

RAISON WAS PAID

Return of Young Cudahy Cost His Father \$25,000.

HOW THE BOY WAS ABDUCTED

Messing Letter of His Kidnapers— Omaha Millionaire Packer Lost No Time in Depositing the Gold at the Point Designated.

OMAHA, Dec. 20.—Edward Cudahy, Jr., who was kidnaped Tuesday evening, held for ransom of \$25,000 in gold, which the young man's father unhesitatingly paid, has been returned to his family.

At 1 o'clock Wednesday, a horseman rode past the Cudahy mansion on the eighth street and threw a letter into the lawn. A servant noted the action, and, seeing the letter, found it contained the information that the young man had been kidnaped and was safe and was being held for a ransom. Three hours later, Mr. Cudahy received through the mails a second communication, naming the conditions under which the boy would be surrendered to himself. The condition named was that Mr. Cudahy should deposit \$25,000 in gold in a place indicated by the letter, north of the city on a lonely road leading up the bank of the Missouri River.

Mr. Cudahy shortly after supper entered a high-top buggy and after securing the money, started out entirely alone for the place designated by the kidnapers. To identify himself, he had attached to the front of the buggy a red lantern, which was one of the conditions of the letter. Mr. Cudahy drove north on the Sherman-avenue road to a point about five miles from the city, where he found the road leading up the river bank, but when Mr. Cudahy arrived there nobody was in sight. He at once alighted, placed the bag of gold conveniently near the door, and without waiting for developments, returned to the city without hearing a sound.

That the bandits were near the spot and at once secured the valuable package, he doubted. For about 1 o'clock this morning the young man ran breathlessly up to the front door of his father's home and rang the bell for admission. Two policemen, who in the early evening had been placed near the family mansion, had later been sent to the stables by Mr. Cudahy, who feared that should the police return they would see the policeman who had driven away without leaving him. The boy came in so suddenly the police knew nothing of it until a member of the family went to the stables to get the horse, and the young man had returned and that their services could be dispensed with.

Notwithstanding that the entire police force of the city, several "Pinkertons" from Chicago and half a hundred of Mr. Cudahy's own men have been searching diligently for a clue leading to the capture of the outlaws ever since the boy's disappearance, nothing has been developed to give the least idea of the identity of the men who perpetrated the deed. The police are confident that they will get it, for he will see the condition of your child and realize the fact that we mean business and will not be mollified by any offer of money.

THE KIDNAPERS' LETTER.

The letter sent to Mr. Cudahy is as follows: "Omaha, Neb., Dec. 18.—Mr. Cudahy: We have kidnaped your child and demand \$25,000 (twenty-five thousand dollars) for his safe return. If you give us the money the child will be returned as safe as when he was taken. If you refuse, we will put acid in his eyes and blind him, then we will immediately kidnap another millionaire's child that we will not let go until we have the money we get it, for he will see the condition of your child and realize the fact that we mean business and will not be mollified by any offer of money. Get the money all in gold, \$5, \$10 and \$20 pieces, put it in a white wax sack, get in your buggy alone on the night of December 19 at 7 o'clock P. M. and drive south on the highway, turn right on the turn west on Center and drive back to Ruser's Park and follow the paved road toward Fremont. When you come to a lantern that has been placed on the road, place the money near the lantern and immediately turn your horse around and return home. You will know our lantern, for it has two red ribbons, black and white, tied on the horse. You must place a red lantern on your buggy, where it can be plainly seen, so we will know you a mile away. This letter and every part of it must be kept secret, and the money, and any attempt at capture will be the saddest thing you ever do. If you remember, some 20 years ago Cudahy kept a man named Sargey, who was a young man with \$25,000 ransom asked. Old man Ross was willing to give up the money, but Burns, the great detective, with others, persuaded the old man not to give up the money, and the street the thieves would be captured. Ross died of a broken heart, sorry that he allowed the detectives to detain to him. This letter is not to be seen by any one but you. If the police or some stranger knew its contents, they might attempt to capture us, although against your wish, and some might see the lantern and represent us, thus the wrong party securing the money, and this would be as fatal to you as if you refused to give up the money. So you see the danger if you let the letter be seen. "Mr. Cudahy, you are up against it, and there is only one way out. Give up the coin. Money we want and money we get. If you don't give up the money, the next man will, for he will see that we mean business, and you can lead your boy around blind the rest of your life, and all you will have is the copper string. Do the right thing by us, and we will do the same by you. If you refuse, you will soon see the saddest thing you ever see."

