OREGON SENATOR MAKES REPLY

basis of their action, I was under obligation to try the cases.

I resigned as attorney for the Columbia River Railroad company immediately after my election, though it was but a local road and no matter in which it was interested could possibly come before congress; but I wished to devote all my time to the duties of my office, as I have done. When not attending congress, I have spent most of my time going over the state, securing information to aid me in representing it. While I never have said anything about it, or sought to advertise it, yet it is a fact that for two years before the rate law containing the anti-pass provision was enacted, I declined to ride to and from Washington on a pass, but paid for myself and family, not even permitting my clerks to ask for passes, as they will all testify, for it is a matter they very distinctly remember.

Hall-Brownell Matter.

I have, in previous communications and interviews, given the facts in regard to the Mitchell letter in which I concurred, hence will not take time or space here to repeat. The entire burden of that letter relates to Borwnell's candidacy for congress and is devoted to explaining why we could not take part in it. I have no recollection of signing the letter, but doubtless did. When it was first made public, only an excerpt therefrom was given, and I had not the slightest recollection concerning it. When it was published in full, however, by the Oregonian, I recalled that Mitchell had told me of Brownell's request that we assist him in his candidacy for congress. I told Mitchell I could not do it, and suggested that he explain to him how entirely inadvisable and out of the question it would be for us to do so.

Mitchell wrote that letter, and no doubt brought it to me and asked me to concur. It is my belief that I never read it, or I would more distinctly recall it; besides it was not unusual for him to write a letter and come to me, telling me what in substance he had said, and ask me to indorse thereon my approval. Be that as it may, it should be observed that the letter was written by Mitchell, speaking in the singular throughout. The further fact should be kept in mind in reading this letter, and it is true as well of all the Mitchell letters, namely, that it was in Mitchell's language, not mine. He was a most kind hearted and impulsive man. He had a deep affection for Brownell. I do not know, of course, all he said to Hall, but I do know that he never told me that he would support him for reappointment.

Letter From Brownell.

On the contrary, he always averred the he was under a promise most sacred to stand by Moreland. I have never seen any of the Brownell-Mitchell letters, but from the letters now given out it appears that on October 28, 1903, Brownell wrote to Mitchell saying that Hall was threatening to indict him, etc., and in that letter he complained that I had not earnestly supported him, etc. On the same day Brownell wrote me a letter as follows:

Oregon City, Or., Oct. 28, 1903.—My Dear Mr. Fulton—I have been considering the matter of the appointment of a United States district attorney, and have concluded that the best and safest political course for you and Senator Mitchell to take will be to reappoint Hon. John H. Hall, the present incumbent. He has made an exceptional record in the office. Then I think it will, outside of its good effects in Multnomah county, tend to strengthen you and Senator Mitchell with the administration. This course being adopted will satisfy me. Hoping that you are well and succeeding in your new life, I am sincerely yours,

GEO. C. BROWNELL.

Observe that not a word did he say to me about Hall threatening to prosecute him.

Fulton's Answer.

On November 3, 1903, I received the above letter, and answered it as follows:

Washington, D. C., Nov. 3, 1903.—Hon. Geo. C. Brownell, Oregon City, Or.—My Dear Mr. Brownell: I have just received your letter of the 28th ult., in which you request me to support Mr. John Hall for the position of United States district attorney. I cannot understand your purpose in writing such a letter. Not that I am unfavorable to Mr. Hall for the position; on the contrary there is no man I think more highly of than I do of him. But that is not the question. If you absolutely withdraw from the race, as I assume you do by writing this letter, then I will have to consider the claims of all my friends who are applicants. Before leaving Oregon, however, at your very earnest request and representations that it would be to your interest to have Mr. Campbell appointed, I met Mr. Campbell in your presence and assured him of my support. It is true he understood, and I understood, that it was to your interest, and that you and he were to be associated in some way, the particulars of which I did not inquire about, nor did I care to be informed. I assume from your letter recommending Mr. Hall that satisfactory explanations have been given Mr. Campbell, and yet would like to have something from him showing that he has retired from the field. Before taking further action in the matter I will write him. As I have said, I entertain a very high opinion of Mr. Hall. He is my personal friend, and he rendered me very valuable aid and support in my contest for the senatorship. But there are others to whom I am under great obligations also. For instance, our friend Eddy of Tillamook would like to have the position, and you know what my obligations are to him. Then there is Kelly of Linn, who is also a candidate, and a warm friend of mine. Hence, in view of the fact that you have withdrawn from the race, not only yourself, but have I supposed arranged with Campbell satisfactorily so that he will not be a candidate, I cannot make any promise at this time as to what I will do in the way of supporting a candidate for the position. I must, however, have something from Campbell to show that he has absolutely retired before I can discuss the matter of supporting any other candidate, because I feel that I am under promise to support Campbell. Had you not brought him to me and secured my promise directly to him, it would be different, for otherwise the promise would be simply to you, and that you could release. It is true that in a sense my promise was only to you, even though Campbell was present, for he fully understood that it was for you and in your interest that the promise was made. Of course Senator Mitchell has made Campbell no promise, as I understand, and consequently he is differently situated, and while it is likely you could secure Senator Mitchell's support if you withdraw, I do not know what Senator Mitchell will do.

