

# The Dalles Weekly Chronicle.

VOL. II.

THE DALLES, OREGON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1892.

NUMBER 44.

## REPUBLICANS' NIGHT.

The Court House the Scene of Eloquent Addresses.

SINNOTT AND EDDY INTRODUCED.

Who Spoke Eloquently and Well Upon Leading Issues.

SEN. DOLPH ADDRESSES THE HOUSE

Full Report of That Portion of His Speech Relating to the Opening of the Columbia.

Hon. J. N. Dolph arrived in the city yesterday, and was met at the court house last evening by a large audience among whom was quite a number of ladies. The brass band led the procession and after the meeting was called to order by Mr. Huntington, the young men taking considerable part in the exercises, Mr. N. J. Sinnott was introduced and made his first political speech. It was a very creditable effort, of which our young friend has just cause for congratulations. Col. J. B. Eddy was next called, and made a stirring speech. Senator Dolph treated upon general topics, and was listened to attentively for over an hour, upon one topic, in which this community is most interested, Mr. Dolph said:

The resolution of the platform of the democratic party concerning river and harbor improvements is to say the least, a very peculiar one. The Mississippi river is deemed worthy of special mention and is the only one so mentioned. The other navigable waters referred to are under the head of other great waterways of the country. It is in effect a declaration against a general system of waterway improvements and a general river and harbor bill. Under the wording of this resolution all the improvements along our coast would be excluded, and if we may judge from the action of the present democratic house, the Columbia river is not in the estimation of the party one of the great waterways of the country.

The increases secured by me in the senate committee on commerce for the mouth of the Columbia river and the lower Columbia and Willamette, as well as for Siuslaw and Yaquina, were bitterly fought by the house conferees, and after a prolonged and bitter contest the provision placed by the republican senate in the river and harbor bill of last session for opening the Columbia at the dalles rapids was defeated.

The resolution of the Chicago convention should be read in the light of the pocket veto of President Cleveland of river and harbor bill of 1887, by which the appropriations for the Oregon works were defeated and the works delayed.

There is not a state in the union, thanks to republican administrations, that has received greater consideration from congress or larger appropriations for rivers and harbors during my service in the senate than Oregon. Our people complain at the progress being made with the work upon Oregon improvements; but if they would examine a river and harbor appropriation bill they would find that there are usually 400 or more appropriated for, many of them quite as important as ours and many of which have been longer under way. The Oregon improvements which have been so far undertaken are, as compared with similar improvements elsewhere, in a most gratifying condition. The improvement at Coos Bay has already begun to show beneficial results, and the liberal appropriation just made for it will enable the work to be prosecuted with new vigor. Commencement of the work at Siuslaw and Tillamook Bay has been provided for. One comparatively small appropriation will complete the existing project for the improvement of Yaquina Bay. The work at the mouth of the Columbia river will be substantially completed with the present appropriation, and if any further appropriation is required it will be insignificant. This improvement, for which I secured the first appropriation after I entered the Senate, has cost less than one-half the estimate and has already proved a success. A safe entrance and harbor of refuge has been secured, with nearly 30 feet of water at low tide. Thanks to the liberality and enterprise of the people of Portland, who are expending \$500,000 to secure 25 feet of water from Portland to the sea, one more ordinary appropriation will proba-

bly complete the work of improving the lower Columbia and Willamette, and that improvement will be out of the way of others.

The construction of the canal and locks at the cascades to completion, has been secured by the adoption for the work of the contract system. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding and misrepresentation about this system. It was adopted by the senate committee on commerce two years ago for the new locks upon the Sault Ste. Marie canal, Galveston harbor, and Philadelphia and Baltimore improvements. It was then considered to some extent experimental, and the committee did not dare to increase the contract works for fear of defeating the bill. I was then promised by the leading members of the senate committee on commerce that in the next river and harbor bill, one of the Oregon works should be placed under the contract system. I said to the people of the Columbia assured if it had not been for obstructions and difficulties emanating from my own state.