"Wednesday, Dec. 18.—This night or never. Follow these instructions and no harm will befall you or your son."

THE BOY'S STORY.

Young Cudahy detailed the following circumstance of his disappearance: He said he was in front of General Cowan's house, in front of his own home, on his way back from the Rostin residence. Tuesday evening, when two men approached him. One of them stepped up to him and said: "We are Sheriffs from Sargey County, and we rest you as Eddie McGee, who escaped from the reform school." The lad protested that he was not the mythical Eddie McGee, but his captors said that he would have to be identified. They placed him in a buggy and drove to Leavenworth street, and thence south to Leavenworth street, a motor car passed them. The lad recognized the conductor and said to his captors: "There is a man who knows me; he can identify me." But the captors immediately blindfolded him, and drove across the street. The lad thinks that they crossed Leavenworth street and then drove in a southerly direction. Presently they came to a house, which in the opinion of the lad, is somewhere in the southwestern part of South Omaha.

Young Cudahy was taken from the

THE COMMON POINT RATE

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CONCESSION.

L. R. Seelye Says That a Seaport Right at the Ocean Should Be Recognized.

PORTLAND, Or., Dec. 18.—(To the Editor.)—The time has arrived when the Editor of this paper should be advised that the common point rate is a concession that should be made.

I believe that unless a seaport right at the ocean is recognized and utilized, and quickly, too, Puget Sound ports will continue to be the only ports of the maritime business of this country. While the common point is extended to the mouth of the Columbia River, then it will be extended to the great seaport of Oregon, Washington and Idaho, and Portland, Seattle, Tacoma and Spokane, because of Pugetian. How does it favorably to ship the products of the entire country embraced in the territory of this trinity of seaports.

Mr. Hughes in a letter to The Sunday Oregonian, November 11, makes three declarations which I will quote, and endeavor to show that they are not based on facts.

First declaration: "The seaport of the Columbia is at Portland, for the sole and only reason that this is the proper and only natural place for it, and it will remain here for the reason that it cannot be established and maintained at any other point on the Columbia River save at a steady and continuous expense for maintenance." My answer to this is: No ship can reach Astoria unless it first reaches and then passes Astoria. The expense to the Federal Government and Port of Portland for dredging the channel from Astoria to Portland for the last 10 years has been probably not less than \$2,000,000, and the towage bills of the O. R. & N. Co. up and back for this 10 years are probably not less than \$500,000. Altogether, say \$2,500,000, making a grand total at least of \$3,000,000. These figures are approximated, and I would like them given accurately, if Mr. Hughes is so sure of his facts.

Second declaration: "There is no such thing in the world as the principal seaport of the Pacific coast, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port.

Third declaration: "When the means of transportation can be found cheaper than the hold of a sea-going vessel, the seaport of the Columbia will move from Astoria to the mouth of the river." Answering this I again state: In the 10 years mentioned, probably 4,000,000 tons has gone out of the river for foreign and home trade, and from Portland to sea, as shown, is some \$2,500,000, or 70 cents per ton; while this tonnage could have been delivered from Portland to Astoria by rail for a cost more than 40 cents per ton, making a total of \$2,000,000, which is \$400,000 less than if it had not gone in the hold of a ship. This showing is true, and it is exactly true as to the principle, if not right as to the amount approximated, then according to Mr. Hughes' own statement, "the head of the Columbia will move from Portland to the mouth of the river," because the "hold of a ship" is not the cheapest way to take ocean-bound freight from the coast, but to the contrary it is the most expensive way.

