

THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC.

W. J. FIEDDICORD, Editor.

Published every Thursday by THE PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING CO.

SUBSCRIPTION, ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR.

Entered at the Wasco, Oregon, postoffice as second-class matter.

THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1898.

UNION TICKET.

STATE.

Governor—W. B. KING, of Baker.

Secretary of State—H. R. KINCAID, of Lane.

Treasurer—J. O. BOOTH, of Josephine.

Supreme Judge—W. A. RAMSAY, of Yamhill.

Attorney General—J. L. SPOCK, of Wasco.

Postmaster—CHAS. A. FITCH, of Clackamas.

Post Office Inspector—W. S. LYMAN, of Clatsop.

CONGRESSIONAL.

First District—B. M. VEATCH, of Linn.

Second District—C. M. DONALDSON, of Baker.

SEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT.

Judge—W. E. BRADSHAW.

Member Board of Equalization—G. F. KING.

JOINT REPRESENTATIVES.

J. B. BURGESS, of Deane.

C. L. MORSE, Hood River.

COUNTY.

Commissioner—MARION POWELL, Moro.

Clerk—P. M. RUGGLES, Rutledge.

Sheriff—N. W. THOMPSON, Monkland.

Assessor—J. A. VAN GILDER, Wasco.

Treasurer—T. B. MCINNIS, Moro.

School Supt.—H. HARRIS, Grass Valley.

Surveyor—A. V. UNDERWOOD, Bigelow.

Coroner—M. H. BENNETT, Kent.

"IT'S NOT OUR FIGHT."

After a strong commendation of the

Republican candidate for Treasurer and

the Republican candidate for Commissioner,

winding up with an unjustifiable

attack at the other candidates for

Commissioner, by saying "Why trade him

off" (the Republican) "for a new-

hatched, unfledged neophyte?" the

Wasco News has this to say of

William Holder's present complications:

"Mr. Holder has explained. And

while it's none of our fight we cannot

refrain from saying that these rumors

reached our ears some time ago, and

that we investigated them, and became

satisfied that Mr. Holder's official con-

duct does not merit censure."

Read the results of the Republic's

investigation, compare with the above

statement, and you will readily be con-

vinced that there is a material difference

between an investigation to bring truth

to light and an investigation to conceal

it. Mr. Holder and his lieutenants

will go down together. The editor of

the paper from which the above is taken,

which by the way no longer represents

the policy of its own party even, says

"It's none of our fight." Has the

News forgotten that it was the

first paper in the county to

nominate William Holder? Has it

forgotten that it has clabbed through

the campaign with Mr. Holder's other organ,

offering both papers for \$1.50 a year?

When an organ thinks enough of a

candidate to go out of its own party to

nominate him even before there is any

expression from his own party, most

people would say that organ is in honor

bound to stand by its nominee especially

after declaring him innocent, instead of

crying out "it's none of our fight!"

Whose fight is it, then? As further

evidence that the News is consid-

ered one of the seconds, we heard during

our many rounds about the county of

Wasco a prominent Republican remark

just after the charges against Mr.

Holder were published in the Republic,

that "it looks now as though the Demo-

crats are not going to elect their sheriff."

Of course he had reference to the very

few Democrats who helped to steer Mr.

Holder on to the Republican ticket.

Let whether the other few after consid-

ering the charges, confessions, denials,

and proofs, although the editor of the

News pronounces him innocent, will

still support him, remains to be

seen. We hope not.

The News has yet to learn

that it is not good policy, to say nothing

of the unprovoked disrespect, to allude

to men of Powell's or Gibson's age and

standing as "a new-hatched, unfledged

neophyte." If he had studied his lexicon

a little, he wouldn't fly so high to

HOLDER

CONFESSES

Is Subject to Removal, Fine and Imprisonment.

SOME INDISPUTABLE FACTS

Our Sheriff a Law Unto Himself.

Has Levied Upon Property Without Warrant of Law—Holds Back Funds and Says Our Laws Are "Peculiar."

It has been charged through the columns of the Republic that damaging irregularities existed in connection with the sheriff's office. That money had been withheld at different times which the statutes of Oregon expressly enjoined to be paid every thirty days. That Mr. Holder had prepared blanks to suit himself, and that these irregular statements had been certified to. Instead of a denial, he confesses them, but attempts a weak defense, rendered evasive and deceptive by the manner in which he treats it as well as by the amount of irrelevant matter brought in. Saying nothing of the special tax which the law says shall be paid over every week, just take Mr. Holder's own figures and see whether he did not hold back more than \$1,000. We quote him verbatim:

"We intended and had supposed, that we had put in our October, 1897, report the amount of money in our hands at that date belonging to the state and county fund which amounted to \$890.01 instead of \$1037.40 as the Republic has it. Now, from October 1st, 1897, to November 27th, 1897, I collected of state and county taxes the sum of \$135.68 and on December 1st, 1897, (not the 11th as stated) I turned the entire amount over to the county treasurer and in addition thereto was \$16.00 in poll taxes. Now during the rest of December, 1897, and January, 1898, I collected \$137.36 more of back taxes and turned that amount over to the treasurer when I did my collections in February, 1898, the same being on the tax roll I am now collecting on."