One thing I want to say to you, Brownell, and that is that you are doing me a very great injustice by things that you are saying of me. I receive a letter every once in a while detailing statements of what you have said repeatedly. I cannot understand why you should take the statements, as I have been very earnest in your support, and have been willing to do anything to secure your appointment, all of which is well known to the other members of the delegation, and indeed I think everybody who takes any part in politics in the state of Oregon. It is true that I feel under obligations to you for your support of me, but I had also supported you before. You could not have been elected president of the senate without my support, and then I did many other things for you of which you know and which it is unnecessar, to mention, all of which ought to be I think some evidence of my friendship for you. Now do not think that in view of what I have done you ought to accuse me of either want of earnestness in your support, or of having done anything against your interest without some proof of it.

Sincerely yours, C. W. FULTON.

Brownell answered, but said nothing about Hall. The following is his letter:

Brownell Talked Too Much.

"Oregon City, Or., Nov. 10, '03.—Hon. C. W. Fulton, U. S. Senate, Washington, D. C.—My Dear Sir and Friend: I have at all times, so far as I know, spoken very kindly of you. There was a few times in my talk with Senator Mitchell and Minto, about the time that you and I were being interviewed in the Oregonian, when I was worried to death and very much discouraged about my health, that I might possibly have said that I did not like the way things were going. Within my heart, I have always felt very kindly to you, and do now. It is sincerely my hope and wish to do all I can in the future for you and Senator Mitchell both. You must, my dear friend, make some allowances for my nervous temperament, and the way I have been used by many has made me, at times, get very blue with everybody. I understand the situation now, and you can simply forget those things, as I have had to forget many things from others. You certainly know that I would not injure you knowingly for the world; no longer ago than yesterday I was telling Baker and W. W. Cotton, and others, that you had been very true to me, and that I had to be to you, and I wanted you to be re-elected when the time comes; and I mean this as sincerely as anything I have ever said to you or Mitchell. I would suggest to you and I believe sincerely that who has ever written to you have very much exaggerated what I may have said.

"The real truth is I am working for you and Mitchell every day, not only in my own county, but wherever I can build up sentiment for you both. I will admit, however, that I was probably a little foolish last summer before you left and might have talked too much, so let it go, and remember old times and we will begin over again.

"With kindest wishes for your health and also Senator Mitchell's, I remain, sincerely your friend,

"GEORGE C. BROWNELL."

It will be seen from the above how far I was from supporting, or proposing to support Hall.

Brownell Scared.

It is true that Mitchell told me afterwards, in substance, what Brownell had written him about Hall's alleged threats. I said to Mitchell that I did not believe a word of it. That in my judgment, Brownell being frightened, thinking the interior department was after him, wanted to court favor with Hall by making him think that he (Brownell) had secured his (Mitchell's) support for him, and, knowing that Mitchell was pledged to Moreland, had put up this story to induce Mitchell to abandon Moreland; that I recalled that, for some reason, Brownell had all along been very anxious, apparently, to conceal the fact of his own candidacy for the attorneyship, when he was a candidate therefor; that Hall had several times told me that Brownell had told him that he was not a candidate, and that, when I had told Brownell about it, he had laughed, and said he did not want anyone to know what he was doing. I stated that, probably, later Brownell had concluded to get on the good side of Hall by supporting him, and adopted these tactics to secure Mitchell's support. Such was the view I took, for I could not and did not believe Hall guilty of the conduct charged.

Many Contradictions.

