THE ARGUS

Entered at the Post-office at Hillsboro, Oregon, as Second class mail matter.

LUCIUS A. LONG, EDITOR.

County Official Paper.

ISSUED EVERY THURSDAY
— BY —
The Argus Publishing Company.

Subscription: One Dollar per Annum. Six Months, 60 cts; Three Months, 35 cts.

Opposed to Gold Mono-metallism. Believes in the Bimetallic Standard. Thinks we Ought to Take Care of our own People Before Annexing Hawaii. Has no use for Marcus A. Hanna.

TRUTHS PLAINLY SPOKEN.

The very active part which great corporations are taking in the political affairs of the country should be sufficient to alarm the rank and file of the nation's strength. To charge the men in these corporations with lack of patriotic ardor is neither here nor there, nor is it a fact that they are not patriotic in the strictest sense of the word. It is their absolute subservience to their own best interests when those interests clash with the best interests of the commonwealth that makes them dangerous. If citizens who are in the common walks of life would for an hour divest themselves of partisan prejudices and make a thorough analysis of the political situation, they would discover:

1. That these men, as a rule, and the exception here and there proves it beyond peradventure of doubt, stand together on economic ideas and vote, spend their money and time, for like principles, irrespective of party—that is to say, if they can not control one party, they will switch their support to another and control their adoption. Party is nothing to them. They are simply looking for their own financial betterment regardless of the wellfare of others.

2. That their money, unscrupulously used, has done more to corrupt our legislation than all other possible agencies combined and that their chiefest aim is to keep the great common people divided, as by this method they can keep the people warring while they retain political power.

These propositions alone should be enough to cause our producers to look into the great and vital economic questions of the day and not heedlessly cast their lot with any party because of its past, now buried. Politics is business, and farmers should begin to stand as closely together as those who are interested in debasing, as far as possible without utter collapse, the product and property, muscle and intelligence of the farm elements.

WHAT WE REPUDIATE.

Yes, we are repudiationists. We seek to repudiate the legislation which is tending to Europeanize this nation under the stolen garb of "national honor" and an "honest dollar." We seek to repudiate the monetary system which each year lends to confiscation of productive worth. We seek to repudiate the influences which are trying (and nearly succeeding) to fix the confiscatory policy upon our people. It will not do for our learned imitators, who should be in touch with the democracy of the nation, to assert that the law of supply and demand does not operate upon money as it operates upon all other things, for this is in open admission that a million dollars will give as good prices as a billion—a deduction quashed by every fact of history.

What we want to do is to repudiate the influences dragging us towards the condition of gold standard Spain, Portugal, Italy—all Europe, in fact. And Americans will yet do it. They are of too good ancestry to blindly submit to the partisan lash.

PLENTY OF MONEY, "YES."

We often hear that "money is plenty" and that more is in circulation at present than has been for years. Certainly, money is more plentiful in the banks and interest rates are lower, and no one desires to negative the statement. But why should money not be more plentiful in the wheat raising districts? When it is considered that the great European bread shortage gave us better export prices for our grains, with greater purchases, quantitatively, why should there not be more money in circulation? But this year's prices have receded, and with but a small part of the American crop removed, the balance yet to be thrown against the market, is it not reasonable to suppose that prices will sink still lower? Where, now is our "dollar wheat" of which our brothers were wont last spring to boast? Where now is the wheat raiser who has made a surplus the size of a gnat's eye winker for his 1898 crop? With the shortage which has obtained the last two years we should have received more than a dollar for each bushel of wheat raised.

So there is plenty of money. Especially so is this to those who have plenty of money and do not want to see more new money to come in competition with what they already have. These people realize that the law of supply and demand operates upon money as it does upon all other things. When we say "these people" we refer to those who understand the situation; not to those who follow and cuckoo any party platform; neither to those who think it popular to stand with those solely interested in money, nor to those who follow the beck and call of the intellectually commercial. "Plenty of money to those people means just what they want in the economic field, with very low prices and values of commodity and property and high values of dollars, when the normal again comes—and which is coming rapidly.

THE RIGHT OF CONTRACT.