Notwithstanding he reported to the county court that he had not collected any taxes during July, August, and September, he now admits that he had collected \$890.01, and did not turn it over even in October, and added \$135.68 state and county tax, and \$16 poll tax, making a total of \$1041.69, according to his own figures, before it occurred to his mind that he ought to disgorge. We understand that about \$140 special tax should have been mentioned along with the above statement. According to Mr. Holder's own published statement, he turned in his collections but a single time between the 1st of October and the 1st of March, and does not deny that the taxes collected for the remainder of June, the months of July, August and September were not turned over until December 1, making but a single payment between the 21st of June and the 1st of March, notwithstanding the statute on this point is unmistakably plain:

Section 2796.—The sheriff shall receive, receipt for and pay over to the county treasurer all moneys and county orders collected by him for taxes in the manner prescribed in Sec. 2797, and any sheriff failing to comply with any of the provisions of the above sections of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not less than one hundred nor more than one thousand dollars, and the court before whom said sheriff is tried shall declare the office of such sheriff vacant for the remainder of his term.

Sec. 2797.—The sheriff shall settle with the county treasurer at least once in every thirty days, and shall pay over all moneys, and county orders collected by him for taxes from any tax list placed in his hands for collection, and he shall be required in each settlement to submit the stubs of his receipt book to the treasurer, who shall settle with him in accordance therewith, giving a receipt for the amount of cash and county orders respectively, as shown upon the stubs of said receipts, and not otherwise, and no sheriff shall be allowed to pay into the county treasury a greater amount in county orders than is shown upon his receipt stubs. The receipt given by the treasurer to the sheriff shall be in duplicate, and each receipt shall immediately after each settlement with the treasurer, file one receipt with the clerk of the county court, and the sheriff shall, upon his annual settlement with the county court in the month of July of each year, file with the county clerk the book containing all the stubs of the receipts given by him or his deputy during the year.

Section 1905.—Any sheriff who shall neglect or refuse to pay over all moneys by him collected for taxes, or shall refuse or neglect to make a return of the delinquent taxes of his county as required by law, shall be liable to be indicted therefor, and upon conviction may be punished by fine not less than \$100.00 nor more than \$1000.00, or by imprisonment not less than six months nor more than six years, or by both at the discretion of the court.

Mr. Holder's excuse for not using the legal form of printed blanks is that

"many of our county officers are throwing them away and making out their reports otherwise." Now it is this "otherwise" business we are after, and legal forms properly filled out and certified to, will prevent it. Certainly Mr. Holder is a law unto himself.

Now the reason Mr. Holder did not hold more back was probably because more was not paid in. It may as well have been \$5,000 as \$1,000. That it was not, is not to his credit, but to the credit of those who were unable to pay, and if it were not to be put to its legitimate use, it should have been left in the hands of those who earned it by the sweat of the face. But as it was, neither the man who held his warrant could get it, nor could the farmer merchant or laborer make any further use of it. If not put to use by Mr. Holder, it was simply hoarded and totally withdrawn from use.

But it is no longer a question as to whether the law has been violated. Mr. Holder's statement is a plain confession. It is simply a question whether the law shall be enforced with reference to our sheriff as the sheriff enforces law, and a fine of from \$100 to \$1,000 be collected of him.

Again, does Mr. Holder assign any reason for this neglect simply to turn over the money he had in his possession? Did he have to take a load of wheat to town, find a market for a horse or a cow, in wind and dust, or, perchance, mortgage his home? Simply enter the bank, one door to his left on his way to the postoffice to get his daily paper, and thirty days in which to think of it. Or his faithful deputy, who has been seen in every nook and corner of our county, not simply during campaign to meet "every voter," but whenever his superior sent him, could have been dispatched to the bank once every thirty days.

But Mr. Holder, after admitting that, contrary to law, he has held back funds that should have been reported and turned over, pleads as a bar that precinct justices do not make their returns according to law. Mr. Holder held back more funds in three months than all the justices in Sherman county put together, even if they had kept back 50 per cent of their entire fees for a whole year. Moreover, does Mr. Holder on a salary greater than the constitutional salary of the governor of Oregon, claim no more responsibility than a justice of the peace at Buck Hollow? Does Mr. Holder listen to Mr. A when he says I shall not pay my taxes because Mr. B has not paid his? No, sir! Mr. A must "come down with the dust," or up goes a notice of sheriff's sale for delinquent taxes, and even sometimes then, as in Mr. Henegan's case. Are we to understand by Mr. Holder's reply that if these justices, who, with a single exception, live remote from the county treasury, could be induced to turn over their nickels he is willing to turn over his dollars?

In Mr. Holder's reply he aims to mitigate his own grave offense, by criminalizing us, as an official, by implication. As to what the people have been enabled to see and hear for themselves, we have nothing to say at this time. As to our books, every dollar is accounted for, even the money donated by the citizens of Moro to help our county institute, and the financial reports of the 27 districts through our assistance and the patience and diligence of the clerks balance to a cent.

