LOCAL

Mrs. Nellie Price of Beloit, Wisconsin, is visiting her sister, Mrs. Partridge.

Mr. Al Harrison has sold his place in this city to Fred Abbott.

Mr. J. W. Day has sold his home in in this city to Chas. Muckle and purchased a lot adjoining the property of C. H. John from W. B. Dillard, on which he will erect a residence.

The Deer Island Artisans will give a dance in their new hall on the nineteenth of November.

PIGS OR SALE—Ten weeks old; $5.00. Call on or address E. C. King, Deer Island. 10 21 2t

Bedroom for rent at reasonable price. Inquire at the Mist office

Dr. G. Pratt, of Portland, will speak on the subject of temperance at the M. E. Church in Houlton this Friday evening at 7:30 o'clock.

George DeMasonville, a man bordering on seventy years of age, was committed to jail by Justice Blackford of Clatskanie Wednesday, charged with a statutory crime against his 14-year-old granddaughter.

POMONA AT ST. HELENS—Owing to the fact that Warren Grange was unable to secure a hall for the day appointed, Pomona Grange for Columbia County will be held at Odd Fellows Hall in St. Helens on Satuaday, November 5th. The Master of the State Grange is expected to be present and the annual election of officers will take place. This should result in a large attendance.

CIRCUIT COURT—Isherwood vs. Salene, to enjoin Mrs. Salene from digging a ditch to drain a lake used for hunting purposes: Tried and taken under advisement. Fuller vs. Muckle, to foreclose lien: Postponed. Masters vs. Masters: Divorce granted. State vs. McEvoy and Lyons, charged with stealing logs from the Jennings-McRae boom at Marshland, Oregon: On trial Thursday.

DEER ISLAND RALLY—There will be a Republican rally and free dance at Deer Island on Saturday evening, November 5. Local speakers and the candidates on the county ticket will occupy about two hours of the time, after which all who desire will dance to the music of a Portland orchestra. All are invited.

BOWERMAN AT RAINIER—Hon. Jay Bowerman and Grant B. Dimick spoke to a crowded house at the K. P. Hall in Rainier last Wednesday night and were enthusiastically applauded for the many telling points made. After the speaking a good supper was served by the Ladies of the Maccabees. Excellent music was furnished by the Clatskanie band.

Mr. Frank Smith, of Redmond, was a visitor to the county seat on Tuesday last. Redmond is to be the county seat of the proposed new county of Deschutes, and Mr. Smith was looking around in the interests of the measure to create the new county, which they desire to form from the northwest corner of Crook. Crook county is so large that it takes a resident three days to make a trip to the county seat from the more remote parts of the county, and the part that the proposed measure is to cut off is only about one fourth of the total area. The way that Mr. Smith presents it there does not seem to be any doubt but that the county should be created. Mr. Smith was once engaged in the logging business at Cathlamet and is very well known along both sides of the river.

Grant Johnson of Rainier, is the latest victim of his own foolishness. It seems he had been on a prolonged spree and on last Friday night after the saloons closed, he went over to the Rainier station, and though there is no way of absolutely knowing it is presumed that he crawled into one of the box cars standing on the siding. There was a freight switching at two and another at three, and he probably fell out of the car. At 4:30 the marshal found him asleep in front of the drug store, with one foot badly crushed. There was a trail of blood from the track to the freight depot and from there to where the man was found. Even when found he was not aware that he had been run over, but told the marshal that his foot was badly sprained. He was given medical treatment at once and taken to the hospital at Portland on the morning train, but he died in the afternoon of the same day.

The city council met last Monday night and transacted considerable business. A representative of the firm of Long & Company, dealers in fire fighting apparatus was present and the council ordered considerable new hose and other apparatus from them. It is about time that the fire department was revived and the merchants and other business men of the town should get together and take an active interest in the matter. It is something that should not be left in the hands of a few or slighted in any way, for there is a lot at stake, and the property owners will do well to realize it before they see their homes or places of business going up in smoke because of the inefficiency of an untrained fire department. At the next meeting, which will be next Monday night, an ordinance declaring the buildings that are on the Strand and the adjoining tide lands a fire district and ordering their removal will be read first time.

BOWERMAN MAKES REPLY TO BOURNE

Nominee Says Senator Urged Harmony When Seeking Votes Four Years Ago.