Indeed Brownell's course with me relative to his own candidacy justified that view, for he had so vexed and annoyed me by his inconsistent and contradictory statements to others that I several times remonstrated with him and, on one occasion, addressed him the following letter on the subject:

"Astoria, Or., June 14, 1903.—Hon. George C. Brownell, Oregon City, Oregon.—My Dear Brownell: I received your letter of the 9th instant on my arrival home this morning. We reached no conclusion yesterday. You say you have had no conversation with Hall, excepting along the lines mentioned to me. Now pardon me for making the suggestion that I think you make a mistake in saying you do not want the office, that is, if you do want it, as you assure me you do. It places me in rather an unpleasant position to be continually met by other applicants for the position with the statement that you assure them that you do not care about it. Hermann, for instance, was informed that you had agreed to wait for two years, serving out your time as a member of the state senate. Now, statements of this character, unless you actually mean them, only tend to embarrass us.

"I will be in Portland on Wednesday, the 17th instant. Sincerely yours,

"C. W. FULTON."

The above letter was in response to one by Brownell to me on June 9, which I give below, and in which he refers to a conversation I had had with him criticising him for having told Hall that he did not care for and was not seeking the office, and in which he had affirmed that he had simply evaded the question, because Hall was a good fellow and he disliked to appear to be against him.

Wanted Attorneyship.

The following is Brownell's letter of the 9th:

"Oregon City, Or., June 9, 1903.—Hon. C. W. Fulton, United States Senator, Astoria, Or.—My Dear Sir and Friend: I desire to thank you for the engraving or picture of the 33 members who stood together for you in the senatorial contest just passed; I should have written to you and thanked you for it sooner, but overlooked it. Now you understand that I have had no conversation with John Hall excepting upon the idea on the line expressed by me to you in your room; of course, I want the attorneyship and want it bad, and hope you will be able to get Mitchell and Hermann to stay with you at the meeting on the 12th. I had a conversation with Mitchell last night, and I have no doubt but what if you are firm with him that he will arrange some scheme to have Moreland withdraw, so as to make it easy for you and him both. With sincere regards, I remain sincerely your friend,

"GEORGE C. BROWNELL."

And here I will refer to a bit of Brownell's testimony in the Steiwer case in which he said he had a secret promise from Mitchell to support him. It will be seen that he here makes no such representation to me, but says that he hopes I "will be able to get Mitchell to stay with me" for him, and that if I will be "firm with him" he will arrange for Moreland "to withdraw"; that is, he wants me to insist on Mitchell trying to have Moreland withdraw. I do not pretend to any knowledge of Brownell's understanding with Mitchell, but I do assert that Brownell never claimed to me that Mitchell had promised to abandon Moreland for him. Were it otherwise why was he urging me to try to get Mitchell to stay with me for him at a meeting to be held on the 12th?

Calls Brownell Perjurer.

Another statement Brownell made in his testimony, is wholly untrue. He testified that he turned over to me at my request some letters that I had written him. The statement is absolutely untrue. He never turned over to me a single one of my letters to him, and I never asked him for one. Indeed, he gave all of my letters to Mr. Heney. I had no objections, for I never wrote him a letter that all the world might not see.

The above letter of November 3, 1903, in which I declined to promise my support to Hall at his request, has been published by Heney. How did he get it? From Brownell. Mr. Brownell, of course, testified for immunity, and I pity him; but it is a strange nature, one I cannot understand, that in order to save himself, is willing to bear false witness against another, particularly one who has done so much for him as have I.

He apparently forgets that, when I returned to Oregon after his indictment, he called on me, and, crying, told me that he was without money wherewith to employ an attorney. I asked him whom he wanted. He said he preferred Judge Bennett, and thereupon I told him I would employ Bennett for him, and I did so. It is true that he delivered to me the Washington telegram from Hall, but not with any letters of mine.

Explains Telegram.

The way he happened to give me that telegram was this: On my return to Oregon, when I met him, I asked him why he should have made so peculiar a request of me as that contained in his telegram given below. He said that Hall had wired him to wire me. I said I did not think Hall asked him to make the request of me that he made, but he was unable to understand that he had made an extraordinary request and afterwards brought Hall's original telegram to him and left it in my room. I give it below. Other statements of Brownell's of minor importance, while incorrect, I will not now mention.

Now the above letters clearly show that Brownell had never complained to me that Hall was threatening him; but, on the contrary, that he was friendly with Hall. It also appears by my letter to Brownell of November 3, that he had ceased to be a candidate for United States attorney before I left for Washington in the fall of 1903, for, in that letter, I call his attention to the fact that he had requested me, and I had promised, to support Campbell, and it also appears that, when he indorsed Hall and asked me to support him, I declined to promise so to do. Such then was the situation so far as I was concerned up to January, 1904, when Hall came to Washington. All these letters from which I have quoted, which passed between Brownell and me, it should be remembered, Heney has in his possession, for Brownell turned over to him our entire correspondence.

