NOTICE.

Notice is hereby given to all whom it may concern that I have been made trustee and assignee of the estates of L. D. Kinney, The Belt Line Railway, a corporation and the Coos Bay Rapid Transit Co. also a corporation.

All persons having claims against said L. D. Kinney or against either of said corporations are hereby notified and requested to present the same to me, under oath at my office in Marshfield, Coos county, Oregon, within three months from and after the date of this notice. Outstanding contracts must be settled at once or they will be cancelled.

Dated August 15, 1911.

W. J. RUST, Trustee.

Home Study

Editor Times:

The opening of our schools, with the attendant thoughts of school efficiency and home cooperation, suggests the subject of home study.

As our courses of study are now fashioned and our schools conducted, home study is expected regularly from pupils in high school and in the upper grammar grades. It is expected, too, from healthy pupils in the lower grades when they fail to make suitable proficiency in their work.

It seems not unreasonable to demand some home study from healthy children whose principal occupation during the school year (in some cases only occupation) is study, and whose actual time in school is five and one-half hours in every twenty-four.

Home study has three good features: First, it has educational value. Many things in school work can be acquired only by continued, faithful repetition. They are like piano playing in that they are learned by very constant practice. This is true of spelling, of penmanship, of fundamentals of arithmetic, of oral reading, of memorizing, of principals of Algebra and Geometry, of language forms in Latin and German, of certain phases of history and grammar, and many other things. The home study period supplements the work of the school by affording just the time and the place for this helpful repetition—this necessary practice; Second, home study has a moral value. It affords a definite work for a definite time with a definite motive. Regularity is recognized both by specialists and laymen as peculiarly effective in training for good morals in children. Since home study is not hard but simply a matter of "getting at" a task it can be listed nicely among the regular duties of children, many of whom in this age of labor saving inventions have few, if any, regular home duties; Third, it tends to secure cooperation between home and school. It gives the parent a fine chance to show that he is interested in the school, and the psychological effect of this on the child is great. School takes on an entirely different aspect if father and mother show in no unmistakeable way, that they are interested in what goes on there. A visit to the school by a parent often gives the school a reality and an importance in the child's mind that it never assumed before the visit. This new importance of the school tends to improve the child's scholarship. Interest at home in the school tasks of children will produce some of the same good effects that a personal visit to the school will produce although both are necessary. A writer in the September number of the Normal Instructor in an article entitled "Securing Home Cooperation" makes this very point. He says, "No teacher needs to be reminded of the advantage possessed by the pupil who can have regular intelligent help from his parents. This is especially true of the pupils of the lower grades who usually feel less responsibility in regard to their home work than older ones and need every possible incentive to get it done as it should be. With any pupil, however, the value received during the school year can easily be doubled by active home cooperation."

Shall we not strive for school efficiency in every posible way?

F. A. TIEDGEN,
Superintendent of Schools.

BANDON MEN IN TROUBLE

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE MATTER IN RE SLAUGHTER OF "SPOTTED FAWNS" AS RELATED BY THE JUSTICE WHO HEARD THE CASE.

Editor Times:

Attention has been called to an article in your issue of Aug. 30, last, which seems to be in need of substantial correction.

It has to do with H. E. Noak, Sam Barrow, Rev. H. C. Hartranft, B. F. Klepefer and H. C. Schmoke, who were brought before me on the 5th of last Aug. on complaint of State Deputy Game Warden F. M. Morgan, charging them with "willfully, wrongfully and knowingly having in their possession a spotted fawn, or deer of the first year."

The penalty in the books for this misdemeanor is by fine of not less than $50 nor more than $250 or by imprisonment in the county jail not less than 60 days, nor more than 90 days or by both such fine and imprisonment; which penalty some people consider rather rough punishment for the misdemeanor named (for it is not classed with crimes.)

The reader will note that $50 is the minimum fine, i. e. is the least within the power of the court to impose.

This meant $250 from the five defendants if proven guilty, half of which goes into the County Treasury, less the expenses of the trial, and the other half goes into the pocket of the informant, in this case, State Deputy Game Warden F. M. Morgan.