To Jonathan Bourne, Jr.: In the Portland evening papers of September 30 there appeared an interview, credited to you, in which you indulged in a great many generalities and meaningless platitudes. In this phraseology you presume to issue a command to the people of Oregon to vote against many candidates in the coming election nominated by the recent primary.

Since your election to the United States senate you have not taken sufficient interest in the State of Oregon to spend any considerable part of your time here. You have devoted your time and such enterprise and energy as you possess to pastimes and associations more agreeable to you while you were able to find in other parts of this and foreign countries. You have visited this state but twice during the last four years, and then devoted very little time to ascertaining the wishes of the people of Oregon, or their needs or requirements; but you have devoted your time to issuing mandates to the people of this state directing them how they should vote. You claim to be a friend of the people of Oregon. I presume you imagine that by repeatedly telling the people you are their friend, someone will believe you. Fortunately, however, some of your sins of commission and omission are matters of public record, which you are obliged to face and cannot avoid, excuse or deny.

Bourne Works With Aldrich.

It is a matter of public record that you, at the special session of congress in 1909, in a harrangue, by courtesy called a speech, delivered by you, when the tariff bill was under consideration, referred to that other "friend" of the people, Senator Aldrich, as an authority upon tariff legislation. It is a well known fact that during your term in the senate you have labored in complete harmony with Senator Aldrich. In this so-called speech you stated that you knew nothing of the tariff, but that your particular friend, familiar and boon companion, Senator Aldrich, was a master of rates and that you would be content to abide by his decisions.

You voted against Senator Bristow's proposed amendment, which would have taken the "joker" out of the sugar schedule. By this vote $60,000,000 a year is wrung from the people of this country and given to the sugar trust. You further outraged the people of Oregon and of this country on this occasion by assisting in placing a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on iron ore. Of course you knew the steel trust owned the iron ore in the United States and that by your vote you were taking this money from the people of this country and from your own constituents and giving it to the many millionaires who control this, the greatest trust in the world. No doubt you expect the householder, when he purchases a cook stove and pays this unnecessary tribute to your colleagues to be blinded to your neglect of duty by the platitudes you indulge in concerning myself and the other candidates who are not favored with your support, or with the acquaintances and associations of your millionaire chums and friends who are the beneficiaries of your misrepresentation of this state in the senate.

Duty on Woolens; Silk Free.

You voted to admit to this country raw silk free and to place a duty of 53 per cent upon the manufactured article. At the same time you voted to place a duty of 135 per cent (average) on woolen and worsted cloth, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound. Was this act on your part induced by your friendship for the people? Was it in the interest of the common people? Did you vote to place this exorbitant duty upon goods used by "us, of common people," for the benefit of anyone except your coupon-clipping chums and associates?

Your chief legitimate income is said to be from a large cotton print mill, owned by yourself and relatives, in New England. You voted to place a duty of 12½ cents a square yard (see paragraph 318, schedule I) on the class of goods manufactured by your mill. When the mechanic, farmer or other citizen is compelled to purchase this class of goods and pay tribute to you and your plutocratic intimates and associates, on account of the official position given to you by the people of Oregon, they can calm their outraged feelings by the happy thought that you secured this position and opportunity to plunder them and hope to continue in your present office by the use of resounding platitudes and windy commonplaces and the assertion that you are a friend of the people. How does 12½ cents a square yard tariff on goods manufactured in your cotton print mill, which are used chiefly by poor people, compare with a duty of 25 per cent to 50 per cent on champagne? Did you make this great difference in order to encourage the use of champagne by your constituents and to induce them to dispense with the clothing customarily worn in this country? Probably you assume they will believe in your pretended friendship; pay you this exorbitant duty and then sing a sweet refrain in honor of their alleged friend.

Aristocratic Friends Favored.

Instances almost without end can be cited in which you voted to place low duty on articles which are worn by men of your aristocratic class or placed upon your tables, and in which you voted to place a high duty on similar articles used by people in moderate or straightened circumstances. It would be a matter of more practical interest to the people of the state to receive from you a communication stating how much money this tariff bill places in your pocket each year and in what other way you have been benefited by your term in the senate of the United States than to receive your dictatorial instructions as to whom they should cast their vote for.