In explanation of the general rule, the transportation of cargoes in the hold of a sailing vessel is the cheapest way we must remember that this applies only to a vessel while at sea, under sail, in her natural element, propelled by the wind, and not to a vessel under tow, or if she is towed to sea to her destination, or takes a tug outside to come into the river, or a river steamer to tow her 200 miles up and back from Portland, the cost of towing her, especially if she has to have an artificial and expensive waterway provided for her, is 50 per cent of the cost of the ship to Portland. To make it plain, if Portland was right at the ocean and without river towage, as Astoria is, then sailing vessels could come right into her harbor, as they frequently do at Astoria (but as a rule they are towed), then Portland would be as cheap a seaport as Astoria now is. Look at it another way: Portland and Astoria, would Mr. Hughes then advise taking the ships past Portland and 100 miles inland to Astoria, and pay useless river towage and expend thousands of dollars to dredge a channel, or would he not be advocating a common point at the sea, and be entitled to it by all the natural laws that govern commerce? "Fair rule that won't work both ways."

Here I beg leave to quote from "General Address by George H. Daniels, General Passenger Agent, New York, Boston & Hudson River Railroad, and President of the American Association of General Passenger Agents, before the International Commercial Congress, at Philadelphia, October 25, 1897."

"Transportation underlies material prosperity in every department of commerce. Without transportation commerce would be impossible. Those states and nations are rich, powerful and enlightened whose transportation facilities are best and most extended. The dying nations are those with little or no transportation facilities."

Railroads Supercede Canals.

"One hundred years ago the Governor of the great State of New York advised his friends not to invest their money or waste their time in aiding the building of railroads, expressing the opinion that, while it was possible that improved methods of construction and perfected machinery might in the remote future, enable the people to make a car upon a railroad at the rate of one or six miles per hour, he did not believe that they could

THE COMMON POINT RATE

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CONCESSION.

L. R. Seelye Says That a Seaport Right at the Ocean Should Be Recognized.

PORTLAND, Or., Dec. 18.—(To the Editor.)—The time has arrived when the Editor of this paper should be advised that the common point rate is a concession that should be made.

I believe that unless a seaport right at the ocean is recognized and utilized, and quickly, too, Puget Sound ports will continue to be the only ports of the maritime business of this country. While the common point is extended to the mouth of the Columbia River, then it will be extended to the great seaport of Oregon, Washington and Idaho, and Portland, Seattle, Tacoma and Spokane, because of Pugetian. How does it favorably to ship the products of the entire country embraced in the territory of this trinity of seaports.

Mr. Hughes in a letter to The Sunday Oregonian, November 11, makes three declarations which I will quote, and endeavor to show that they are not based on facts.

First declaration: "The seaport of the Columbia is at Portland, for the sole and only reason that this is the proper and only natural place for it, and it will remain here for the reason that it cannot be established and maintained at any other point on the Columbia River save at a steady and continuous expense for maintenance." My answer to this is: No ship can reach Astoria unless it first reaches and then passes Astoria. The expense to the Federal Government and Port of Portland for dredging the channel from Astoria to Portland for the last 10 years has been probably not less than \$2,000,000, and the towage bills of the O. R. & N. Co. up and back for this 10 years are probably not less than \$500,000. Altogether, say \$2,500,000, making a grand total at least of \$3,000,000. These figures are approximated, and I would like them given accurately, if Mr. Hughes is so sure of his facts.

Second declaration: "There is no such thing in the world as the principal seaport of the Pacific coast, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port.

Third declaration: "When the means of transportation can be found cheaper than the hold of a sea-going vessel, the seaport of the Columbia will move from Astoria to the mouth of the river." Answering this I again state: In the 10 years mentioned, probably 4,000,000 tons has gone out of the river for foreign and home trade, and from Portland to sea, as shown, is some \$2,500,000, or 70 cents per ton; while this tonnage could have been delivered from Portland to Astoria by rail for a cost more than 40 cents per ton, making a total of \$2,000,000, which is \$400,000 less than if it had not gone in the hold of a ship. This showing is true, and it is exactly true as to the principle, if not right as to the amount approximated, then according to Mr. Hughes' own statement, "the head of the Columbia will move from Portland to the mouth of the river," because the "hold of a ship" is not the cheapest way to take ocean-bound freight from the coast, but to the contrary it is the most expensive way.