Some of our gold standard friends complain that the Chicago platform would deprive them of the "right of contract" to get back gold, for gold loaned. Under bimetallic law there would be no legal tender difference between the silver dollar and the gold dollar. Either would buy the same amount of commodity for the simple reason that one pay as much debt, and no more, than the other. It would only be proper then, that no ulterior force or advantage should be granted one of the moneys, as against the other. With the license of a contract abrogated—a contract which is, under bimetallism, pratically immoral because of discrimination against the dollar the man in modern circumstances must purchase—the equities of each dollar would be the same, a condition earnestly to be desired by every advocate of honest money. The gold contract clause on its face is harmless enough within itself, but the effect of such a contract liberty under bimetallism would virtually be a detriment to trade relations in many respects. As a matter of public policy, no contract should be permitted, which, though not "mala in se," yet borders too closely to special privileges. The true economist desires law which stands for the greatest number. A contract which is license per se is not in touch with republican institu-ti...

BARGAIN AND SALE.

"It has been a record of unparalleled dishonor, disaster and incapacity."—Rep. platform 1896, speaking of the Cleveland admidistration.

This is the bitter dose swallowed by Henri Watterson and Joseph Pulitzer for the remuneration of slaver and sickly sentimentalism puked upon them by the bankers' magazines and the organs of the East and London, with the ducats which went along with it! For this Watterson and Pulitzer are trying to keep the great pulsating and producing elements divided, that the Hannaites may hold the balance of power. Fortunately Kentucky has repudiated the domination, while New York bids fair to follow.

ANARCHY OF THE WORST TYPE

It is rather amusing to see some of our "holier than thou" friends yelling "anarchy" at the bimetallists and yet voting or sanctioning the vote which decided to pay the 1897 holdup legislators for full time. Such payment was anarchy, pure and simple, but, as it was one of the anarchical methods used to elect a "patriot" to the senate, it is voted O. K. by our "friends of the flag." It was robbery, pure and simple—anarchy of the worst type. If the holdup legislators wanted anarchy and got it through the holding up of the state, the "stand and deliver" policy of paying them is simply heaping insult to injury. And yet, this is but one of unlawful methods used by our dear patriotic friends of "the best dollar" on earth, or in other words "cheap, nasty product."

MR. WALL REPLIES.