Now, while Hall was in Washington, where he had come at the request of the attorney general, I received from Brownell the following telegram:

Oregon City, Or., Jan. 16, 1904.—Hon. C. W. Fulton, U. S. Senate, Washington, D. C.: All in all I think best political thing to do for you and Senator Mitchel is to reappoint Hall. If you do this Hall should, I feel, do something for me, for I am having a big fight in this county against Steel and Apperson combination. GEO. C. BROWNELL.

Says He Wanted Bribe.

This is the telegram to which I above referred. It was practically asking me to ask Hall to pay him (Brownell) a sum of money in consideration of my support of Hall. I never answered the telegram or spoke of it to Hall. As above stated, Brownell brought to my room Hall's original telegram to him. It reads as follows:

Washington, D. C., Jan. 16, 1904.—Geo. C. Brownell, Oregon City, Oregon: Wire Fulton for my appointment. JOHN H. HALL.

I am, fortunately, in possession of the original of each of the above telegrams as delivered by the Western Union, and I will let any person inspect them and also every letter I herein quote who may desire so to do. Now these two telegrams constitute absolute proof that there was no combination between Hall and me, or Brownell, Hall and me.

In the first place, had Brownell expected me to ask Hall to protect him from prosecution, that would certainly have been doing enough for him, and he would not have requested me to exact financial aid for him in his Clackamas county fight also.

In the second place, if I had promised Hall my support on condition of his support of Brownell, why should Half wire out from Washington to Brownell urging him to ask me to support him? Remember, Hall was then in Washington, where and when Heney charges the agreement to protect Brownell was entered into, pursuant to the complaint made by Brownell in his letter to Mitchell.

Hall Had Trouble.

Is it not quite clear that Hall was finding it difficult to secure my support of his candidacy? Hall had been in Washington some days when he sent that telegram. Indeed, he left for home on the 20th, and this telegram was sent by him to Brownell on the 16th, asking him to wire me to support him. Brownell did so and asked me to ask Hall to help him in Clackamas county.

Clearly Hall and I had not entered into any agreement and clearly I was declining to promise him my support. In truth I never did agree to support him. I told him that, should he secure other members of the delegation sufficient with my vote to make a majority, I would support him. That is all.

It is true that, when Hall arrived, I asked what there was about Brownell being threatened with prosecution. Hall said that he did not know of any evidence implicating Brownell in the land frauds; that he understood the government claimed to have evidence to the effect that Brownell had attached his notarial seal to certain affidavits when the parties had not actually appeared before him.

Careless and Foolish.

I said I should deeply regret his indictment; that, while Brownell was careless and foolish, he was not vicious, and that I had no doubt that whatever he had done he had done through thoughtlessness, and had received nothing for it, and that I trusted he would be as lenient as he could, consistent with his duty.

Hall spoke most kindly and assured me that, so far from being disposed to persecute Brownell, he would greatly regret being compelled to prosecute him, and that he had no intention of so doing, unless a case of intentional wrong-doing should appear. Such, in substance, was my conversation with Hall about Brownell. It is exactly what I should say at any time in behalf of any person.

Is it conceivable that if Hall and I had entered into an agreement whereby I was to support him and he protect Brownell, he would have wired Brownell to wire me urging me to support him? And had Brownell supposed I was to do so on condition that Hall was to protect him that he would have wired me as above? The contention is absurd. But that is not all. As a matter of fact neither Mitchell nor I ever supported Hall or recommended his reappointment. Indeed, Mr. Heney admits in his speech that he alone was responsible for Hall's reappointment.

Actions speak louder and more strongly than words. Let actions speak here. After we returned to Oregon, in the summer of 1904, and long after the date of the alleged conspiracy, we held a meeting of the delegation at the Hotel Portland to select a United States attorney. We took many ballots. I was the only member who at any time voted for Hall. I voted for several others, but Mitchell and Williamson continued to vote for Moreland. Times Hermann would vote with me. I think he voted for Eddy, and also for Kelly of Albany, but never for Hall.