In explanation of the general rule, the transportation of cargoes in the hold of a sailing vessel is the cheapest way we must remember that this applies only to a vessel while at sea, under sail, in her natural element, propelled by the wind, and not to a vessel under tow, or if she is towed to sea to her destination, or takes a tug outside to come into the river, or a river steamer to tow her 200 miles up and back from Portland, the cost of towing her, especially if she has to have an artificial and expensive waterway provided for her, is 50 per cent of the cost of the ship to Portland. To make it plain, if Portland was right at the ocean and without river towage, as Astoria is, then sailing vessels could come right into her harbor, as they frequently do at Astoria (but as a rule they are towed), then Portland would be as cheap a seaport as Astoria now is. Look at it another way: Portland and Astoria, would Mr. Hughes then advise taking the ships past Portland and 100 miles inland to Astoria, and pay useless river towage and expend thousands of dollars to dredge a channel, or would he not be advocating a common point at the sea, and be entitled to it by all the natural laws that govern commerce? "Fair rule that won't work both ways."

Here I beg leave to quote from "General Address by George H. Daniels, General Passenger Agent, New York, Boston & Hudson River Railroad, and President of the American Association of General Passenger Agents, before the International Commercial Congress, at Philadelphia, October 25, 1897."

"Transportation underlies material prosperity in every department of commerce. Without transportation commerce would be impossible. Those states and nations are rich, powerful and enlightened whose transportation facilities are best and most extended. The dying nations are those with little or no transportation facilities."

Railroads Supercede Canals.

"One hundred years ago the Governor of the great State of New York advised his friends not to invest their money or waste their time in aiding the building of railroads, expressing the opinion that, while it was possible that improved methods of construction and perfected machinery might in the remote future, enable the people to make a car upon a railroad at the rate of one or six miles per hour, he did not believe that they could

THE COMMON POINT RATE

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CONCESSION.

L. R. Seelye Says That a Seaport Right at the Ocean Should Be Recognized.

PORTLAND, Or., Dec. 18.—(To the Editor.)—The time has arrived when the Editor of this paper should be advised that the common point rate is a concession that should be made.

I believe that unless a seaport right at the ocean is recognized and utilized, and quickly, too, Puget Sound ports will continue to be the only ports of the maritime business of this country. While the common point is extended to the mouth of the Columbia River, then it will be extended to the great seaport of Oregon, Washington and Idaho, and Portland, Seattle, Tacoma and Spokane, because of Pugetian. How does it favorably to ship the products of the entire country embraced in the territory of this trinity of seaports.

Mr. Hughes in a letter to The Sunday Oregonian, November 11, makes three declarations which I will quote, and endeavor to show that they are not based on facts.

First declaration: "The seaport of the Columbia is at Portland, for the sole and only reason that this is the proper and only natural place for it, and it will remain here for the reason that it cannot be established and maintained at any other point on the Columbia River save at a steady and continuous expense for maintenance." My answer to this is: No ship can reach Astoria unless it first reaches and then passes Astoria. The expense to the Federal Government and Port of Portland for dredging the channel from Astoria to Portland for the last 10 years has been probably not less than \$2,000,000, and the towage bills of the O. R. & N. Co. up and back for this 10 years are probably not less than \$500,000. Altogether, say \$2,500,000, making a grand total at least of \$3,000,000. These figures are approximated, and I would like them given accurately, if Mr. Hughes is so sure of his facts.

Second declaration: "There is no such thing in the world as the principal seaport of the Pacific coast, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port.

Third declaration: "When the means of transportation can be found cheaper than the hold of a sea-going vessel, the seaport of the Columbia will move from Astoria to the mouth of the river." Answering this I again state: In the 10 years mentioned, probably 4,000,000 tons has gone out of the river for foreign and home trade, and from Portland to sea, as shown, is some \$2,500,000, or 70 cents per ton; while this tonnage could have been delivered from Portland to Astoria by rail for a cost more than 40 cents per ton, making a total of \$2,000,000, which is \$400,000 less than if it had not gone in the hold of a ship. This showing is true, and it is exactly true as to the principle, if not right as to the amount approximated, then according to Mr. Hughes' own statement, "the head of the Columbia will move from Portland to the mouth of the river," because the "hold of a ship" is not the cheapest way to take ocean-bound freight from the coast, but to the contrary it is the most expensive way.