The contract system resulted in securing a contract for the construction of a new lock upon the Sault Ste. Marie and improvement of Hay Lake channel for more than a million dollars less than the estimate and in a great saving in the Philadelphia and Baltimore improvements. Under such a provision contracts are let for the whole work, the contractor receiving in due time as a payment upon the work the appropriation already made, and receiving his future payments as appropriations are made by congress. The secretary of war is authorized to incur indebtedness to the amount of the contract price and the appropriations are thereafter made, not in the river and harbor bill, but in the sundry civil appropriation bill, as appropriations are made for all liquidated claims against the government and will be made annually.

I have observed that it is supposed by some that there will be difficulty in securing a contract for the completion of the canal and locks; but I have no doubt that there will be bids from every quarter of the Union and a contract will be secured for a price much below the estimates. To help secure a responsible bidder for a price within the estimate of the cost, the limit of the expenditure, I secured in the east the names of all the bidders successful and unsuccessful for the Galveston harbor, the locks on the Sault Ste. Marie canal, the Baltimore canal, the Baltimore and Philadelphia improvement, and brought them to Maj. Handbury, and had copies of notices of the letting of the work upon the cascade canal mailed to them.

There has been complaint because the engineers have not proceeded with the appropriations made in the last river and harbor bill. I do not think the secretary of war had authority to expend the money for work carried on under the government engineers. As I have said, the appropriation is made to apply as the first payment on the contract price of the work. It necessarily takes time to effect the change of the work from the old system to the contract system. Official communication between the department and the local engineers was necessary in order that the department could be fully informed as to the condition of the work and the local engineer could be fully advised as to the character and effect of the new provisions concerning it. Careful working plans and specifications for every part of the work were required before the work was advertised. Extensive advertisement of the letting of the contract was required that contractors in all parts of the country might have an opportunity to bid and a reasonable bid secured. But when these necessary preliminaries have been attended to and the contract let, the work will proceed without delay until completed.

Much that has been recently said in the press concerning this work has been based upon insufficient information concerning present conditions. There has been a most unaccountable effort from certain sources to place obstacles in the way of the delegation in congress and especially to weaken my influence in endeavoring to secure an open river. I am not in the habit of noticing personal attacks, especially attacks of which my official record is sufficient refutation; but I think I will embrace this opportunity to say at this place and this time, once for all, that if any one can show a single act, vote or speech of mine which was calculated to retard the opening of

the Columbia river,—I will put it in stronger terms,—if any one will show where there has been an opportunity to promote the opening of the Columbia river and to secure appropriations for that purpose which I have not improved with all the zeal, ability and perseverance I possess, I will at once resign from the United States senate.

I will say in this connection that in all that has been accomplished and all that has been attempted to secure an open river and for river and harbor improvements in Oregon, Mr. Mitchell, since he entered the senate, has earnestly cooperated with me, and all the Oregon delegation have been energetic and diligent; and it one has accomplished more in this respect than another, it has been because his opportunities, being a member of a committee having jurisdiction of rivers and harbors, were better.

I will go further; if any one can show that in my controversy between the people and corporations I have not exerted all my influence and cast my votes for every just and constitutional measure in the interest of the people and for every measure calculated to benefit the laboring man, I will retire to private life.

The senate committee on commerce, through my efforts after I entered the senate, was endeavored to give me a place upon it. The first speech I ever made in the senate was in favor of the improvement of the Columbia river. I have from the time I entered the senate improved every opportunity to secure appropriations for the work at the cascades. Being a new member and failing in committee to secure an increase of the appropriation for the canal and locks in the river and harbor bill of 1884, I made, notwithstanding I was a member of the committee and tacitly committed to support the report of the committee, a motion in the senate to increase the appropriation for the canal and locks \$50,000 and supported it with a speech. It failed, lacking a few votes of a majority. You will recollect that Senator Frye of Maine, spoke against it, saying that Oregon was already liberally provided for and that I was the greatest beggar for my state in the committee.