How many citizens of Oregon who "earn their bread by the sweat of their brow" honor you with their acquaintance? What effort have you ever made to acquaint yourself with the desires, hopes or requirements of the people who make Oregon great, namely, the producers?

During the four years since you were elected Portland and the state of Oregon have suffered immense loss in commercial ways on account of your neglect of official duties. Within the last few months you stood by and without protest permitted the reclamation acts to be so amended that this state lost over $5,000,000 which was due it, and should have been invested in irrigation projects in Oregon. This loss is only a small per cent of the actual damage we have incurred by reason of your dereliction in duty. By reason of your carelessness in this particular our desert lands will continue to be inhabited by the coyotes, jackrabbits and other creatures of the desert, when by the exercise of any reasonable diligence on your part these deserts would have been reclaimed and happy families would be inhabiting these lands, producing large crops which would have supplied the needs of other portions of the state. Even when the Board of Army Engineers was here last month to examine the Umatilla project with a view of correcting some of your errors and omissions, you did not have sufficient interest in the welfare and development of this state to accompany the party or to urge upon the members the merits of our only eligible reclamation project. You have devoted your time to tennis, golf and other pastimes, while our merchants have been denied their reasonable portion of contracts for government supplies. Yet you presume to dictate to the people of Oregon as to whether or not they shall support me.

Man of Many Parties.

In this interview you say: "All admire the courage of the man who goes down to defeat fighting for the principles in which he believes, but spurn with contempt the man who changes political creeds for the sake of victory," and "Chameleons and trucklers change their colors, but men of conviction fight for their principles to the death." Concerning some of these statements, there is no better authority in the state than yourself, for within the memory of young men you have been a Democrat, a Republican, a Populist, a non-partisan and all the time a demagogue.

It is manifestly apparent to all that you are no more a republican today than you were in 1896, when you undertook by treachery to use the office of secretary of the Republican State Central Committee to assist in electing Mr. Bryan president of the United States. It is also manifestly true that you are in league, and for some time have been working in complete harmony, politically and otherwise, with your Democratic colleague, Senator Chamberlain, and his protege and legatee, the Democratic nominee for governor of this state. While you prate about reform and the good of the people, you expect to use the office of governor of this state, if it can be placed in the hands of Mr. West, for the purpose of returning you to the senate of the United States and to perpetrate a further outrage upon the people of the country, and of course the other partner in this political compact expects at the end of his term to be rewarded by re-election. You desire to convey to the people of this state the false impression that I have sought to return to the old system of electing United States Senators, and by the old system I refer to that method made damnable by your own practices, which are well known to our citizens; which practices were instigated and contributed to by yourself, and your associates, and yet you know, and the record of this state will prove conclusively, that I have never at any time favored or undertaken such a course. You know that I voted for you in 1907, because the people of the district I represented gave you their votes, and that I did this notwithstanding the fact that I held you in the utmost contempt, both as a man and as a public official. I told you when you asked me whether I would support you, that I expected to do so solely upon the ground that my constituents had expressed a desire to have you represent them, and when I cast the vote for you I wanted you distinctly to understand it was the vote of the people of Gilliam, Wheeler and Sherman counties, and not my personal choice. In 1904, when I was first a candidate for the office of State Senator, I promised the people of my district that I would vote for that man for United States Senator whom I believed they would wish me to. This was before the direct primary law was adopted or even drawn. Statement No. 1 was at that time unheard of, and your own unsavory reputation was so apparent and notorious that I did not expect that I would be compelled to vote for you; nevertheless, when by the use of money and artifice you did carry the district I represented, I cast the vote intrusted to me for you. In 1908 I was again a candidate for the office of senator, and I again promised the people of those counties that I would cast their vote for United States Senator for the man chosen by them. Mr. Cake carried each of the three counties I represent, and in fulfillment of that promise, in 1909, I voted for Mr. H. M. Cake.

