

MERCHANT & KAMMERER

GOING OUT OF THE GENTS' FURNISHING GOODS AND CLOTHING BUSINESS. \$25,000 Stock of High Grade Merchandise to be Closed out regardless SALE COMMENCES TODAY AND WILL CONTINUE UNTIL SOLD OUT

Hart Schaffner & Marx Clothing and Overcoats, Boys' and Young Men's Knee Length and Long Pants Suits. Cluett and Monarch Shirts, Nettleton, Bannister Thompson Bros.' Shoes, Gautner & Mattern and Cooper's Underwear. Oil Clothing, Rubber Boots, Rubber Goods of all kinds. Mackintoshes, Leather Goods, Neckwear, Etc., Etc. Not a single article restricted from sale.

For the convenience of the men who may not be able to come during the day we will keep open every night until 8 p. m. Watch the papers for prices. See Window Displays. Come in and get prices. Supply your needs for the winter.

An opportunity of a lifetime.

Very Respectfully,

MERCHANT & KAMMERER.



Copyright 1909 by Hart Schaffner & Marx

SOUTHERN OREGON COMPANY REALLY BEHIND \$50,000 MEASURE.

Now, if we conclude that Mr. Bennett is not personally interested in the \$50,000 measure, why is he working and spending his money for it? It may be that it is not his money at all which is being spent, and it may be that Mr. Bennett is getting paid and paid well for the efforts he is making in behalf of such measure. We all remember that the Southern Oregon Company first tried to employ Attorney Sherwood of Coquille, to block the Port development, and Mr. Sherwood refused, because the case was without merit. Then the Southern Oregon Company went to Mr. Bennett and he became suddenly active with his injunction suit as attorney for the Southern Oregon Company. Mr. Bennett had known for some time of the contemplated bond issue by the Port, but he never said anything in opposition, never had a protest recorded until he was employed in behalf of Southern Oregon Company. That suit is still pending in the Supreme Court, and Mr. Bennett is still the attorney for the company. We would not expect him to act for the Company's interest in one case and against it in another. Whatever you may say of Mr. Bennett, he is a consistent fighter, when employed in a case, and if he can't win before the Courts, he will try to effect the same objects before the people. He has almost given up in the State Court, he is now trying the people, and if he loses out with the people, he has the suit in the Federal Court to fall back upon. The Southern Oregon Company is a non-producing timber and land holding company which owns hundreds of thousands dollars worth of property in Coos county. It has adopted the policy of closing up its mills and doing nothing to help develop the country. It will neither sell its property nor develop it, but the Company every day grows richer because other developed lands necessarily increase the value of the Southern Oregon Company's lands. And now Mr. Smith is going about among non-resident stockholders, attempting to buy the stock of the Company at a price of 15 cents on the dollar, saying that Coos county is never going to amount to anything, and that the Company's affairs are in litigation, etc. The Southern Oregon Company has fought the Port from its incorporation, and we expect will keep on doing so until Mr. Smith gets all the stock at his own price, then he will let the country develop so as to boom his stock and give him a chance to sell again. The Southern Oregon Company has two reasons for opposing the development of the Port. First, its holdings are centered in the townsite of

Empire, and the Company does not wish to have the Upper Bay developed so as to build a city at Marshfield and North Bend, for that would take things away from Empire; secondly, the Company does not want to spend money for any development, but wants the other land owners to increase the value of its holdings. A dog in the manger policy, and such a policy as Mr. Bennett would not attempt to defend in any person or corporation other than his client. If a voter wants to further the purpose of the Southern Oregon Company, then he should vote for the \$50,000 measure.

Result of \$50,000 Measure.
If the \$50,000 measure carries, it will not give the people of the Port anything which they have not now, it will not give us any greater rights. We have the recall, initiative and referendum, to control not only the policies of the Commission but the membership of the Commission as well. Now we can force an election whenever ten per cent of the people want it. Under Bennett's amendment we will have to have an election to vote on a proposition that all are in favor of. We make a burdensome necessity of that which is now a blessed privilege.