Finally, Hermann went over to Moreland. That made a majority, and I was at a loss to know what to do. I personally liked Moreland, but Frank Baker, Republican chairman, and a number of active Portland Republicans, charged that he had not at the last election supported the Republican ticket, and they had appealed to me not to support him for that reason. I told the delegation the situation, and some one suggested that Moreland be sent for and asked what the facts were, and I said "all right, if he will satisfy me that the charge is untrue, I will join in indorsing him."

Moreland Admitted Charge.

Judge Moreland was sent for and came, but he acknowledged that he had opposed the Republican nominee for district attorney, and that admission and that alone prevented Judge Moreland from receiving the indorsement of the entire delegation then and there. As a result, we adjourned without having reached an agreement. Some weeks thereafter, possibly months, Hall was reappointed without any member of the delegation having recommended him, or having even been consulted, but, as I afterwards learned, solely on the recommendation of Mr. Heny.

These facts can be conclusively proven. Do they indicate, or, in view of them, is it possible to believe that Mitchell or I, or either, had any agreement with Hall to recommend him for appointment in consideration that he would protect Brownell, or otherwise? Judge Moreland will remember being sent for and asked the question. Why was he sent for, if not to give him an opportunity to clear up the charge? Had he cleared it up he would have been indorsed for appointment. Does not that prove conclusively that we were not pledged to Hall?

But it is argued that Mitchell in some of his letters to Brownell says that he has everything fixed, and that he need not fear Hall, unless he goes back on his promise. Well, it is only necessary to recall that Brownell was writing that Hall was persecuting him, knowing him him to be innocent, etc. Hall doubtless assured Mitchell, as he did me, that he had no disposition to wrong Brownell. Possibly Mitchell gave Hall some assurances of support in case Moreland could not be appointed. I do not know, but he never so intimated to me, and I do not know that, had Moreland assured me that he had supported the ticket at the last election I would have joined the other members in his support. So far as Mitchell's letters are concerned, it is well to remember that he was much given to the use of extravagant language. I do not say this unkindly. It is a fact well known by his friends.

All Letters Confidential.

That Mitchell's letters are marked "strictly confidential" means little. It was his habit. For instance, in his letter of November 17, 1903, to Brownell, responding to some statement of Brownell that Hall was persecuting him he said: "Neither of us blame you a particle, under the circumstances. We do blame Hall, but write you this in strict confidence." Well, if Hall had done wrong, and we blamed him, why be so strictly confidential about it? Then again, in that same letter, he says "simply say all you know about the district attorneyship is that the two senators are still in locked horns. Fulton is still standing firmly by you, while I am standing by Moreland." Now Brownell had withdrawn from the race the previous summer, and was a candidate for congress, and had appealed to us to help him. My letter to him of November 3 shows that during the previous summer he had given up the attorneyship. Hence the mysterious suggestions of Mitchell count for little.

But it is not incumbent on me to explain Mitchell's letters. My own letters show that I declined to promise my support to Hall and the fact that, when in Washington, Hall was telegraphing out to have me urged to support him shows that I was not disposed to support him. So I pass from the Brownell matter.

The Steiwer Incident.

Mr. Heney exerts himself to prove that I sought to have Hall bring a civil suit against Steiwer rather than a criminal one, to have the legality of his fences tested. He need not exert himself in that behalf so far as I am concerned, for I admit, and ever have admitted that I did. I would do so again. I told Hall, and do not apologize for it, that so long as a civil suit would accomplish what he desired, namely, the removal of the fences, if maintained in violation of the law, it seemed to me wrong to institute against a reputable citizen a criminal proceeding.

That was my firm conviction, and is today. What was there wrong in my so stating? To my knowledge, the question did not arise until months after my election, hence, I had nothing to gain personally. Oh, but I was striving to assist a friend. If so, I have committed many crimes. I am being appealed to every day to go to this or that department to help some person out of trouble. Perhaps a postmaster has made a mistake or used funds he ought not to have used, but had returned them, or a soldier has deserted and been arrested, or an officer court-martialed, and I am appealed to to seek leniency for him. Must I not do so? Is it improper? What am I to do when persons in trouble appeal to me to try to adjust their difficulties? I must not, of course, accept a compensation for what I do, but no one contends that I ever did.

What was it I did that was wrong? I never have been able to ascertain. Mr. Heney says, however, that I took back from Steiwer a letter I wrote him, and he says that letter doubtless told of Hall's promise to proceed by civil action. Well, were it true, would I have desired to conceal that fact, when I have admitted from the start that I advised a civil action? Now, you will not find me denying anything that is true, and it is quite true that Steiwer did return one of my letters. There was nothing mysterious about it, however. All I blame Mr. Steiwer for is for not telling just how it occurred. I did not, as he states, ask him to bring down all of my correspondence. Why should I, having as I did all of his letters to me and copies of most letters written to him?