I believe I have secured in every subsequent river and harbor bill, except the last, liberal increases for this work. At the 51st Congress I introduced and reported from the Senate Committee on Commerce and secured the passage through the Senate of a bill appropriating the whole amount required for the completion of the Cascade canal and locks. During the 52nd Congress I introduced, reported and secured the passage through the Senate of a similar bill appropriating the whole amount required for this work. I now recall no other case where this has been done except the improvement at the mouth of the Mississippi. Does this look much like a disposition on my part to retard the work or prevent the opening of the Columbia river? If so, let some of my Democratic friends indicate what else I could have done?

I have recently discussed the matter of the improvement at the dalles of the Columbia and I need not enlarge upon it here. My strenuous exertions to secure the commencement and speedy construction of this work have brought down upon my offending head the wrath of all who were seeking to maintain the grasp of existing monopolies upon the commerce of the Columbia River Valley and the adverse criticism and misrepresentation of the Democratic press; and the strangest thing connected with the matter is that the people who are seeking to control the river attack me by alleging that I am seeking to perpetuate the existing monopoly.

Let my record speak for itself. When the improvement of the cascade locks had got fairly under way, with the prospect of liberal treatment from future Congresses, I turned my attention to the obstructions to navigation at the dalles of the Columbia. Major Jones had proposed a boat-railway as a means of overcoming the obstructions at this point. The boat-railway scheme was new to me and I offered in the Senate a resolution directing the Secretary of War to cause the obstructions at the dalles to be examined and to report a plan of improvement. I saw the chief of engineers concerning the matter and learned that there was no fund out of which the survey and examination could be made, and that such examination could not be made without an appropriation for that purpose. I therefore dropped the resolution and proceeded to examine the question with care, and elaborately presented the subject to the Senate in a speech which I entitled, "An Obstructed River." In the next River and Harbor bill, fearing that the scheme of a boat-railway might prove impracticable and not being willing to entrust the matter of recommending a plan for the improvement, as is ordinarily done,

alone to the engineers in charge, we secured a provision for the appointment of a board of three Army Engineers to make a survey and report a plan for an improvement to overcome the obstructions at the dalles, with an appropriation of \$10,000 to defray the expenses.

This board was appointed, consisting of three eminent Army Engineers, who spent 14 months in examining the question, during which time they visited similar works in Europe. They reported in favor of a boat-railway as the most effective and economical method of overcoming the obstructions.

Mr. Mitchell, being chairman of the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, upon the receipt of the report to Congress, introduced a bill to provide for the construction of a boat-railway, which he had referred to his committee and which in due time favorably reported it, and by our united efforts it was passed through the Senate. We believed that there was a chance to secure the passage of this bill through the House and asked for and were promised a hearing before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors and were surprised at the action of that committee in reporting the bill to the House with a substitute providing for an ordinary portage road. I immediately investigated the matter, to see if there was a prospect of securing the passage of the substitute through the house, and was then assured, and I have recently been assured by the chairman and members of that committee, that the report was made under an agreement that the bill should not be called up in the house, and to get rid of impotency concerning it, that no member of the committee was committed to the project, and that the committee was not prepared to, and would not make the new departure of entering upon the construction of ordinary railroads, a work upon which any citizen might enter.

At the last session of congress Senator Mitchell again introduced his bill, which was again referred to the senate committee on transportation routes to the seaboard, reported from that committee, passed through the senate, and sent to the democratic house to sleep the sleep of death.

In the meantime, knowing that a separate bill providing for the prosecution of this work under the contract system would not pass the house, I was working up my proposition to incorporate in the river and harbor bill a provision for the work. While doing so, the Seattle canal project was brought before the senate committee on commerce and pressed with great energy and perseverance by the Washington senators. I felt compelled to oppose this measure, on the ground that it was not in the interest of general commerce and because I knew that the proposition to expend so large a sum for this canal would necessarily interfere with and prevent me from securing an appropriation for the improvement at the dalles. By my presentation of the importance of the proposition for the removal of the obstructions at the dalles, as compared with the Seattle canal, an improvement which I considered of vastly more importance to the people of Washington than the canal, I became embarrassed with the Washington senators and was put in the position by the public press of complaining of them. The appropriation for the Washington canal prevailed in the committee without my support and it was only by a great effort that I secured a provision in the bill making an appropriation for the commencement of the boat-railway and for its construction under the contract system. Then the real fight commenced.

