

PEOPLE COMING AND GOING.

John Johnson, wife and children, of Erekensville, are in the city.

Miss Mollie Probstel is in the city from La Grande visiting friends.

Antone Berg, a resident of Grand Valley, is visiting with the family of August Buchler.

Mrs. Ella McFarland, who has been visiting her brothers here and in Astoria, returned to her home in Seattle yesterday.

Attorney W. H. Wilson went to Portland on the afternoon train.

Mrs. Orlin Morgan went to Astoria today to visit her parents and incidentally attend the fair.

A. S. Mac Allister returned yesterday from a visit to his sleep ranch on the John Day.

Judge Bradshaw, accompanied by Messrs. Frank Neudie and H. S. Wilson, left yesterday for Prineville, where the October term of circuit court opened today.

E. W. Oebner, manager of the Permythiana Fire Insurance Company, and an old-time friend of T. S. Hodson, is in the city on a friendly visit.

Deputy Sheriff E. B. Wood, who has been through Hood River, Mosier and Cascade Locks collecting personal property county tax, left this morning on the same business for the regions south of The Dalles as far as Astoria.

Joe Heiler came in from Dulles this morning to take home his son who, with Mrs. Heiler, has been here for the past month while receiving medical treatment for stomach troubles from Dr. Gieseler's office. The young man returned home much improved.

This morning, June Ick, to Rev. Robert and Mrs. Warner, of this city, a son.

Wages of the Anthracite Miners.

The Bryanite press has had very much to say about the manner wages of the anthracite coal miners now on a strike.

Of course they are careful never to mention the fact that anthracite coal is on the free list and that therefore the coal combine, known as the coal trust, does not owe its existence to our protective tariff laws any more than the three or four hundred colossal trusts of Great Britain, or hundreds of others in this country, owe their existence to that cause.

It would appear that there is another side to this wage question. The men do not work all the year, and the practice of the Bryanite press is to conceal this fact and divide the yearly wage by the number of working days in the year, instead of by the number of days of actual work.

There a daily wage scale of from 65 cents to 80 cents a day is figured, and this truly starvation wage, if it were true, is the Bryanite answer to the full dinner-pail argument of the republicans and is used as a proof of the grinding oppression of the trusts.

That the readers of THE CHRONICLE may see the other side of this picture, we print the following letter, which appeared a short time ago in the New York Sun. The writer is a resident of Scranton, Pa., and ought to know what he is talking about:

Last week's press dispatches contained an account of one of Mr. Bryan's characteristic speeches in which he was quoted as referring to the condition of the anthracite miner now engaged in his customary December strike.

In this speech Mr. Bryan drew a pitiful picture of a human being, toiling and sweating like a beast of the field all day long in the dark and gloomy bowels of the earth for the meagre sum of 75 cents per diem.

What rot! Having lived in the anthracite coal regions for a period of twenty-eight years I consider that I am privileged to say: What rot!

The interior of our mines is lighted with electricity. The miner of today does not toil and sweat like a beast of the field. On the contrary it is not an infrequent occurrence for a miner desirous of taking a two or three day outing at some pleasure resort to go into the mine at 6 o'clock in the morning and before noon out sufficient coal to keep his laborer or laborers—in some cases a miner employs three laborers—working three days to load and send the coal to the surface.

Here then is a miner, a brother to the male, who, in six hours, has worked three "shifts" for which he receives no compensation, or circumstances in the mine are so arranged that he can make a profit of less than \$2.50 for each and every "shift." I use the word permitted because it is an invariable rule, a custom of the trade, in this coal region that if at the end of the month the miner has failed to average \$2.50 per shift a sufficient "allowance" of powder, oil, and patch is given to him to make that average.

If a miner works twenty-five shifts a month his wages can in no event be less than \$62.50. During the month of August last 20 per cent. of the miners in the Lackawanna region cleared over \$90.

Mr. Bryan has been sadly misinformed on this question. If his knowledge of other questions is based on no better information than this, his utterances must be the veriest sophistry.

Worked in it.

"You voted for Bryan four years ago, did you?" said the passenger in the skull cap.