The \$300,000 Measure.
The Port Commissioners recognized that there was some opposition to bonding the Port, and hence has submitted this question to the people of the Port, as to whether a project of improvement shall be undertaken and carried out. To carry out any project of harbor improvement demands considerable money. It costs just so much to move a yard of dirt and just so many yards must be removed to dredge a channel so many feet deep and wide. If the people want harbor improvement and pass the \$300,000 measure, it will mean that we will enter upon the dredging of a main ship channel 20 feet deep at low tide and 300 feet wide in all places with 200 feet additional width in front of the towns. That is not an extravagant proposition, and the Engineer of the Port has calculated that such a project by contract to the best bidder would cost over \$200,000. So the bulk of the money will go to the dredging of this main ship channel which will be the big artery of commerce and will benefit every taxpayer in the Port. Does anyone think that this is too large a one think that this is too large a channel? If so, he should understand that such a channel will barely accommodate our present boats at all stages of the tide. If any one thinks the price is too large, let him consult an engineer, not necessarily the Port engineer, but any engineer who is competent to express an opinion. Mr. Bennett would have one think

that the coming of the dredge Oregon would remove all shoals and make sufficient improvement. This is not true. In the first place, the dredge Oregon cannot go out of its project, which is the center of the channel. The project does not follow the wharf lines at North Bend, so that the shippers of that town will in no wise be relieved by the dredging of the Oregon. And in calculating the above project, the engineer of the Port made allowance for all the dredging which the Oregon would do under the \$50,000 appropriation. Mr. Bennett knows as well as anyone that the bar dredge will not in any way develop the inner harbor, and it will not be ready for use for eighteen months at least. So, regardless of the appropriations of the last Congress, our harbor demands an immediate improvement by the local authorities. The dredge Oregon will help within the lines of its project, but \$50,000 appropriated at the last Congress will not give any appreciable aid, except on certain shoals, for the dredge will work straightaway to a depth of 18 feet as long as the money lasts,—this will not extend to the bar, so as a result we will be little better off, for we will have an unimproved channel between the ocean and the improved channel. A channel is as deep as its shallowest place and no deeper.

Then this measure provides an expenditure of \$50,000 on the improvement of the inlets and waterways emptying into Coos Bay. Is that extravagant? There are ten waterways emptying into Coos Bay this appropriation would only average \$5,000 each, yet Mr. Bennett, in his speech at the Chamber of Commerce said that every inlet ought to be improved by the abutting property as a street is improved. One would hardly know why the farmer should be taxed unless some of the fund is to be expended for the benefit of his transportation facilities.

The measure also provides for the purchase of lands suitable for Public Docks. Portland is today having the fight of its existence in attempting to wrest from the transportation corporations sufficient waterfront for Public Docks. Supposing Portland, twenty years ago had invested \$50,000 in Public Docks, then that investment would today retire a bond issue of \$300,000. So long as Harbors have the facilities for Public Docks, the corporations will be fair in the handling of freights, but if the Harbor is controlled by the corporations, then it will be bottled up in the interest of such corporations. We want a harbor here that every boat that floats can enter and dock, without asking the permission of some corporation which may be competing and charge such a dockage as to prevent the competing ship from

entering this Port. Public Docks will insure an open Harbor.

The \$300,000 Bond Issue.
Mr. Bennett's only argument against a bond issue, is the old cry of "Don't let your homes be mortgaged." He would make each man with a thousand dollar home believe that, in voting for a bond issue, he was voting to mortgage that home for \$300,000. Mr. Bennett's object in making such an argument, is first, to scare the voter into voting against the bonds and thus voting for the Southern Oregon Company, and, secondly to make such a hullabaloo that the voters will forget to investigate into the relationship existing between Mr. Bennett and the Southern Oregon Company.

So far as the mortgage is concerned, each voter's property will, in any event, only be liable for a proportionate tax to meet the payment of the bonds, in case the Port defaults in payment. The Property of the Port is now valued conservatively at \$15,000,000 so that a tax of 2 per cent is all that we are pledging our property to pay even if there were no change in conditions. But does Mr. Bennett think that there will be no change in conditions, is he a pessimist, does he not expect that in twenty years from now, when this bond issue will become due, that the value of the taxable wealth of this Port will have quadrupled, so that the tax would be only five mills, in case the Port should default in its bonds. But more than that, we are going to buy some water front which in twenty years will be worth such an amount as will redeem the entire bond issue, and if the Port defaults, then the property of the Port will retire the bond issue and no person's property will be taxed a cent's worth.

As a matter of fact, we, in voting bonds, are not going to mortgage our homes in any different manner or to any greater extent than the home is mortgaged each year. Nobody gets scared about the regular tax, why should we get frightened about the levy of a tax to retire a bond issue, which is the same in nature and effect as the regular tax. Mr. Bennett's argument in this regard is all bosh and he knows it.