To the Editor: To acquire and maintain a good and great nation, men of firm convictions with the courage to advocate them are the greatest requirement. For this reason, and while differing with him on economic questions, I am glad to see Mr Huston give publicity through the columns of your last week's issue, to his views on national issues. While I very much deprecate the position he has taken, and the conclusions he arrives at, yet I am neverthele s possessed of a sense of approbation for his publicly announcing, at last, his convictions upon questions arresting the attention and inviting the consideration of the most careless and indifferent citizens. Mr. Huston is opposed to the declarations of the Chicago platform, and asserts that their vindication at the polls would be 'dangerous' to the institutions of the country. He admits that the free coinage of silver was the paramount issue in the Bryan campaign, and believes it will continue to be the leading issue until it "suffers an overwhelming defeat in 1900," when from his view, it will die a natural death. But as Mr. Huston did not attempt to discuss this all important question except to say that it is "dangerous" doctrine, and therefore a bad thing, I shall not undertake at this time to discuss it except to ask whether the gold standard is "safe" and therefore "good" and if so why support a platform which declares for free coinage of silver by international agreement and above all, its negative, "currency reform?" A *good* thing and a *safe* thing ought not to be threatened in any such manner. A gold standard man standing on the St. Louis platform says he believes in at one and the same time, in both a 'good thing' and a 'bad thing;' or he at least says he is willing to exchange a good thing for something he does not know whether good or bad; in other words he admits that the gold standard is not the 'best thing.' Assuming that Mr. Huston stands on the St. Louis platform—and I see no other place for him to stand—he confesses that currency reform is necessary; then why does he not, as a benefactor, conceive and propose a scheme for this admitted needed reform, instead of using his best endeavors in assertions that our idea is dangerous? Remember, it is hard to plan and easy to find fault. Let us change positions for a short time and perhaps we may write long articles criticizing his schemes; it might be an easier side to fight on. He admits reform is necessary, yet will neither accept our theory nor evolve one to succeed the chaos now existing. Thus continually putting us on the defensive without our opponents taking an affirmative. Mr. Huston's second objection is: "The denunciation of Cleveland for quelling the Chicago riot." I shall dismiss this objection, because it is a constitutional one, over the which great constitutional lawyers have differed, and it would indeed be presumptuous in me to say Cleveland was right or that he was wrong. The Chicago platform says in its preamble that the party is pledged to the 'faithful observance of CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS.' Who con ask for more? The third objection he makes is: 'The threat to reorganize the Supreme court whenever the democratic party shall have power to do so.' Does the Chicago platform say so? Here is what it says, after referring to the adverse decision on the income tax: We declare that it is the duty of congress to use all the constitutional power which remains after that decision, or which may come from its reversal by the court as it may hereafter be constituted, so that the burdens of taxation may be equally and impartially laid, to the end that wealth may bear its due proportions of the expense of government.' We still stand upon 'constitutional limitations.' If we do this, then how are we to pack the Supreme court? We might kill one or more of the Justices in order that a vacancy be made, and in this way 'pack the court.' Mr. Huston well knows that the Justices are appointed for life and vacancies are caused only by death, resignation or by malfeasance. Was it impolite for the Chicago platform to refer to the court by saying 'as it may hereafter be constituted?' He says Yes! But why? Does not the personnel of the court suffer change without breach of the constitution? Is it possible that a free silver administration would estop death or resignation, more than another? Justice Field recently resigned, and I suppose had the democrats had the power to have named his successor, no doubt our gold standard friends would have charged us with packing the court! The objection is certainly imaginary—the outgrowth of a too strong partisan hatred—and vanishes by force of its very absurdity. The last objection he makes is: The prohibition of the liberty of contract with reference to the class of money in which a debt is to be paid. On this question the plank of the Chicago platform reads: After declaring for free coinage of silver, etc., and demanding that the silver dollar shall be a full legal tender for all debts, it says: "We favor such legislation as will prevent for the future the demonetization of any kind of legal tender money by private contract." We are still standing upon sacred ground—the constitution of the United States; we are still for good government if the constitution be applied as the test. The constitution gives congress the right to 'coin money and regulate the value thereof.' Under this provision Mr. Huston will readily grant that if it is necessary for us to have any law, it is a law with relation to our circulating medium-money. Mr. Huston must again admit, that the best and the most honest money is the money which fluctuates the least in its purchasing and debt paying power. He will also admit that the government by permitting its citizens to discriminate against any of its several kinds of money "by right of private contract" it will as a result effect the exchange value of the class of money so discriminated against and therefore restrict its usefulness as a medium of exchange. The result would be the same with either gold or silver. If these propositions be true, self preservation the first law of nature being axiomatic, then no one can deny the government the right, legally, or morally, to pay to its subjects "you shall not be permitted to exercise the right of private contract by discriminating against the money of the country so long as that right subordinates to it the welfare of society." If not, you may as well say that the government has not the right to pass laws for its own preservation because it conflicts with the right of private contract. Why pass usury laws—why not allow men to charge more than 10 per cent? Why pass laws prohibiting trusts and combines? Why pass laws at all? There never was a law made that didn't put a restraint upon a man's natural "private rights." It is not at all probable, but were it not for the laws against it, Mr. Huston himself could run off with some otherman's wife, but for the welfare of society, the government says by law you shall not do so. But Mr. Huston says: "The proposition which declares that citizens shall not be permitted to contract for payment in as good money as they part with is repugnant to those democrats who believe with Jefferson that the best government is a government which governs the least." First, under proper laws one class of money will be as good as the other,—prohibit discrimination for example. Second, we will go further than either Mr. Huston or Thos. Jefferson and say that society [government] which does not require to be governed at all is perfection. But neither Jefferson nor Mr. Huston informs us how few or how many laws it requires to secure their ideal government. So the water is just as dark and murky as it was before they gave utterance to that high sounding phrase; it looks well in print and sounds pleasant to the ears, but that doesn't solve the problem,—this is an age of realities. And that fact brings me to the thought suggested by the words "mob element, and radicals" used by Mr. Huston. I am loath to criticize, but I am apprehensive that the men whom he designates as the "mob element" are men with families, struggling from day to day to secure a mere existence for themselves, wives and children, who are as dear to them as the wives and childrem of the most opulent. Men who are driven almost to despair from lack of the necessaries of life are not to be named as a mob. While these conditions exist is it to be wondered at that these men; victims of unmerited unavoidable circumstances become dissatisfied? That they should protest against conditions which create unceasing poverty on one hand and increasing wealth on the other? I venture the assertion that if there were no poor people there would be no "mob elements."—and mayhap they would be all advocates of the single gold standard; and more than that; they would perhaps be "conservatives," but I opine not gold standards. In conclusion, I cannot help but express my surprise at the interest Mr. Huston takes in showing why Bryan is not the logical candidate for 1900. If free coinage of silver will be paramount issue in the presidential campaign in 1900, which Mr. Huston concedes, then why is not Mr. Bryan the logical candidate? He is certainly an able advocate of that doctrine; there is not a man in the U. S. today who is admired more than he,—even his opponents admire him. But that is neither here nor there. The Chicago platform will be reaffirmed in 1900 by the democratic party and possibly by a faction of the populist party and the free silver republicans.