"I do," replied the man in the flashy waistcoat.

"And you say you are going to vote for him again?"

"That's right."

"Did you hear or read any of his speeches in 1896?"

"Lots of them."

"Didn't he make a lot of prophecies about what would happen if the country went republican?"

"He did."

"Did any of them come true?"

"None that I know of."

"Don't you think he's either a dema-

gogue or a mighty small specimen of a statesman?"

"I do."

"Then why in the name of all that is decent and consistent are you going to vote for him again?"

"I'll tell you. You know that little eyes-eyed Trighammer who used to give you a good time?"

"Yes."

"Well, when McKinley was elected in 1896 little Trighammer was so sure the country was going to enveloping smash that he sold me his house and lot for \$800.

"That was a bargain, anyhow. You've still got the property, haven't you?"

"No, I sold it afterward for \$2,000."

"What has all that to do with your voting for Bryan again?"

"I want to see him elected so I can buy back that house and lot for \$800."

WHAT IS A TRUST?

All kinds of Business Corporations Attacked by Bryan.

It is not impossible that for the next thirty days Mr. Bryan will make the "trusts" his theme. Many democratic speakers and papers will follow his example.

It may be the prearranged plan of the democratic national committee that they shall do so. If that is to be the case, those who are to discuss "trusts" should agree on some precise definition of that word.

It would be a great assistance to the listeners to anti-trust speeches, and readers of anti-trust editorials if they knew what a "trust" is and where the "trusts are to be found."

At present there is a remarkable diversity of opinion regarding this matter. Senator Hanna says he "does not believe there is such a thing as a trust in the United States."

Most men will deem this altogether too sweeping a statement. Some of his friends will scarcely understand what he means.

Some of his opponents understand him to mean that there are no longer any monopoly combines which have what a lawyer would call a "trust" form of organization.

That is indeed the case. Corporations which desire unity of control no longer transfer their interests to some other corporation which acts as trustee for all and manages the affairs of all. Corporations consolidate now, where they once formed a "trust."

People do not generally use the word "trust" in its legal sense. Many mean by it a large industrial company built up by the consolidation of a number of the companies engaged in a particular business, and they often assume that such a consolidation is harmful.

One of Senator Hanna's critics gives a more precise definition. He says most people mean by trusts "a combination or consolidation of establishments embraced in any given branch of production, powerful enough practically to control output and prices."

If this is the definition which is accepted by Mr. Bryan and other democratic anti-trust orators, it would be well for them to enumerate some of the organizations which may properly be called "trusts."

This enumeration will have more effect on the people if it can be shown that these organizations have restricted output and thereby restricted consumption, and have raised prices.

The best evidence of the power of a combination to control output and prices is the evidence that it has done so. Where that is lacking the power of the combination is merely alleged, not proved.

There are many consolidated companies which are properly called "trusts" which have not restricted the output.

They have welcomed increased consumption because it enabled them to make more money. Nor, if able to control prices, have they always used their power to increase them.

This is true of some of the steel combines. The price of steel was lower here immediately after the Illinois Steel company was formed than it was before that company was organized.

If the Carnegie company has the power to control prices it has not always exercised that power. Its prices have not been the highest when it was the strongest.

In fact, it has obtained its ascendancy in the markets by underselling competitors. The Detroit Company may be said to have a monopoly, but is there evidence that it has so controlled prices as to restrict consumption? A control which increases consumption may not be objected to.

The anthracite coal roads are called a "trust." No doubt they act in unison. They are in a combine at this time particularly odious. They manage to agree as to prices.

But when the evidence that they have made an agreement which the law can take hold of is asked for it is not forthcoming. Men will "think alike" sometimes, even as to the prices which they ask for their goods.

No law which congress can pass and the president sign can prevent their doing so. There is no way under the constitution and laws in which this combine can be broken up.

Here is a case of a "trust," according to the popular definition, which not even national legislation can reach. Nor is it easy to see what national legislation can be devised to dissolve the most powerful of so-called "trusts"—the Standard Oil Company.