In explanation of the general rule, the transportation of cargoes in the hold of a sailing vessel is the cheapest way we must remember that this applies only to a vessel while at sea, under sail, in her natural element, propelled by the wind, and not to a vessel under tow, or if she is towed to sea to her destination, or takes a tug outside to come into the river, or a river steamer to tow her 200 miles up and back from Portland, the cost of towing her, especially if she has to have an artificial and expensive waterway provided for her, is 50 per cent of the cost of the ship to Portland. To make it plain, if Portland was right at the ocean and without river towage, as Astoria is, then sailing vessels could come right into her harbor, as they frequently do at Astoria (but as a rule they are towed), then Portland would be as cheap a seaport as Astoria now is. Look at it another way: Portland and Astoria, would Mr. Hughes then advise taking the ships past Portland and 100 miles inland to Astoria, and pay useless river towage and expend thousands of dollars to dredge a channel, or would he not be advocating a common point at the sea, and be entitled to it by all the natural laws that govern commerce? "Fair rule that won't work both ways."

Here I beg leave to quote from "General Address by George H. Daniels, General Passenger Agent, New York, Boston & Hudson River Railroad, and President of the American Association of General Passenger Agents, before the International Commercial Congress, at Philadelphia, October 25, 1897."

"Transportation underlies material prosperity in every department of commerce. Without transportation commerce would be impossible. Those states and nations are rich, powerful and enlightened whose transportation facilities are best and most extended. The dying nations are those with little or no transportation facilities."

Railroads Supercede Canals.

"One hundred years ago the Governor of the great State of New York advised his friends not to invest their money or waste their time in aiding the building of railroads, expressing the opinion that, while it was possible that improved methods of construction and perfected machinery might in the remote future, enable the people to make a car upon a railroad at the rate of one or six miles per hour, he did not believe that they could

THE COMMON POINT RATE

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CONCESSION.

L. R. Seelye Says That a Seaport Right at the Ocean Should Be Recognized.

PORTLAND, Or., Dec. 18.—(To the Editor.)—The time has arrived when the Editor of this paper should be advised that the common point rate is a concession that should be made.

I believe that unless a seaport right at the ocean is recognized and utilized, and quickly, too, Puget Sound ports will continue to be the only ports of the maritime business of this country. While the common point is extended to the mouth of the Columbia River, then it will be extended to the great seaport of Oregon, Washington and Idaho, and Portland, Seattle, Tacoma and Spokane, because of Pugetian. How does it favorably to ship the products of the entire country embraced in the territory of this trinity of seaports.

Mr. Hughes in a letter to The Sunday Oregonian, November 11, makes three declarations which I will quote, and endeavor to show that they are not based on facts.

First declaration: "The seaport of the Columbia is at Portland, for the sole and only reason that this is the proper and only natural place for it, and it will remain here for the reason that it cannot be established and maintained at any other point on the Columbia River save at a steady and continuous expense for maintenance." My answer to this is: No ship can reach Astoria unless it first reaches and then passes Astoria. The expense to the Federal Government and Port of Portland for dredging the channel from Astoria to Portland for the last 10 years has been probably not less than \$2,000,000, and the towage bills of the O. R. & N. Co. up and back for this 10 years are probably not less than \$500,000. Altogether, say \$2,500,000, making a grand total at least of \$3,000,000. These figures are approximated, and I would like them given accurately, if Mr. Hughes is so sure of his facts.

Second declaration: "There is no such thing in the world as the principal seaport of the Pacific coast, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port.

Third declaration: "When the means of transportation can be found cheaper than the hold of a sea-going vessel, the seaport of the Columbia will move from Astoria to the mouth of the river." Answering this I again state: In the 10 years mentioned, probably 4,000,000 tons has gone out of the river for foreign and home trade, and from Portland to sea, as shown, is some \$2,500,000, or 70 cents per ton; while this tonnage could have been delivered from Portland to Astoria by rail for a cost more than 40 cents per ton, making a total of \$2,000,000, which is \$400,000 less than if it had not gone in the hold of a ship. This showing is true, and it is exactly true as to the principle, if not right as to the amount approximated, then according to Mr. Hughes' own statement, "the head of the Columbia will move from Portland to the mouth of the river," because the "hold of a ship" is not the cheapest way to take ocean-bound freight from the coast, but to the contrary it is the most expensive way.