At the inception of the trial, defendants were informed of their right to have attorneys, separate trials and a jury if they so desired; and upon complaint being read to them, the 'bunch' pleaded 'not guilty' and announced themselves ready to go on with the matter as individuals and that too without attorney or jury. Prosecuting Attorney Liljeqvist was out of the county, and the attorney who was to represent him in such state matters during his absence, failed to materialize, and we had to go on with the trial as best we could. An entire day was broken up, and nearly four hours consumed by the court in the investigation; none too little that substantial justice might be done.

State Deputy Game Warden F. M. Morgan was the first and only witness produced for the state; was sworn, and told his story about the business, and during his testimony produced and exhibited one spotted fawn skin and another which remained upon the dead body of the lovely little animal. The witness gave in his evidence after the manner of a man who had great confidence in his cause and made a faithful and proper exhibit of the slaughtered fawns, but did not in any manner connect the defendants with said fawn skins other than the statement that they were found at, or near, the free-for-all-comers cabin where the defendants were, or had been camped, and upon this testimony the state rested its case.

And the court understood that this was all the testimony it was possible to produce for the state and Mr. S. D. G. W.—F. M. Morgan seemed to think it was all sufficient.

The defendants were then informed of their right each to make a statement in their own and comrade's defense, whereupon Rev. Hartranft arose and said he would be glad to tell the court what he knew about the matter; took the stand; was sworn and testified.

After a few preliminaries, as to residence, occupation, etc., he turned to the remains of the two fawns lying near the witness' chair, and said with a determined emphasis: "Your Honor, I declare on my solemn oath that I never saw those things until I saw them here in this court room," nor did the cross examination by the S. D. G. W.—F. M. Morgan in any way change that plain, square statement.

Following Rev. Hartranft's testimony, the other defendants were sworn and testified, but no one convicted himself, or their reverend comrade, with "willfully, wrongfully and knowingly having in their possession spotted fawn or deer of the first year" on the fourth day of August, 1911, or at any other time. But during the examination the fact came out that the cabin where the party had lodged was a free-for-all-cabin, and that when they took possession of it, there was evidence of recent occupation, by unknown parties and thereupon defendants rested their case.

In his summing up the court in part said: "It is quite evident that two spotted fawns or deer of the first year have been killed by some one at, or near, or adjacent to, the cabin used by the defendants for a lodging place for a night or two, but the court does not find from the evidence, that defendants were near enough connected with the business to be amerced, each and all, in even the minimum fine of $50, or in fact, any sum. In my judgment, if there is anything clear about the affair, it is a clear case of 'not proven;' in other words the court considers the evidence insufficient to convict.

"Nor do I believe that five as respectable gentlemen as the defendants before me would deliberately perjure themselves for a pair of little fawns. And furthermore, as the court sees it, the preponderance of proof is largely in favor of the defense, and therefore defendants must be acquitted."

About a week or ten days after the trial and acquittal of the defendants above named, L. A. Liljeqvist, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, came into my office accompanied by a stranger, whom he introduced, but whose name I failed to catch, who almost at once wished to see the records and files, in the case of "The State vs. H. E. Boak et al." The open docket was placed before him, together with the complaint, but he, without giving much attention to what he had asked for, began to criticise the court about the matter and his reasons for discharging defendants; whereupon the court asked a question, to-wit:

"What is all this about, anyway?"

Mr. Liljeqvist: "This is the State Game Warden."

The Court: "In that case, Sir, defendants were discharged because of insufficient testimony to convict, the defendants having the preponderance of testimony, and the benefit of the doubt," or words to that effect. "Why, Sir," the court continued "almost the first words Rev. Hartranft said after taking the stand, was that he had never seen those fawn skins until he saw them in this court room, and his co-defendants amply substantiated that statement—the which if you want to know more about I would suggest that you had better see the parties concerning whom you are quizzing me. I got through the trial of the case on the 5th."

And upon this statement of facts, the very honorable (?) State Game Warden Finley gives out a full grown falsehood for publication of which the following is a verbatim copy, as printed in your paper, August 30th, last:

"State Game Warden Finley alleges further that Justice Holden stated that his principal reason for deciding contrary to the evidence introduced by the State, was the statement of Rev. H. C. Hartranft, pastor of the Presbyterian church of Bandon, denying the charges."