The Bryanites who are denouncing "trusts" and asking to be given power

that they may destroy them ought to submit a list of the corporations they think ought to be wiped out, because for reasons that should be stated, their existence is dangerous to the public welfare. They should explain also in detail what Federal legislation they propose and show how it can be made effectual either to destroy or control the trusts complained of. There are some of the things the people might well be informed of before the elections.

PARTNERS FALL OUT

O'Reilly and Lytle, of the Columbia Southern—Two New Suits Are Commenced—Former General Manager Makes a Short Statement of His Side of the Litigation.

The stockholders of the Columbia Southern Railway Company appear to have become involved in a general legal tangle, which may take some time for the courts to straighten out, says the Sunday Oregonian.

In the beginning, Drake C. O'Reilly, who owns stock in the company amounting to over \$100,000, filed suit at Mono, Sherman county, asking for the appointment of a receiver, and substantially charging that the president, E. E. Lytle, and others had arranged to freeze him out, intending themselves in the building of an extension of the road to Shanika.

Yesterday, Henry A. Moore, who avers that he is the owner of 125 shares in the concern, filed suit in the state circuit court in this county against O'Reilly, asking for judgment against O'Reilly in favor of the company for \$25,000.

Moore avers that on February 17, 1899, O'Reilly was general manager of the company, and moneys were drawn from the treasury on his order and that of E. E. Lytle, president, and that O'Reilly drew and applied to his own use \$25,000, and, although he pretended to have President Lytle assist him to secure the money, it was taken from the treasury without authority from the board of directors, on the following order:

WASCO, OR., Jan. 21, 1899 Columbia Southern Railway Company To D. C. O'Reilly, Dr. For compensation as projector of the Columbia Southern Railway Company, and for services rendered in promoting the construction of the same—\$25,000.

He was not the projector of the road, so it is alleged, and was not connected with it until after considerable portion of it had been built, and then only in the capacity of general manager and director, under salary, which was full compensation for his services, and any services performed prior to his incorporation were voluntary, and not worth \$25,000.

When the money was taken, the plaintiff says, the corporation was in debt, and until October, 1900, he did not know the money was taken. He states that he made a demand upon the board of directors to bring suit to recover the money, and was refused, and cannot apply to the stockholders to have the directors removed because the directors own substantially all of the stock except what is owned by O'Reilly. Judgment is demanded in favor of the company for \$25,000.

Henry A. Moore has filed a similar suit against E. E. Lytle, the president of the corporation, in the same court, to recover \$22,709 for the company. This money, it is alleged, Lytle wrongfully drew for services rendered in the construction of the road, and as projector. The allegations otherwise are almost entirely the same as in the O'Reilly case.

Recently, O'Reilly filed a mandamus proceeding against President Lytle and others, which is pending before Judge Frazer, to compel the officers of the company to allow him to inspect the books. Yesterday the defendants filed a long answer to this case, setting up that O'Reilly has been permitted to make reasonable examinations of the books, but his requests have been made with great frequency, and the inspection of the books by him has consumed so much time as to interfere with the general business of the office.

O'Reilly's suit asking for the appointment of a receiver is mentioned, and the effect of which it is alleged would be to destroy the value of his stock. He is charged with trying to wreck the company, and in part pursuant to his plan to have caused mechanics' liens amounting to \$30,000 to be filed against the company in Sherman county.

Concerning the suit against him, Mr. O'Reilly said to a reporter: "This is only a 'fake' case, to give me trouble. It is absurd. You know that I am suing Mr. Lytle, president of the Columbia Southern, in Sherman county, among other things for misappropriating \$100,000 of the funds of the Columbia Southern. This is one of his ways of 'getting even.' Read the complaint itself, and you will see that the board of directors of the Columbia Southern resolve that my taking this money was a fraud, and I ought to be sued; yet, as the complaint goes on to say, the board refuse to bring suit. Doesn't that look ridiculous?"