In explanation of the general rule, the transportation of cargoes in the hold of a sailing vessel is the cheapest way we must remember that this applies only to a vessel while at sea, under sail, in her natural element, propelled by the wind, and not to a vessel under tow, or if she is towed to sea to her destination, or takes a tug outside to come into the river, or a river steamer to tow her 200 miles up and back from Portland, the cost of towing her, especially if she has to have an artificial and expensive waterway provided for her, is 50 per cent of the cost of the ship to Portland. To make it plain, if Portland was right at the ocean and without river towage, as Astoria is, then sailing vessels could come right into her harbor, as they frequently do at Astoria (but as a rule they are towed), then Portland would be as cheap a seaport as Astoria now is. Look at it another way: Portland and Astoria, would Mr. Hughes then advise taking the ships past Portland and 100 miles inland to Astoria, and pay useless river towage and expend thousands of dollars to dredge a channel, or would he not be advocating a common point at the sea, and be entitled to it by all the natural laws that govern commerce? "Fair rule that won't work both ways."

Here I beg leave to quote from "General Address by George H. Daniels, General Passenger Agent, New York, Boston & Hudson River Railroad, and President of the American Association of General Passenger Agents, before the International Commercial Congress, at Philadelphia, October 25, 1897."

"Transportation underlies material prosperity in every department of commerce. Without transportation commerce would be impossible. Those states and nations are rich, powerful and enlightened whose transportation facilities are best and most extended. The dying nations are those with little or no transportation facilities."

Railroads Supercede Canals.

"One hundred years ago the Governor of the great State of New York advised his friends not to invest their money or waste their time in aiding the building of railroads, expressing the opinion that, while it was possible that improved methods of construction and perfected machinery might in the remote future, enable the people to make a car upon a railroad at the rate of one or six miles per hour, he did not believe that they could

THE COMMON POINT RATE

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CONCESSION.

L. R. Seelye Says That a Seaport Right at the Ocean Should Be Recognized.

PORTLAND, Or., Dec. 18.—(To the Editor.)—The time has arrived when the Editor of this paper should be advised that the common point rate is a concession that should be made.

I believe that unless a seaport right at the ocean is recognized and utilized, and quickly, too, Puget Sound ports will continue to be the only ports of the maritime business of this country. While the common point is extended to the mouth of the Columbia River, then it will be extended to the great seaport of Oregon, Washington and Idaho, and Portland, Seattle, Tacoma and Spokane, because of Pugetian. How does it favorably to ship the products of the entire country embraced in the territory of this trinity of seaports.

Mr. Hughes in a letter to The Sunday Oregonian, November 11, makes three declarations which I will quote, and endeavor to show that they are not based on facts.

First declaration: "The seaport of the Columbia is at Portland, for the sole and only reason that this is the proper and only natural place for it, and it will remain here for the reason that it cannot be established and maintained at any other point on the Columbia River save at a steady and continuous expense for maintenance." My answer to this is: No ship can reach Astoria unless it first reaches and then passes Astoria. The expense to the Federal Government and Port of Portland for dredging the channel from Astoria to Portland for the last 10 years has been probably not less than \$2,000,000, and the towage bills of the O. R. & N. Co. up and back for this 10 years are probably not less than \$500,000. Altogether, say \$2,500,000, making a grand total at least of \$3,000,000. These figures are approximated, and I would like them given accurately, if Mr. Hughes is so sure of his facts.

Second declaration: "There is no such thing in the world as the principal seaport of the Pacific coast, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port.

Third declaration: "When the means of transportation can be found cheaper than the hold of a sea-going vessel, the seaport of the Columbia will move from Astoria to the mouth of the river." Answering this I again state: In the 10 years mentioned, probably 4,000,000 tons has gone out of the river for foreign and home trade, and from Portland to sea, as shown, is some \$2,500,000, or 70 cents per ton; while this tonnage could have been delivered from Portland to Astoria by rail for a cost more than 40 cents per ton, making a total of \$2,000,000, which is \$400,000 less than if it had not gone in the hold of a ship. This showing is true, and it is exactly true as to the principle, if not right as to the amount approximated, then according to Mr. Hughes' own statement, "the head of the Columbia will move from Portland to the mouth of the river," because the "hold of a ship" is not the cheapest way to take ocean-bound freight from the coast, but to the contrary it is the most expensive way.