I wish to call your attention to the further fact that in the recent primary I did not only receive more votes than you did when you were a candidate for United States Senator, but that the plurality given to me was nearly four times as large as yours. As soon as you were nominated in 1906 you cried for party harmony and the support of the united party. I not only gave you my vote in 1907, but bowed to the will of the people as to your election and successfully supported the man for president of the senate whom you desired; you claimed that unless your candidate for president of the senate was elected, the will of the people would be thwarted and you would be defeated. Since your election I have asked you for nothing and do not ever expect to ask or receive at your hand any favor or courtesy, official or otherwise. Even the courtesy of a letter thanking me for the assistance rendered in bringing about your election was not forthcoming.

I entered the contest under the primary law in good faith. I publicly announced that I would support the successful candidate and expected my friends and supporters to do likewise. In the primary campaign you used all of your influence, official and personal, to defeat me. After a fair, open contest in which no improper methods were resorted to by any candidate, to my knowledge, I was successful, and I submit that any man who has any element of fairness in his makeup, or any desire to do that which is right, will, if he has been defeated in an open political contest, support the successful candidate. A man who has no regard for the obligations he owes his party, who is not acquainted with the rudiments of fair play and transgresses all the elements known as manliness by bolting a ticket solely for selfish reasons, is a traitor to the interests of the people, an enemy of the direct primary law and is devoid of any characteristics of real leadership. The difference between the venality of yourself and the conduct of the honorable gentlemen who opposed me in the primary election, is most marked. This contest between myself and the other opponents was devoid of acrimony, personalities or other unpleasant features, and these gentlemen are today loyally supporting the entire ticket.

I believe you are not sincere in your alleged devotion to the primary law. If you are I ask you to announce publicly whether or not you will by every means within your power oppose the amendment, change or repeal of the primary law and other laws that have been heretofore or at any time hereafter may be written on the statute books by the people. Yours truly,

JAY BOWERMAN.

Portland, Oregon, Oct. 3, 1910.

DAN MALARKEY [illegible] SUPPORT BOWERM[illegible]

Declares Attack on Ticket Is a Blow at Direct Primary Law.

(The Oregonian.)

Dan J. Malarkey, Republican candidate for joint senator and "progressive" leader in the anti-primary campaign has announced his firm intention to stand by and work for the election of Mr. Bowerman as Republican nominee for governor.

"I certainly am going to support Mr. Bowerman," said Mr. Malarkey in discussing the present political situation. "I did not participate in the late primary election, either as a voter or a candidate, with my fingers crossed. Nor did I regard it as a game of 'heads I win, tails you lose.' Unless those who participate therein abide by the result, a primary election of and within a political party under the direct primary law, serves no good purpose and is a mere waste of time and effort.

"One of the main objections to the old convention plan of nominating candidates was that through 'frame-ups' and slates and manipulation of delegates by unscrupulous and self-seeking political bosses, the candidates named by the convention were rarely the real choice of the rank and file of the party; and that such methods occasioned and frequently justified the opposition to such nominees of many members of the party.

Safeguards Are Ample.

"To overcome those objections the direct primary law was enacted. Under it any member of a party can with little trouble, become a candidate for nomination, and the candidate who receives the most votes in the big convention held on primary election day in which all the members of the party participate with equal voice and equal influence under the safeguards of the Australian ballot system and the registration law becomes the nominee of the party. Under the system no loyal Republican can consistently oppose one who has been so chosen as the nominee of his party.

"Mr. Bowerman complied with the direct primary law in becoming a candidate for the Republican nomination for governor in that he filed a sufficiently signed petition in regular form with the proper official and otherwise did everything required by that law. The primary election was regularly held and fairly conducted. No one contends that it was tainted by fraud or corruption. Notwithstanding the handicap of an assembly endorsement, Mr. Bowerman received the most votes for governor in that election and became the lawful nominee. I opposed his nomination. I voted against him in the primary election. But I bow to the will of the rank and file of the Republican party as expressed by the verdict of the ballot box. The Republicans have expressed their will. They have selected a republican ticket of which Mr. Bowerman is the head. He is just as surely and legally and rightfully the nominee of the party as I am or any other Republican who at the primary election received a plurality of votes cast for the nomination sought.

Party Will Expressed.

"It is said by those who would now have anti-assembly Republicans oppose Mr. Bowerman, that he was not the choice of a majority of the members of the party. Neither was Mr. Lafferty, who was nominated for congress in this district, nor Mr. Weinberger, who was nominated for constable in this city, the choice of a majority of the republicans who voted for candidates for those nominations.