"The fact is, Lytle is president, his wife, his brother, a brother of this plaintiff, are the directors. Why don't they let the company sue? Because the facts are that Lytle and I, when we were

sole owners of the Columbia Southern, partners, you might say, divided between us \$50,000 of the surplus in the treasury of the company. That was authorized and ratified by the board of directors, and W. H. Moore, brother of this plaintiff, was one of those directors. It was, in fact, our money. Why shouldn't we divide it? And this plaintiff got the very shares of stock he is spring on as a consequence of the agreement between Lytle and myself, which, among other things, provided for a division of funds on hand. This stock was given M. A. Moore. He never paid a cent for it. He and his brother were bankers at Mono, and lent me money for the Columbia Southern at 8 and 10 per cent, which has been repaid them.

"If H. A. Moore did not know of this division between Lytle and me, he is probably the only man in that region who didn't. His brother and partner was one of the directors who officially authorized it.

"It is a 'fake' case. They are suing Mr. Moore to do what they couldn't do themselves; it is conclusive that the real person suing is Lytle. Some of it is very laughable, and it is all 'bumboogie.' When we get to the merits of the case I will tell you my story. At the present time I am devoting myself to efforts to see the books and records of the company. I own more than one-third of the stock, and since June have been trying to get an inspection of the books and records of the company, and every effort in court and out of it has been resisted by Mr. Lytle and his associates. They seem to think that 'might makes right,' and every trick is clever."

Are you ready to buy your fall shoes? We are sole agents for the celebrated Hamilton Brown Shoe Co.'s line of footwear. If you want the best shoe for the least money, call and see us. No trouble to show goods at the New York Cash Store.

CONTEST NOTICE. U. S. LAND OFFICE, THE DALLES, OR., September 15, 1900.

A sufficient contest exhibit having been filed in this office by Joseph H. Sherar, contestant, against homestead entry No. 743, made June 1, 1899, for 1/2 NW 1/4 Sec 28, and E 1/2 NW 1/4 Sec 29, T. 2 N., R. 14 E., by William Gill contestant, in which it is alleged that said William Gill has wholly abandoned said tract and allowed his residence therefor for more than six months since making said entry, and that prior to date of contest, and that he did not abandon the tract to enter the military or naval service of the United States, and parties are hereby notified to appear, respond and offer evidence touching said sections thirty days after the date of this notice, to-wit: on or before October 10, 1900, before the register and receiver at the United States land office in The Dalles, Oregon.

The said contestant having, in a petition, filed August 10, 1900, set forth facts which show that due diligence personal service of this notice can not be made, it is hereby ordered and directed that notice be given by due and proper publication.

JAY P. LUCAS, Register.

NOTICE FINAL SETTLEMENT. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has duly filed with the County Clerk of Wasco County, Oregon, his final account and report as administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTICE. Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been duly appointed by the county court of the state of Oregon, for Wasco county, administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased, and that the Honorable County Court has fixed Monday, the 24th day of November, 1900, at 10 o'clock a. m. of said day as the time, and the County Court room of the County of Wasco County, Oregon, as the place for hearing said final account and report, and for the settlement of said estate, and hereby notified to appear at said time and place and show cause, if any there be, why said report should not be approved and said administrator discharged.

Dated this 15th day of October, 1900. J. P. AGIDIUS, Administrator of the estate of Adolph Agidius, deceased.

SUMMONS.

In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon for Wasco County. The Oregon Railroad & Navigation Co., Plaintiff.

John H. Kolberg and Emma Kolberg, his wife; Charles E. Gieseler; John Doe and Richard Roe, whose names are unknown, Defendants.

To John H. Kolberg, Emma Kolberg, his wife; Charles E. Gieseler; John Doe and Richard Roe, whose names are unknown, Defendants: In the name of the State of Oregon:

You, and each of you, are hereby notified that the Oregon Railroad & Navigation Company has filed a complaint against you in the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon for the County of Wasco, and you are hereby required to appear and answer the complaint on or before the last day of the time prescribed by the order of publication, that is to say on or before Saturday, the 10th day of November, 1900. You are further notified that if you fail to appear and answer the complaint, or plead thereto, at said time, the plaintiff will cause your default to be entered and will apply to the court for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and the plaintiff may also apply to the court for an order that the defendant be held to answer for the relief sought by the plaintiff in the complaint, and the court may grant such relief as it may see fit to grant, and the court may also order the plaintiff to pay the costs of this action, and