Had No Copy of Letter.

The fact is that I had written him two letters from Portland, of which I had not kept copies. The fact that I had advised Hall to bring a civil suit was being talked about by Heney and others. It occurred to me that I might wish to make a statement of the facts some day, so meeting Steiwer I asked him to send me copies of the letters written by hand. He promised to do so. Some time thereafter I met him in Portland when he told me that he had all of the letters and I could take them if I desired. I told him I did not want them, but wished to see, and possibly take copies of those written by hand. The letter in question was a statement in effect that I had met Hall and he had said he would have to take proceedings in the fence matter, but did not know just what steps he would take, but that I had hopes he would proceed by civil suit, yet he would have to be governed by any instructions he might receive, and then I used some strong language in regard to a matter.

Destroys Original.

On reading that letter I said to Steiwer: "That language is rather extreme and would not look well in print." He said: "Destroy it if you wish," and I simply tore it up then and there, because of the language it contained. That is all. Now that letter was written some time in the fall of 1903, I suppose on October 6th, as it probably was the one to which Steiwer replied by his letter of October 10, 1903, given below. While all this talk about my action in the Steiwer matter is positively silly, for I have always admitted that I advised a civil suit, I give below all the letters written both before and after that letter and Steiwer's answer to it.

Some time in the early summer of 1903 I was told that Hall was contemplating indicting Steiwer and others for illegal fencing of public lands, and, happening to see him, asked him about it. He said he had not fully determined just what course he would pursue, but that the fences must come down. I then suggested the civil suit, but did not write about it to Steiwer.

Steiwer's Letter.

Later Steiwer wrote me as follows:

"Fossil, Or., July 11, 1903.—Hon. C. W. Fulton, Astoria, Oregon.—Dear Senator: Replying to your letter of the 8th instant, will say that I had already sent a proxy to F. P. Mays with instructions to vote for Frank Baker for chairman of the state central committee, so I trust this will be entirely satisfactory to you.

Special Agent Dixon has been in this section and has returned again, opening up enclosures in which there is government land. Our company, whose lands, enclose more or less government land, has been gone over by him and our fences ordered opened, and we are complying with his order and having them opened as directed by him. And he has gone over quite a section of country besides and ordered quite a number of them opened. Some of them the fences were on government land, but in quite a number of cases the fences were entirely upon private lands. The effect of the policy he is carrying out, in my judgment, is going to be very damaging to the stock interests of Eastern Oregon. All of these lands so enclosed are rough and fit for pasturage only, and hence there would be no probability of them being settled upon and occupied by homebuilders. About the only grass our stockmen have for stock now is in these pastures. If the enclosures are opened the grass will be killed out, instead of being preserved, as it is now. There are numerous other reasons why the policy of Mr. Dixon should not be enforced, and I write you this that you may have some little idea of the effect of his actions in this country, so that, if it is possible, you might assist us in that he will do as little damage as possible in the general interests of the country. Yours very truly, W. W. STEIWER."

Following I give a copy of the letter written by me in answer to the above:

Fulton's Reply.

"Astoria, Or., July 16, 1903.—Hon. W. W. Steiwer, Fossil, Oregon.—My Dear Senator: I have just received your favor of July 11th. I have been absent from home for several days and hence did not receive it sooner. I think the action of the department of the interior requiring the removal of fences to the extent that they are requiring them removed is unjust, unreasonable and uncalled for, but we cannot do anything to stop it. I have already taken the matter up with the department and Mr. Hall, United States district attorney. **Mr. Hall, however, is helpless in the matter, as he has his instructions from Washington.** The present secretary of the interior entertains some very peculiar ideas about Oregon. He is of the opinion that there are no honest men residing in the state, and that we are generally entitled to no consideration. I do not believe that there is a thing that can be done. Mr. Williamson spoke to me about the matter, as also did F. P. Mays, and I have talked it over with Senator Mitchell, and we do not know of anything that can be done. Sincerely yours, C. W. FULTON."

Following is the letter which I assume was written by Mr. Steiwer in answer to the letter that was destroyed:

Censures Dixon.