In explanation of the general rule, the transportation of cargoes in the hold of a sailing vessel is the cheapest way we must remember that this applies only to a vessel while at sea, under sail, in her natural element, propelled by the wind, and not to a vessel under tow, or if she is towed to sea to her destination, or takes a tug outside to come into the river, or a river steamer to tow her 200 miles up and back from Portland, the cost of towing her, especially if she has to have an artificial and expensive waterway provided for her, is 50 per cent of the cost of the ship to Portland. To make it plain, if Portland was right at the ocean and without river towage, as Astoria is, then sailing vessels could come right into her harbor, as they frequently do at Astoria (but as a rule they are towed), then Portland would be as cheap a seaport as Astoria now is. Look at it another way: Portland and Astoria, would Mr. Hughes then advise taking the ships past Portland and 100 miles inland to Astoria, and pay useless river towage and expend thousands of dollars to dredge a channel, or would he not be advocating a common point at the sea, and be entitled to it by all the natural laws that govern commerce? "Fair rule that won't work both ways."

Here I beg leave to quote from "General Address by George H. Daniels, General Passenger Agent, New York, Boston & Hudson River Railroad, and President of the American Association of General Passenger Agents, before the International Commercial Congress, at Philadelphia, October 25, 1897."

"Transportation underlies material prosperity in every department of commerce. Without transportation commerce would be impossible. Those states and nations are rich, powerful and enlightened whose transportation facilities are best and most extended. The dying nations are those with little or no transportation facilities."

Railroads Supercede Canals.

"One hundred years ago the Governor of the great State of New York advised his friends not to invest their money or waste their time in aiding the building of railroads, expressing the opinion that, while it was possible that improved methods of construction and perfected machinery might in the remote future, enable the people to make a car upon a railroad at the rate of one or six miles per hour, he did not believe that they could

THE COMMON POINT RATE

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CONCESSION.

L. R. Seelye Says That a Seaport Right at the Ocean Should Be Recognized.

PORTLAND, Or., Dec. 18.—(To the Editor.)—The time has arrived when the Editor of this paper should be advised that the common point rate is a concession that should be made.

I believe that unless a seaport right at the ocean is recognized and utilized, and quickly, too, Puget Sound ports will continue to be the only ports of the maritime business of this country. While the common point is extended to the mouth of the Columbia River, then it will be extended to the great seaport of Oregon, Washington and Idaho, and Portland, Seattle, Tacoma and Spokane, because of Pugetian. How does it favorably to ship the products of the entire country embraced in the territory of this trinity of seaports.

Mr. Hughes in a letter to The Sunday Oregonian, November 11, makes three declarations which I will quote, and endeavor to show that they are not based on facts.

First declaration: "The seaport of the Columbia is at Portland, for the sole and only reason that this is the proper and only natural place for it, and it will remain here for the reason that it cannot be established and maintained at any other point on the Columbia River save at a steady and continuous expense for maintenance." My answer to this is: No ship can reach Astoria unless it first reaches and then passes Astoria. The expense to the Federal Government and Port of Portland for dredging the channel from Astoria to Portland for the last 10 years has been probably not less than \$2,000,000, and the towage bills of the O. R. & N. Co. up and back for this 10 years are probably not less than \$500,000. Altogether, say \$2,500,000, making a grand total at least of \$3,000,000. These figures are approximated, and I would like them given accurately, if Mr. Hughes is so sure of his facts.

Second declaration: "There is no such thing in the world as the principal seaport of the Pacific coast, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port. My reply to this statement is: The principal seaport of the Pacific coast is at Astoria, and the head of navigation for sea-going vessels, where the course of the river is in the line of the commerce which passes through the port.

Third declaration: "When the means of transportation can be found cheaper than the hold of a sea-going vessel, the seaport of the Columbia will move from Astoria to the mouth of the river." Answering this I again state: In the 10 years mentioned, probably 4,000,000 tons has gone out of the river for foreign and home trade, and from Portland to sea, as shown, is some \$2,500,000, or 70 cents per ton; while this tonnage could have been delivered from Portland to Astoria by rail for a cost more than 40 cents per ton, making a total of \$2,000,000, which is \$400,000 less than if it had not gone in the hold of a ship. This showing is true, and it is exactly true as to the principle, if not right as to the amount approximated, then according to Mr