Whereas the fact is that the statement of the reverend gentleman had no more influence with the court than that of any of his co-defendants, all of whom testified under oath. I had never seen or heard of any one of them until they came into my court room that morning.

Therefore, if Mr. State Game Warden Finley made any such statement as that given above about this court, he is, or was, as economical of the truth as was Satan, when he wheedled our mother Eve. In other words, he is a plain, contemptible liar, and may God have mercy on his soul.

One word more. Of course Mr. S. D. G. W.—F. M. Morgan felt a good deal "left" because the court did not multch each of those five defendants $50, as in that case he would have reveled in half the proceeds; but alas, when he saw that that $125 was not coming his way, he could scarce restrain his wrath until he got out of hearing, and then, how he did roar! and get his "Boss" Finley down into Coos to have all the doings of that "Old Fool Court" ripped up the back and done over again more to his liking.

It is barely possible, however, that they may find themselves up against a little constitutional provision that saith, "No person shall be put in jeopardy twice for the same offense."

These five co-defendants had a full and complete trial under the code. The state put in all the evidence it was capable of producing (or if it did not, it was the illustrious (?) Deputy's own fault, and the Court under his oath of office, in full consideration of all the facts, acquitted them. The S. D. G. W.—F. M. Morgan failed to get the $125 he was after and to that extent, is decrying the Court, whose verdict, so far as we know (except as to himself and "Boss") everybody else approves.

No doubt the aforesaid "Deputy" feels deeply disgruntled over his loss of "spoils," but the Court has no apologies to make either to him or the great (?) State Game Warden—Finley, or any other man.

One thing is certain that this court, in its seven years of service, has never rendered a verdict it was better satisfied with than that herein considered, and which these "spotted fawn" fellows are raising such a roar about, and libelling a conscientious court. I do not think the Grand Jury will spend any more time on them than is necessary to "fire them out of court."

E. G. D. HOLDEN,
Justice of the Peace,
Third District, Coos Co., Ore.

PURELY PERSONAL PARAGRAPHS.

I am 77½ years old

And not yet in the "sear and yellow leaf."

Can walk a mile in 15 minutes, and more at the same gait if necessary.

Am serving my fourth term as Justice of Peace of this (Third) District of Coos county.

Have been a resident of Oregon 12 years, and have lived without criticism, so far as I know, until of very recent date.

Previous to coming to Oregon, I lived in Kent County, Mich., 54 years, and in the city of Grand Rapids (its county seat) 47 years and left it in broad day light.

In point of population, Kent county Mich. was, and is, the second county in the state.

I was admitted to the Bar at Grand Rapids, Mich., March 5th, 1859, and licensed to practice in all the courts of the state, and as soon as it was established, also in the U. S. District Court of the Western District of Michigan.

Was elected Prosecuting Attorney of Kent County in November, 1862, and again in November 1864, and had to do with all the crimes in the catalog from murder down to assault and battery in my four years of service and with marked success.

In 1874 I was unanimously nominated by acclamation in a state convention of over 700 delegates for Secretary of State, and elected, and again in 1876 I was re-elected in the same manner for the same office, and again elected by the largest majority accorded any candidate on the state ticket that year, as shown by the archives in the State Department.

After the last above office held in Michigan, I devoted a straight twenty years to my own private business, and held no other official position until I was made Recorder of Coquille in 1902, and twice re-elected, and a part of this time also held the "Ancient and Honorable" office of Justice of the Peace, in Coos county, District No. 3, which the same I am now endeavoring to fill, as in the past, to the satisfaction of my constituents, of whom S. D. G. W.—F. M. Morgan is not one.

I want State Game Warden Finley and his "deputy" to know that when beaten in court it is only the "Fool-Ass" who rushes into print to libel better men.

In church matters, I am an humble member of the Methodist Episcopal army, "a foot thick, yard wide, and all wool; and incidentally let me add, that I have married 115 couples since I became Justice of the Peace, and expect to make it 150 at least before Brother (?) Morgan puts me out of office.

E. G. D. HOLDEN.