"Fossil, Or., Oct. 10, 1903.—Hon. C. W. Fulton, Washington, D. C.—My Dear Senator: Your letter of October 6 from Portland received and I feel under many obligations for you for what you did in the matter mentioned. There is clearly a misunderstanding on the part of Mr. Dixon as to the government land he alleges our company has inclosed. We complied with his orders and directions in opening our fences given last July, in opening our fences he seemed to be but upon his return particularly anxious to find something to report against our company. The large number of acres that he reports has been inclosed by us has not been inclosed. It is in a rough and broken country with a good many natural barriers on one side, and on the other side it is bounded largely by the lands that we have fenced, and to make it more open or uninclosed than it is now, since making the opening in July, is quite a difficult problem to figure out just how it can be done.

"I tried to communicate with Mr. Dixon so that he could tell me just where and how he would expect us to open up more fencing than we have already done, but could not get him to indicate just where we should open up.

"I write this explanation so that you may understand that we are not deliberately defying his orders and keeping inclosed a large amount of government land.

"Again thanking you for what you have done, I remain, yours very truly,

"W. W. STEIWER."

My answer to the last above is given below. The reference therein to a "list of names" refers to a list of persons to whom seeds were to be sent. I had sent a circular letter to every county and many precincts for such lists. I answered the letter of the 10th instant and acknowledged receipt of the list of names in one letter, to-wit:

"Washington, D. C., Oct. 23, 1903.—Hon. W. W. Steiwer, Fossil, Or.—My Dear Steiwer: I have received the list of names you sent me and desire to express my thanks to you for the same. You are under no obligations whatever to me for my efforts in your behalf as Hall. I would be glad to serve you in that matter further, or in any other matter, whenever you think I can be of service to you. I understand that Hall will be here before long to confer with the department of justice and I will then take the matter up with him and the attorney-general as well. Sincerely yours, C. W. FULTON."

That is the last letter I ever wrote Steiwer so far as I can discover, and it shows clearly that there was nothing secret about my suggestions to Hall, for I proposed to take the matter up with both him and the attorney-general. If a civil suit had then been or was about to be commenced, evidently I did not know it. I did not take the matter up with Hall in Washington, and, hearing no more from Steiwer, it passed entirely from my mind.

Gang of Conspirators.

This communication is, I know, too long, but I have found it difficult to say less and I should have preferred saying more, for I realize that this is the last desperate effort of a desperate gang of conspirators to injure my name and reputation.

The people of Oregon have little, if any, conception of the embarrassments and difficulties by which I have been surrounded and impeded during the greater portion of my official term. In February, 1903, I was elected to the United States senate. The first session of congress thereafter, began November 9 of that year. During that session I became slightly acquainted with the members and methods of procedure. The next session began in December, 1904, and during that month both Senator Mitchell and Congressman Hermann were indicted; later, but early in the same session, Mr. Williamson was indicted, and thereupon, I was left a new member, without experience, the sole representative of my state in congress.

I will frankly admit that the contemplation of the tremendous responsibilities and perplexities of the situation almost prostrated me. But I went to work determined to do all in my power to meet its requirements. I am, I confess, proud of the record I made, and later, on some proper occasion, I contemplate giving out a more or less detailed statement showing what, unaided and alone, I accomplished for my state and the record, I trust I may say without being amenable to the charge of egotism, will compare favorably with any made when the entire delegation was present.

Resort to Slander.

But I have not only been handicapped by difficulties inherent to a situation so delicate, and the multitude of duties imposed by reason of being the sole representative here, I have during all the while been constantly assailed in the most malicious and wanton manner. My every movement criticised, my every motive impugned. Constantly and systematically it was announced and published far and wide that I would be indicted for timber land frauds, and then the rumor would assume definite form so that I could refute it, but only to see another spring up to take its place.

All this time I was at work, harder, I believe, than I have ever labored before, and my life has been one of work. I literally worked day and night. But I feel that I succeeded and made good. I secured a strong position and good committees in the senate. Finally, my enemies, having abandoned all hopes of involving me in any violations of law, have resorted to slander, scandal and vilification. Every expedient that malice could prompt or malevolence suggest has ben resorted to. The gutters have been sounded and the sewers drained in order that some vile charge, however stale, gross and improbable, might be brought forth to serve the cravings of insatiable malice. But I have confidence in the people, in their sense of justice and fairness. I shall appeal to them and I shall go before them and ask that they place the stamp of their disapproval on the infamous methods of this band of conscienceless conspirators. C. W. FULTON.

No. 14's Part in French History.

From P. T. O.

So far as France is concerned, it is the number 14 that has played a conspicuous and portentous part in her history.