The opposition to the work which had been going on all the session appeared at once on the surface. Paul Mohr and the lobbyists in the interest put in an appearance. The Washington canal and the boat-railway were straightway connected together. Mr. Blanchard, chairman of the house committee on rivers and harbors and the house conferees, assailed the boat-railway project most bitterly and quoted Gov. Penney's letters and read in the conference committee extracts from democratic newspapers in Oregon opposing a boat-railway. With his, (Mr. Blanchard's), approval, if not at his instance, a paper was circulated in the house and quite numerous signed by members threatening to defeat the river and harbor bill unless the Washington canal and the boat-railway project were eliminated.

I knew nothing of Paul Mohr's scheme prior to the adoption of my amendment. I supposed his project was still upon paper only. He wrote a letter to Senator Squire, which was turned over to the committee, in which he stated that his company had already expended \$420,000 upon his project, that it had three miles of track and were ready to proceed with

the work. I knew this was an exaggeration; but when Mr. Mohr came to see me about the matter, I told him that I did not desire to interfere with any improvement of the Columbia river and would have my proposition amended so as to do him and his company as little harm as possible; that I would have the secretary of war authorized to agree with his company for a right of way over the right of way secured for the boat-railway or for a right to use the tracks of the government road. He said that would reduce their damages compensation, for loss of business on the Columbia by reason of the construction of a boat-railway. I told him that such a claim was preposterous. He said he would go to New York and consult other parties interested with him, about my proposition but he never reported.

In his letter to Senator Squire he claimed that his company had purchased the work done upon the north side of the river by the Northern Pacific Railway Company, and had become the successor of all the rights of the Washington Railroad Co.—I think that was the name of the company—an organization created and maintained by the old O. S. N. Co., and the Oregon Railway and Navigation Co., to hold the right of way at the dalles upon the north side of the river.

I concluded, and I leave it to you to say whether the conclusion was just, that Mr. Mohr could never have secured those interests for the purpose of the construction of a railroad and that his scheme was simply in the interest of those who desired to prevent the opening of the river, and I probably said so to the conference committee. Some member of the committee told him this and he sent me a letter threatening me with his indignation, which I read in the senate and said in my public speech that if he had anything to say about me he could say it on the house-tops.

In violation of the rules of the senate, the morning the report of the disagreement of the conference committee was to be considered in the senate, he placed upon the desks of senators and representatives a document full of falsehoods and misrepresentations and it became my duty to answer it. This brought out the malicious and scurrilous letter circulated among senators and representatives, which he tried to have published in eastern papers without success and which was published in a paper in this city. This was the penalty I paid for my fidelity to the interests of the people. Mr. Blanchard, argued on by Governor Penney, succeeded in defeating the measure. It was constantly asserted in the committee that the project would defeat the bill in the house and that further delay would defeat the bill. I held on to the measure until I began to fear myself that there was danger of the defeat of the river and harbor bill and until I could not ask my colleagues longer to stand by the measure.

I then, in order to remove all possible objection to the plan for this improvement at another congress, secured a provision for the appointment of a new board to consist of seven engineers, three to be taken from civil life, in order to overcome my prejudice against army engineers, to examine and report a location and plan for the improvement, with an appropriation of \$15,000 for the payment of the expenses of the board. What more could any one have done?

I will examine very briefly the grounds of attack against me. First, it is said that a boat-railway is impracticable and will result in keeping the river closed. The answer to this is that a board of eminent engineers from the army have reported that a boat-railway is not only practicable but the most economical and efficient improvement; that I did not trust a single army engineer to pass upon the question but had the survey and examination made by a board; that I had nothing more to do than any of you with the determination of the character of the improvement; and that congress will not authorize an improvement of any other character until the plan is changed by the engineers.

Again, it is said that I selected the north side of the river so as to destroy the property of Paul Mohr's company and not to hurt the Union Pacific Company. It is sufficient to say that I had nothing to do with the location of the boat-railway, which was a matter wholly for the Board of Engineers, and that Paul Mohr's company was not in existence when the location was made.

