

INDEPENDENCE ENTERPRISE

ESTABLISHED 1883.

INDEPENDENCE, OREGON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1910.

NUMBER 20

BOWERMAN IS AFTER BOURNE

SHOWS THAT BOURNE OUTRAGES STATE OF OREGON.

BY FAILURE TO DO HIS DUTY BOURNE ALLOWS \$60,000,000 IN SUGAR DUTIES TO BE WRUNG FROM COMMON PEOPLE.

To Jonathan Bourne, Jr.: In the Portland evening papers of September 30 there appeared an interview, credited to you, in which you indulged in a great many generalities and meaningless platitudes. In this phraseology you presume to issue a command to the people of Oregon to vote against many candidates in the coming election nominated by the recent primary.

Since your election to the United States senate you have not taken sufficient interest in the State of Oregon to spend any considerable part of your time here. You have devoted your time and such enterprise and energy as you possess to pastimes and associations more agreeable to you while you were able to find in other parts of this and foreign countries. You have visited this state but twice during the last four years, and then devoted very little time to ascertaining the wishes of the people of Oregon, or their needs or requirements; but you have devoted your time to learning mandates to the people of this state directing them how they should vote. You claim to be a friend of the people of Oregon. I presume you imagine that by repeatedly telling the people you are their friend, someone will believe you. Fortunately, however, some of your sins of commission and omission are matters of public record, which you are obliged to face and cannot avoid, excuse or deny.

Bourne Works With Aldrich.

It is a matter of public record that you, at the special session of congress in 1909, in a harrangue, by courtesy called a speech, delivered by you, when the tariff bill was under consideration, referred to that other "friend" of the people, Senator Aldrich, as an authority upon tariff legislation. It is a well known fact that during your term in the senate you have labored in complete harmony with Senator Aldrich. In this so-called speech you stated that you knew nothing of the tariff, but that your partisan friend, familiar and boon companion, Senator Aldrich, was a master of rates and that you would be content to abide by his decisions.

You voted against Senator Bristow's proposed amendment, which would have taken the "joker" out of the sugar schedule. By this vote \$60,000,000 a year is wrung from the people of this country and given to the sugar trust. You further outraged the people of Oregon and of this country on this occasion by assisting in placing a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on iron ore. Of course you knew the steel trust owned the iron ore in the United States and that by your vote you were taking this money from the people of this country and from your own constituents and giving it to the many millionaires who control this, the greatest trust in the world. No doubt you expect the householder, when he purchases a cook stove and pays this unnecessary tribute to your colleagues to be blinded to your neglect of duty by the platitudes you indulge in concerning myself and the other candidates who are not favored with your support, or with the acquaintances and associations of your millionaire chums and friends who are the beneficiaries of your misrepresentations of this state in the senate.

sentation of this state in the senate.

Duty on Woolens; Silk Free.

You voted to admit to this country raw silk free and to place a duty of 53 per cent upon the manufactured article. At the same time you voted to place a duty of 135 per cent (average) on woolen and worsted cloth, valued at not more than 49 cents per pound. Was this act on your part induced by your friendship for the people? Was it in the interest of the common people? Did you vote to place this exorbitant duty upon goods used by "us, of common people," for the benefit of anyone except your companion-clipping chums and associates?

Your chief legitimate income is said to be from a large cotton print mill, owned by yourself and relatives, in New England. You voted to place a duty of 12 1/2 cents a square yard (see paragraph 318, schedule I) on the mass of goods manufactured by your mill. When the mechanic, farmer or other citizen is compelled to purchase this class of goods and pay tribute to you and your plutocratic intimates and associates, on account of the official position given to you by the people of Oregon, they can claim their outraged feelings by the happy thought that you secured this position and opportunity to plunder them and hope to continue in your present office by the use of resounding platitudes and windy commonplaces and the assertion that you are a friend of the people. How does 12 1/2 cents a square yard tariff on goods manufactured in your cotton print mill, which are used chiefly by poor people, compare with a duty of 25 per cent to 50 per cent on champagne? Did you make this great difference in order to encourage the use of champagne by your constituents and to induce them to dispense with the clothing customarily worn in this country? Probably you assume they will believe in your pretended friendship; pay you this exorbitant duty, and then sing a sweet refrain in honor of their alleged friend.

Aristocratic Friends Favored.

Instances almost without end can be cited in which you voted to place low duty on articles which are worn by men of your aristocratic class or placed upon your tables, and in which you voted to place a high duty on similar articles used by people in moderate or straightened circumstances. It would be a matter of more practical interest to the people of the state to receive from you a communication stating how much money this tariff bill places in your pocket each year and in what other way you have been benefited by your term in the senate of the United States than to receive your dictatorial instructions as to whom they should cast their vote for.