On May 14, 1554, the Rue de la Ferronniere was enlarged by order of Henri II, and four times 14 years later Henri IV was assassinated there by Ravaillac—namely, on May 14, 1610. Henri had lived four times 14 years, 14 weeks, and four times 14 days—i. e., 56 years and 5 months.

Then Henri's son, Louis XIII, died May 14, 1643, the same day and month as his father. And 1643 added together equals 14, just as 1553 (the year of the birth of Henri IV) equals 144. Louis XIV ascended the throne 1643, which added together equals 14 and similarly the year of his death (1715) equals 14.

Representative Joseph Holt Gaines of West Virginia has the unusual distinction of being the only member of either house of congress born in Washington, D. C.

A Few Reasons

Why We Consider the Portland-Florence the Best Buy Ever Offered at 10 Cents a Share

BECAUSE we own 100 acres on the Golden Circle about half way between Goldfield and Diamondfield.

BECAUSE there are producing mines on three sides of our claims and our surface showing is as good, or better, than the average of the Goldfield mines that have produced millions.

BECAUSE we own a long term, fully equipped lease on the Florence, the richest gold mine on earth.

BECAUSE the shaft has been sunk to a depth of 260 feet, and we have every reason to believe we will pick up a pay chute from this level.

BECAUSE three out of four of the leases on the Florence have made good, and you are getting a three to one chance on the lease alone.

BECAUSE the management of this company is in competent hands, has put in twenty-five times as much money as we ask any one person to invest, and you will get a run for your money.

BECAUSE there is no possibility for us to make a stock-jobbing deal out of it, as we have no promotion stock and are paying for our stock the same as we ask you to do. This is the best argument we can give as to what we think of the proposition.

What Some of the Goldfield Leases Have Produced:

Original Florence leasers	$750,000	Zinn lease	170,000
Reiley lease (Florence)	1,000,000	Richard & Co.	50,000
Little Florence	1,250,000	Ridge & Curtis	300,000
Mohawk Florence	177,000	Vermilyea & Bartlett.	100,000
Florence Annex	240,000	Oddie & Gardner	450,000
Rogers Syndicate (Florence)	60,000	Loftus & Davis	250,000
Florence L. & M.	40,000	Hays & Monette	3,643,000
Quartzite	500,000	Ish-Sheets	100,000
Fuller & McDonald	400,000	Frances-Mohawk	2,300,000
Bowes & Kernick	4,000,000	Oddie lease	200,000
		Truett lease	265,000
		Jumbo Mohawk	476,000
		Stimler-Higginson	61,000

DOES IT PAY TO TAKE THE RISK?

$100 invested in Mohawk at 10c a share would now be worth $10,000.00.

$100 invested in Florence at 10c a share would now be worth $4,000.00

$100 invested in Combination Fraction at 10c a share would now be worth $840.00.

$100 invested in Daisy at 10c a share would now be worth $1,150.00.

$100 invested in Great Bend at 10c a share would now be worth $460.00.

$100 invested in Diamondfield at 10c a share would now be worth $240.00.

$100 invested in Jumbo Extension at 10c a share would now be worth $550.00.

$100 invested in St. Ives at 10c a share would now be worth $500.00.

$100 invested in Atlanta at 10c a share would now be worth $360.00.

$100 invested in Kewanas at 10c a share would now be worth $530.00.

$100 invested in Sandstorm at 10c a share would now be worth $300.00.

$100 invested in Kendall at 10c a share would now be worth $210.00.

$100 invested in Silver Pick at 10c a share would now be worth $330.00.

$100 invested in Red Hills at 10c a share would now be worth $360.00.

$100 invested in Gold Bar at 10c a share would now be worth $330.00.

The above values are late quotations on a few Goldfield stocks, and show several hundred per cent profit even at panic prices.

The time to get in is at the opening price. If you wait to see if a stock pans out all right, there is where you lose your opportunity.

We Are Not Offering You a Dead-Sure Thing but Frankly Ask You to Take a Chance With Us.

WE ARE BANKING ON OUR LEASE FOR QUICK RETURNS AND BELIEVE WE WILL PAY FROM 500 TO 5,000 PER CENT PROFIT INSIDE THE NEXT 12 MONTHS.

Will You Take a Chance With Us at 10 Cents a Share?

Ask for our free map of the Goldfield District showing principal mines and leases.

The Portland-Florence M. & L. CO.

Room 15, 268 Stark Street - - Portland, Oregon

Opposite Chamber of Commerce Bldg.

Phone M. 5489.