Lastly, it is asserted that I am the attorney of the O. R. & N. Co. and therefore I must be working in their interest. Every one knows that when I entered the Senate I severed all connection, not only with the O. R. & N. Co. but with all corporations and other clients. My brother's firm, with whom I never had any connection, some years ago gave up the business of the O. R. & N. Co. and the Union Pacific Company as lessee of its road.

Paul Mohr claims that I appeared in a suit to prevent the government from getting a right of way for a canal and locks, and so attempted to defeat the project. Every one knows that the suit to condemn a right of way over the lands of the O. S. N. Co. was brought many years ago, before I had any connection with the O. R. & N. Co. and while Judge Strong was counsel for the O. S. N. Co. The suit referred to by Mr. Mohr was brought to condemn additional land which was desired for the canal and locks while I was a member of the firm of Dolph, Brownugh, Dolph and Simon and before I entered the Senate, and was never tried. It was settled upon my advice to Mr. Prescott to take the amount offered by the government, to show that the company was making no factious opposition to the improvement, although neither he nor I believed the amount offered was the value of the land.

But I did once figure in a suit for a right of way over the lands of the O. S. N. Co., now owned by the O. R. & N. Co. and the Cascades. I appeared with Col. W. W. Chapman in the suit of The Dalles and Salt Lake Railway Co. vs. the O. S. N. Co., to secure a right of way at the dalles, and spent nearly a week in the trial of the case without compensation or hope of reward, my services being a free gift to the enterprise for the benefit of the people of the state.

Another charge is that I have represented the O. R. & N. Co. in the supreme court in some litigation. Although other senators take suits in the supreme court for land grant railroad companies, I have always refused them. I have not sought legal business, preferring to devote my time to the business of the people of Oregon. I was vice president of the O. R. & N. Co. when it leased the narrow gauge railroad lines of the Oregonian Railway Co. The lease was executed under the direction of the president and executive committee of the company in New York by the Portland board with much hesitation. We believed it to be improvident. When Mr. Villard failed, and the management of the road changed, the execution of this lease was the cause of great complaint against the Oregon board. The other members of the board acted largely under my advice. I defended them in correspondence with the officers of the company, and informed the company that in any controversies with the Oregon directors I should defend them for all acts done while I was connected with the company. I gave an opinion that the lease was void, and the company repudiated it. The Oregonian Railway Co. brought suit for the semi-annual installments of rent, and the litigation was carried to the supreme court. In the first suit in the supreme court, Sidney Bartlett, the great Massachusetts lawyer, and Mr. Carter, the leading lawyer of New York, were employed. I was desired to file a brief, setting forth my views of the validity of the lease; and having, as you will see, more than a pecuniary interest in the litigation, on account of the part I had taken in the execution of the lease, I did so. The fact of my employment and the decision in the case was telegraphed to Oregon and no one thought I had committed any great iniquity until Paul Mohr undertook to make a mountain out of a mole-hill. This one case settled the question involved. No other suit for rent was ever argued; no opinion was written in any other case. Being on the ground, as a matter of accommodation, as the subsequent cases were reached, I filed copies of my brief in the first case in the supreme court.

I think I should ask pardon for taking so much time upon so trivial a matter; but I felt that some statement was due to my friends concerning the attacks made upon me.

### Contract for a Ship Canal.

New York, Oct. 7.—A \$2,000,000 contract has just been let in this city for dredging the jetties at the proposed deep-water harbor of Ropez Pass, Tex. The work consists of a ship channel 30 feet deep, extending from the Gulf of Mexico to Corpus Christi bay, across Mustang Island. A channel 3,200 feet in length has been dredged across Mustang Island to within 800 feet of the gulf beach. Four miles of dockage in 30 feet of water will be provided in the new harbor, which is designed as an outlet for the grain exportation of the West and Northwest.

### Is This Official?

New York World. It is a funny campaign of education, humbug and boodle.

Highest of all in Leavening Power.—Latest U. S. Gov't Report.

# Royal Baking Powder

ABSOLUTELY PURE