How many citizens of Oregon who "earn their bread by the sweat of their brow" honor you with their acquaintance? What effort have you ever made to acquaint yourself with the desires, hopes or requirements of the people who make Oregon great, namely, the producers?

During the four years since you were elected Portland and the state of Oregon have suffered immense loss in commercial ways on account of your neglect of official duties. Within the last few months you stood by and without protest permitted the reclamation acts to be so amended that this state lost over \$5,000,000 which was due it, and should have been invested in irrigation projects in Oregon. This loss is only a small per cent of the actual damage we have incurred by reason of your dereliction in duty. By reason of your carelessness in this particular our desert lands will continue to be inhabited by the coyotes, jackrabbits and other creatures of the desert, when by the exercise of any reasonable diligence on your part these deserts would have been reclaimed and happy families would be inhabiting these lands, producing large crops which would have supplied the needs or other portions of the state. Even when the Board of Army Engineers was here last month to examine the Umatilla project.

(Continued on page eight.)

IS PROHIBITION REALLY A CURSE

FACTS IN THE CASE PROVE IT IS A GREAT BLESSING.

THE SALOON IS NOT CONDUCTIVE TO TRUE ECONOMY EITHER PRIVATELY OR PUBLICLY AND CAN NOT BE CONDONED.

It is a well known fact that prohibition is the most vital issue of this fall's campaign. It marks a period of transition by far too important to pass by unnoticed. It will determine the fate of hundreds and even thousands who either own property invested in the liquor business or who are employed in its prosecution. It will decide whether or not cities shall reap the harvest that comes by saloon licenses or whether they will have to look to another source for revenue. Many who are greatly interested declare that prohibition is a curse. They claim it lessens the revenue, puts many owners of the breweries, saloons, etc., out of employment, stifles business and causes many other undesirable conditions.

Now some of these objections, no doubt, have weight with many people and therefore it is necessary to give them proper consideration.

Prohibition Does Prohibit

Is prohibition really a curse? That it will drive out of the liquor business hundreds of men in this state is admitted by those desiring the saloon. They forget that this admission is proof positive that prohibition does prohibit. But while it will drive a few hundreds or perhaps a few thousands out of this questionable business it will save to the homes of our state the wages of tens of thousands of our citizens, (which would, under the license system, be spent in the saloons,) and give the money to their wives and children. The loss on the one hand will be greatly offset by the gain on the other and it is our business as citizens of Oregon to consider the welfare of the entire population and not that of the few which seek to subsist upon money made by the prosecution of a traffic that takes more money from the people than any other occupation for the value received, a business that is willing to unman man for the sake of the dollar, a business that bleeds men most and trusts them least of all the enterprises known to man. For every dollar lost by those engaged in the liquor business, the men of the state will save ten dollars. We can afford to have a few lose their positions, if thereby many more others are profited.

Liquor Business Losing Proposition

Again, those favoring the liquor business say it will mean a loss in revenue. This seems true only on the surface. While there is a small income to a city from license and to the U. S. government from revenue, it is an established fact that for every dollar income in our country, there is an outlay of from three to five dollars in meeting the bills occasioned by the traffic. In other words, we give the liquor business, by way of protection, billions of dollars to permit them to do their nefarious work. Study the facts and you will be convinced that from the financial point of view, the liquor business is a losing proposition. This being true, prohibition surely is not a curse.

But the claim is made that prohibition stifles business. This is true if they mean the liquor business and its allied interests. But that it stifles any legitimate business is an absurdity. Their claim is that the saloon makes the city. This is absolutely untrue. There is not one intrinsic thing about the saloon business that

will encourage the citizens to buy more groceries, dry goods, furniture, hardware, or purchase farms or city lots or build elegant homes or develop a country. The saloon is not run for that purpose. It is nothing more than a leech that seeks to get all it possibly can from the people and give in return the least possible worth. It is the arch grafter of our civilization. The saloon goes where the money is and it seeks to make the money come where it is but that money comes not to the legitimate channels of business but to the saloons, the brothels and gambling dens allied with the business.

In support of the fact that the saloon does not stifle business note the following:

Proof From Other Towns

1. From Ashland: "To whom it may concern: I have had experience selling goods both in a 'wet' and 'dry' town and say without hesitation that I prefer a 'dry' town. People use more and better goods, ask less credit and pay their bills more promptly. It's a big job for the ordinary man to support the saloon business and his family at the same time. —W. W. Hevener, Manager C. C. Store."

Ashland, Ore., Feb. 23, 1909.

2. From McMinnville: "Dear Sir—Replying to yours asking how prohibition has worked in our town, I beg to say we have been in the merchandise business here just four years. During the first year and a half of this time we had the saloons running. The last two and a half years has been under prohibition. The general appearance of the town and people is better, and leaves a better impression on strangers, of our morality and intelligence. Our house has sold under prohibition 40 per cent more goods than in former years. This disproves the theory that business success depends on the saloon. Prohibition has been an incalculable benefit to our town and country.—Nott & Son, Dry Goods, etc."

