced by his silence) that they had till the next Monday to file their petition, and any district or supreme court in the land will say that this decision of the board was right.

The next Monday the candidates brought the petition back to be filed and were met with the statement that they were one day too late and two members (a majority) of the board were against allowing the Herd-law candidates to go on the ballot. This would have left only the Free Grass candidates to be voted for and would have denied the right to vote to the large majority of the people who intended to vote the Herd-law ticket. The county attorney was called in and he said it was too late. The candidates got A. L. Squire to represent them and he, by showing the law, convinced two of the Board that it was not too late and so after an all-day's fight the Herd-law ticket was placed on the official ballot.

-3-

The Free Grass candidates then employed two high priced lawyers to try to get an injunction forbidding the Election Board to place the Herd-law ticket on the ballot. When they saw the upright character of the district judge they gave it up.

We have positive evidence that almost everyone of the present officers who are candidates for re-election except the county clerk were parties to this infamous plot; and now that the trick has failed they are traveling the county over denying they had anything to do with it.

The fact that they had tried to draw the people's mind by talking national politics and had tried every sort of slander against the Herd-law candidates, but these efforts had failed and they saw they were beaten and this effort to keep the Herd-law candidates off the ballot was their last resort and it has also come to ignominious failure. A large number of eminent lawyers, including one of the judges of the Oklahoma Supreme Court, have been consulted and they will say that the ticket was all right in every way and that had the Election Board refused the courts would have compelled them to put the Herd-law

candidates on the ballot. The ballots are now printed and the Herd-law ticket is on them.

Briefly explained to those who might not understand, the Herd-law people, as a group, were the settlers; and of course, vigorously opposed to free range. The cowmen naturally stood for free range for all livestock, that being the last thread they had to cling to for life in the cattle business. With free range as a right to all, the settler who was trying to farm and unable to fence his cultivated land was oftentimes at such a disadvantage that it was impossible for him to stay in the country. Until the policy of free range was prohibited by law, the cowmen's stock could and in many instances did eat up the growing or matured crop of a settler which the settler was unable to fence, and in such a case it was the settler's hard luck unless the cowman was considerate enough to pay for the damage done by his stock. It was the settler's obligation, however, to fence his fields, and if he did not, and range cattle destroyed it, the owner of the stock was not by law bound to pay damages.