The Heavy Tax Payers.
The large property holders, who will have to bear the greater proportionate share of the proposed bond issue are unqualifiedly in favor of it. Such men as C. A. Smith, L. J. Simpson, W. S. Chandler, P. Hennessey, William Grimes, and many others, who are first of all good business men, are in favor of the bond issue. What is considered best for the property owners by the successful business men and large property holders of the community, should be considered by the small property owner as good enough for him. You can't

benefit the big man without helping the small man as well.

The Non-Property Owner.
And if a man does not own property, and has no taxes to pay, but is working to get money enough to get property, then he should certainly be in favor of the bond issue. In the first place he pays no taxes and bears no burdens, and in the second place, he will benefit directly by having the opportunity to work on the project and get back in wages what the property owners pay out in taxes. Every laboring man should vote for the bond issue as he is thereby voting for his opportunity for employment.
Mr. Bennett recently went to the expense of a cartoon in a local paper in which he depicted his side of the argument, which is no argument at all but only a scare for the voters. He should have depicted Marshfield as a deserted village, with the ghost of the Bennett amendment winding its way among fallen wharves, deserted business blocks, and grass grown streets. For that is what will happen to Marshfield, if we don't develop our harbor and relegate Mr. Bennett and his client the Southern Oregon Company to the Back Ground. A vote for the bond issue and against the \$50,000 measure, is a vote for prosperity; any other vote is against our interest as a community and in favor of the Southern Oregon Company.

(C. R. Peck Paid Adv.)

TO YOUR INTEREST.

Coos County is entitled to representation in the Legislative assembly; will she have such if Storer Pierce as Joint-Representative, and Ed. Rackleff as Representative are elected? No. Why? Mr. Pierce is a resident of Curry County, so is Mr. Rackleff. Then, how will Coos secure proper representation?
The only choice left to the Coos County voter is to vote for R. A. Cople of Marshfield, for Joint-Representative.

If you do not do so, Coos is left out and will not have any one to vote for Your own interests. Democratic County Central Committee, by W. J. RUST, Sec'y.

IF THIS ISN'T "THE REAL THING," WHAT IS?

Good seven-room house, on Central Avenue, modern conveniences, slightly location, paved street, South front, close in, house could not be replaced for the price asked for the property. Steady renter. \$1,100.00 I. S. Kaufman & Co.

Take your SUNDAY DINNER at THE CHANDLER. Special menu and ORCHESTRA. RESERVE tables for PARTIES by PHONE.

POCKET flashlights. The Gunner.

VOTE YES ON NO. 318.

Briefly summarized, the argument in behalf of the Normal School at Monmouth results in this: All the States, and the National Government, supply Normal School training. The average taxpayer wants his child educated in the best way possible. The public school is the great leveler of the Nation, and the bulwark of American independence. The best teachers possible are none too good for this work. The child of the millionaire receives the same courteous treatment here at the hands of the trained teacher as does any other child. The average man is not able to employ a special tutor; he must depend largely upon the education and training which his child receives in the public school; beyond this but few ever advance in their educational work.

The cost of this work at Monmouth is but a bagatelle, only four cents on a valuation of \$1000. If this measure is defeated, it means the duplication of this property in some city, at a very heavy outlay of money to the ordinary taxpayer. The school must be located somewhere; it is in a healthy part of the state, easily accessible to the State Capitol by daily boat and rail service, and is directly connected with the metropolis.

Such schools as these ought not to be in large cities, for the work is peculiar in its nature, and the people who attend get larger results in the smaller towns. The best interests of the taxpayers, the best interests of the public schools, the best interests of the children of the public schools warrants every voter in voting Yes on No. 318 on November 5th.

FOR JOINT REPRESENTATIVE

S. F. Peirce, the Republican candidate for joint representative is a farmer and laboring man and is in a position to know and feel the needs of the working classes in Coos and Curry Counties. He has been a resident of the latter county for now thirty years and during that time has held public offices with full satisfaction to his people. These are items which are worthy of your consideration next Tuesday. Another consideration is that Curry is entitled to name a resident of that county as joint representative. This has been conceded for many years' and this season should be no exception to the rule. Give Curry representation among the law makers. It is entitled to their concession.

If Mr. Cople was so desirous of having Coos County represented why did he not come out as candidate for the Fifth District (Coos County)?—(Paid advertisement by J. S. Barton, sec'y Coos County Republican Central Committee.)