McMinnville, Ore., Feb. 27, 1909.

3. From Albany: "The building activity has been much greater since our city went dry. The closing of the saloons has not retarded in the least the growth or development of our city. We have paved with bitulithic pavement fourteen blocks of our street, and have under contract nine more. We have also laid about eight or ten miles of cement walks since we went dry. The tax rate before the closing of the saloons was eight mills. We were then receiving \$5000 for saloon license, but the municipality was then running behind and our public debt was increasing. Since the saloons are closed we have raised our assessment values, and have put our tax rate at six, seven and eight mills respectively each year, but we have also all running expenses and applied \$5000 to the reduction of our public debt, and this year we will spend at least \$10,000 in public improvements."

(Signed) Dr. J. P. Wallace, Mayor of Albany.

Many other statements are on file showing similar testimony. This county is no exception. Dallas has done more business and more building during the past two years when under dry regime than ever before. Men are coming from wet cities to work in the Dallas mills in order to get the protection from liquor, afforded them in dry towns. Business men of Dallas and vicinity say they have profited so much by being dry that they will leave no stone unturned to make the state dry.

Independence has benefitted equally. During the past two years we have done more improving than the ten years prior to the dry regime. Two new churches, an excellent high school building, a sewer system and a number of fine cottages, all these in one year. Business is better this year than last, and in general we have prospered. Surely prohibition is a stimulus to legitimate business and does not stifle it.

Prohibition Divides People That prohibition divides the people (Continued on page eight.)

CHALLENGES TO JOINT DEBATE

PUBLIC PROCLAMATION MADE THROUGH ENTERPRISE.

REV. WEBER WOULD UNDERTAKE TO STRAIGHTEN OUT SOME OF THE FALLACIES OF ARGUMENT OF HON. RUTH.

Rev. W. J. Weber, pastor of the M. E. church of this city, has issued a challenge to debate with Hon. A. S. Ruth the subject of prohibition in this city tonight or on any other night that the Hon. Mr. Ruth may choose.

Mr. Ruth is the Washington senator who claims to have resided in a prohibition state for years and who will undertake to prove to the people of this city that prohibition does not prohibit. If Mr. Ruth is conscientious in his conviction on the subject of prohibition he will not hesitate to enter into arrangements for the joint debate. The public will, therefore, look forward eagerly to early arrangements for the debate.

Following is the official challenge of Rev. Mr. Weber:

Hon. A. S. Ruth, Portland, Ore.—My Dear Sir—According to the announcements you are to address our people on coming Friday night on the subject, "Prohibition a Curse to Good Government." Having for years lived in a prohibition state, I hereby challenge you for a debate on said night or any other night that you may choose. I shall take the negative. I shall make known publicly that I have challenged you for a debate. Should you feel disposed to accept the challenge, wire me at my expense, Independence, Oregon. Hoping to meet you in debate, I am, yours truly, W. J. WEBER.

Oregon's Crop Wealth

Oregon's agricultural products this year will amount to no less than \$115,000,000, according to the estimate of Dr. James Withycombe, director of the government experiment station at Corvallis. Add to this figure the many millions derived from its timber manufactures, mining and commerce, and it is not surprising that Oregon is such a prosperous state.

Dr. Withycombe's estimate of the year's crops and their values follows:

Livestock	\$25,000,000
Dairy products	\$14,000,000
Wheat, 17,000,000 bu.	\$13,750,000
Hay, 900,000 tons	\$10,000,000
Oats, 11,000,000 bu.	\$ 6,000,000
Potatoes, 6,000,000 bu.	\$ 5,000,000
Fruit	\$ 6,000,000
Poultry products	\$ 5,000,000
Wool 20,000,000 lbs.	\$ 4,000,000
Hops, 80,000 bales	\$ 2,000,000
Miscellaneous products	\$23,250,000
Total	\$115,000,000

CHURCH ANNOUNCEMENTS

United Evangelical Church
There will be no preaching services in the Evangelical church on Sunday as the pastor will be away.

Calvary Presbyterian Church
Owing to the absence of the pastor at the meeting of Synod, there will be no preaching service in Calvary Presbyterian church next Sunday. Sunday school will be held at the usual hour, 10 a. m.

Baptist Church
There will be regular preaching service at the Baptist church next Sunday morning at 11. Sunday school at 10 a. m. and B. Y. P. U. at 7 p. m. In the evening the congregation will join in the union meeting at the Methodist church.

Notice to Trespassers
Notice is hereby given that no hunting will be allowed on my farm, formerly the Huff farm.

JOHN W. KELLY