If so, then whoever the candidate

(Continued on next page.)

SUMMONS.

In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Washington county.

The Northern Counties Investment Trust, Limited, Plaintiff,
vs
W. W. Marquam, Lulu M. Marquam, Mary H. Coffin, Samuel White, E. K. Jones & Co., a corporation, Ida Adeline Eberle, Dennis J. Lyons and Washington County, Defendants.

To the defendants Mary H. Coffin, Samuel White, Ida Adeline Eberle and Dennis J. Lyons:

You and each of you are required to hereby take notice that a complaint in equity has been filed in the above entitled cause and in the above named court, and a summons has been issued thereon and filed on return, served in part as to some of the defendants, and returned not found in the State of Oregon, as to you and each of you, and that the said the above entitled suit so begun is now pending for the purpose of obtaining a decree adjudging that there is due and owing to the plaintiff from the defendant W. W. Marquam, the sum of $1388.20 with interest thereon at 8 percent, per annum on $1300 thereof from September 1, 1896, upon $57.40 thereof at like rate from November 27, 1897, on $24.05 thereof at like rate from March 4, 1898, and upon $6.75 thereof at like rate from June 27, 1898, and for the further sum of $150 as attorneys' fees in said suit, and for the purpose of obtaining a decree that the said sums of money aforesaid are a first lien and charge upon the following described property situate in Washington county, Oregon, to-wit:

Commencing at a point on the north line of the George Richardson Donation Land Claim in Section 36 township one south of range one west Willamette Meridian 437 feet westerly from the northeast corner of said claim, and running from this point as the initial point, south parallel with the east line of said claim 990.4 feet to the center of the Taylor's Ferry Road, so-called; thence along said road north 64° and 30' east 352 feet; thence north 48° 15' east 160 feet to a point on the easterly line of said claim which is 727.3 feet southerly from the northeast corner of the claim; thence southerly on the easterly line of the claim to a point 32 chains from the northeast corner of the claim; thence westerly at right angles and parallel with the north line of the claim 12.50 chains; thence northerly at right angles and parallel with the east line of the claim 32 chains to the north line of the claim; thence easterly at right angles and along the north line of the claim to the place of beginning which is a point westerly and 437 feet distant from the northeast corner of the claim, and being the same property described in the mortgage from W. W. Marquam to the Northern Counties Investment Trust, Limited, which is of record in book V of Mortgages of Washington county, Oregon, beginning at page 6, less the property released from said mortgage by releases executed by the Northern Counties Investment Trust, Limited, to W. W. Marquam, of record in book Y of Mortgages of said county, beginning at page 300, and book 32 of Mortgages of said county beginning at page 444.

The decree for a lien so prayed for being for a mortgage lien thereon under a mortgage upon the said properties and other properties, executed by W. W. Marquam to the plaintiff bearing date of February 25, 1891, recorded February 25, 1891, in book V of the records of mortgages of Washington county, Oregon, beginning at page 6; plaintiff likewise prays for a decree in said cause that said mortgage be foreclosed, and that the lien thereon for the moneys aforesaid is paramount to any interest or claim to the mortgaged properties by any of the defendants in said suit, including you and each of you, and prays for a sale of the mortgaged properties above described, and that thereby you and each of you be foreclosed from any interest or claim therein.