[illegible] ...d ob- [illegible] ...ublican [illegible] ...senator. Becau[illegible] ...ional principle of my political creed is that the will of the people when deliberately expressed is supreme—and that applies to contests within the party for nomination as much as to contests in the general election between candidates of rival parties—I voted for Mr. Bourne for United States senator when I was a member of the state senate in 1907. I so accepted the verdict of the voters, notwithstanding the fact that I was elected to the state senate before our direct primary law, with its Statement No. 1 feature, was adopted, and was under no ante-election obligation so to do, and notwithstanding the further fact that I opposed Mr. Bourne's nomination and would certainly never have voted for him for United States senator if I had not felt it my duty to obey the popular mandate. Though I opposed Mr. Bowerman's nomination, I can certainly obey the popular mandate in this instance, by supporting him for governor more cheerfully and with more confidence that he will prove a good and worthy official than I did when I so voted for Mr. Bourne.

Baring the Feet at Worship.

In India Hindoos and Mussulmans alike wear both sandals and shoes (slippers) and the latter boots also, but the invariable rule is to remove them after entering a private house just when stepping on to the mat or carpet on which the visitor takes his seat. They must be cast off, the right boot or shoe first, before the worshiper enters a temple or mosque, and it is still regarded as an absolute profanation to attempt to enter either fully shod. But the domestic habit arose out of its obvious propriety, and the religious ritual of "the shoes of the faithful," now and for centuries past observed throughout Islam, can be demonstrated to have been dictated by, if indeed it be not derived directly from, the universal social etiquette of the east.

Facetious Nomenclature.

"The people of Wales escaped much when it was decided to call them Welshmen instead of Whalers."

"Yes, but it would have been still worse if they had called them Welshers."—Baltimore American.

He who brings ridicule to bear against truth finds in his hands a blade without a hilt.—Landor.

BOWERMAN STATES POLITICAL POLICIES

Will Support the People's Laws, Including the Direct Primary.

Portland, Ore.—(To the Editor.)—In the Portland evening papers of September 30 there appeared an interview credited to Senator Bourne, in which he endeavors to deceive the people into the belief that I am a reactionary and am not in favor of progressive legislation and favor returning to the old system of electing United States senators.

In answer to this communication and other false and misleading articles recently published, I wish to say: Statement No. 1 is a part of the direct primary law and I have heretofore publicly stated, and now state again, that I will oppose by every means within my power any effort to amend, modify or repeal, or in any other manner render less useful or less satisfactory, any part of the direct primary law, including Statement No. 1, or any other law written on the statute books by the people of this state under the initiative and referendum.

If I am elected governor I will veto any and every measure which attempts or undertakes to amend, change or repeal the direct primary law, Statement No. 1, or any other law adopted by the people, or any part of any of them. As a member of the senate and president of that body, I have never endeavored in any way, manner or form to induce any other member to violate his obligation or pledge under Statement No. 1, and if I am elected governor I shall pursue the same course and shall not in any manner or by any means interfere or attempt to interfere with the conduct of any member in this particular, or induce him to violate his pledge.

It is impossible for the governor to prevent the passage of any law for the legislature has it within its power to pass a bill over the veto of the governor. In order to prevent the possibility of any attempt being made to amend, modify or repeal any of these statutes, I would suggest that the candidates for the legislature be invited to subscribe to the same obligation I have heretofore taken and now take, namely, that they will oppose in every way any attempt to amend, modify or repeal any law made by the people. This will be an effectual guaranty to the people that these men, when elected, will not undertake to tamper with these laws, and I respectfully call upon the nominees to define their position upon this question.

I do not anticipate that Senator Bourne has any fear whatever that Statement No. 1 will be repealed or changed, or that I will violate any of the moral or legal obligations I would owe to the people as governor of this state, but I do believe he is simply indulging in a few cheap heroics for the two-fold purpose: first, of endeavoring to induce the people to forget his own shortcomings in the recent past as a senator, and second, in the further hope that he may create a false issue under which he might be returned to his high office. He evidently feels that he will need the office of governor to assist him in his primary campaign two years hence, and perhaps has many doubts as to his ability to coerce, or otherwise induce me to favor him over other candidates in that primary nomination.

JAY BOWERMAN.