And now you, the said Mary H. Coffin, Samuel White, Ida Adeline Eberle and Dennis J. Lyons, are each required to appear in said suit and answer plaintiff's complaint filed therein, on or before the first day of the term of said court next succeeding the completion of publication of this summons, and which is the 4th Monday in November, A. D., 1898, and which is November 28th, and, unless you so appear and make answer, plaintiff will thereafter take default against you and each of you and apply to the court for the relief demanded in the complaint, which is substantially as set forth in this summons.

This summons and notice are published pursuant to an order of the Judge of said court passed on the 23rd day of September, A. D. 1898.

ZERA SNOW & WALLACE McCAMANT,
Portland, Oregon, Attorneys for Plaintiff.

First publication of this summons made on the 29th day of september, A. D., 1898.

SUMMONS.

In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Washington County.

S. B. Huston, Plaintiff
vs.
H B Hollenbeck and S E Hollenbeck, Defendants.

To H. B. Hollenbeck, the above named defendant;

In the Name of the State of Oregon, you are hereby required to appear and answer the complaint herein filed by Monday, the 28th day of November, 1898, the same being the first day of the next regular term of said Court, and if you fail so to appear and answer the complaint the plaintiff will apply to the court for the relief demanded in his complaint to-wit: For a judgment against you and S. E. Hollenbeck for the sum of $700, with interest thereon at the rate of 8 per cent per annum since August 22, 1896, and the sum of $50 attorney fees, and for the costs and disbursements of this suit; that a certain mortgage executed by you and S. E. Hollenbeck on August 22, 1896, and which is recorded on page 455 of Book 34 of Records of mortgages of Washington County, Oregon, be foreclosed and the land therein described sold according to law and the practice of this court for the satisfaction of plaintiff's said judgment and decree; said land being particularly described as the West half of the Southeast quarter of Section 22, Town 3 North Range 4 West of the Willamette Meridian; that the proceeds of said sale be applied first; to the payment of the costs and expenses of said sale, and second, to the satisfaction of plaintiff's judgment; and further, that you, and all persons claiming through or under you, be foreclosed of all right, title or interest in and to the same, save the statutory right of redemption. This summons is served upon you by publication by order of the Hon. Thos. A. McBride, Judge of the above named court, which said order is made and dated this 13th day of October, 1898.

S. B. HUSTON & JOHN M. WALL,
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

SUMMONS.

In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon for Washington county.

Herberdina Gertler, Plaintiff
v.
Frank Gertler, Defendant

To Frank Gertler, the above named defendant;

In the name of the State of Oregon you are hereby required to appear and answer the complaint herein filed by Monday the 28th day of November, 1898, the same being the first day of the next regular term of this court, and if you fail so to appear and answer the complaint the plaintiff will apply to the court for the relief demanded therein, towit, for a decree dissolving the marriage and marriage contract now existing between you and plaintiff, and for a judgment against you for the costs and disbursements of this suit, and for such other relief as to the court may appear equitable. This summons is served upon you by publication by order of the Hon. Thos. A. McBride, Judge of the above named court, which said order is made and dated at Chambers, Astoria, Oregon, this 26th day of September, 1898.

S. B. HUSTON,
Attorney for Plaintiff.

Administrator's Notice.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has been appointed administrator of the estate of Ambrose Cox, deceased, by the County court of Washington county, State of Oregon, and that all persons having claims against said estate are required to present the same properly verified, to me at the office of John M. Wall, Hillsboro, Oregon, within six months from date, this 13th day of Oct. 898.

John Wall,
Administrator of the estate of Ambrose Cox, deceased.

NOTICE.

City warrants up to August 1, 1895, now payable at the office of city treasurer, Schulmerich store, Hillsboro, Oregon, and interest will cease on same after this date.

Dated Sept. 14, 1898.

F. G. MITCHELL,
City Treasurer
By GEO. SCHULMERICH, Deputy