We do not know what other superintendents have done, but during our term of office we have sent in an itemized, certified report in every instance; and we suppose the county board properly audited every one of them. We say so; first, because the law requires it; secondly, because on one occasion when the quarterly examination was to be held at Moro, we forgot to carry with us some stationery on hands, and had, in consequence, to make an extra purchase at Moro, which, in our report made two small purchases of supplies for examination, one for the February and the other for the May examination, neither of which exceeded \$2.50, come so closely together as to call for an explanation on our part at the instance of a member of the county board. The inquiry was extended even to the very pens we had purchased, and were thereupon requested to order our supplies of the county clerk in the future. But the clerk, as he will tell you, was not able to fill the very first order.

Now the county board, or any member of it simply does his duty when reports are carefully inquired into, as in our case. But to go into the details of a sheriff's report at each quarter, or for a grand jury to expect them before suspicion is even raised, would, it seems to us, be quite unexpected of them.

But why should not the sheriff's affairs be subjected to the same scrutiny visited upon other officials, especially those whose services are not so well remunerated? Mr. Holder receives \$150 per month for much of his time spent in receiving for taxes or sitting with his heels upon the desk, while a deputy at \$45 does the hustling, and if need be puts up his face to be shot at. But, when the frowns are on the prisoner, Mr. H. has had to face the dangerous position of seeing that the prisoner was properly fed, and, if convicted and sentenced, to march him gallantly off to the state prison at a goodly fee and mileage, while his deputy, who took his life in his hand and beat the brush to scare up and arrest the lawless wretch, gets but \$400 a year and a faithless promise.

Mr. Holder goes into long and detailed recital about the money he has turned over at different times. Now, Mr. Holder knows very well what he has

done according to law is not in issue. Why did he not confine himself to the charges? Evidently because he hoped that a long parade of all his assorted collections made at divers and sundry times amounting in the aggregate to \$33,423.97, collected and turned over, would in a measure blind you to the gravity of our charge, suspend your judgment and in some way mitigate the crime of deliberately violated law. The two itemized statements he adroitly injects into his confession and apology are as irrelevant to the charges as his announcement of political meetings.

Mr. Holder says, "Our laws are somewhat peculiar in some other respects as well as tax collections." Now let us see whether our laws are any more "peculiar" than our sheriff's.

On the 2nd of April last Mr. Henry Henegan gave sheriff Holder a check on Moore Bros., bankers, for \$42.94, being the amount of 1897 taxes due from Mr. Henegan and wife. A receipt was properly filled out separately for husband and wife and each signed, Wm. Holder, sheriff. The check was payable to the sheriff's order and bears his endorsement. On the 16th of May, Sheriff Holder levied upon the identical real estate described in the above mentioned receipts for the very same taxes. In order that you may see for yourselves we give below the exact language of the receipts, the check, and the execution notice served on Henry Henegan.

We do not claim that there is in it even an intention of fraud, but this and kindred errors ought certainly to be avoided by one whose salary is \$1,800 per annum. Besides it is no pleasant thing to have one's delinquency published to the world, especially when his taxes are paid. We do not ask you to take our word but give us all the papers just as given us that you may observe two things: first, that we are not "begging the question" as Mr. Holder in his reply; and, secondly, that our sheriff does not use his home-made blanks when he wishes to get a pinch on the tax-payer.

SHERMAN COUNTY, OREGON.

Moro, April 2, 1898.

Received of Henry Henegan Twenty-five and 32/100 dollars, for 1897 taxes as per above on property described herewith.

S. E. 1/4 Sec. 2, Tp. 2 S., R. 17; 160 A.

IN FULL FOR

Poll Tax \$ 1.00

County, school and state tax 24.32

No. 334. Wm. Holder, Sheriff.

SHERMAN COUNTY, OREGON.

Moro, April 2, 1898.

Received of Mrs. M. Henegan by Henry Henegan Seventeen and 62/100 dollars, for 1897 taxes as per above on property described herewith.

S. 1/2 S. W. 1/4 Sec. 2, Tp. 2 S., R. 17; 80 A.

N. W. 1/4 Sec. 11, Tp. 2 S., R. 17; 160 A.

IN FULL FOR

County, school and state tax \$47.62

No. 335. Wm. Holder, Sheriff.

Moro, Ore., April 2, 1898.

Moore Bros., Bankers, \$42.94

Moro, Oregon,

Pay to Wm. Holder or order, forty-two dollars and 94 cents.

H. HENEGAN.

EXECUTION NOTICE.

State of Oregon, ss

County of Sherman, ss

To Wm. Holder, Sheriff of Sherman County, State of Oregon; Greeting:

In the name of the State of Oregon you are hereby commanded that you levy upon the goods and chattels of the delinquent taxpayers named in the within and foregoing list and if none be found then upon the real property set forth therein or so much thereof as shall satisfy the amount of taxes so charged, with costs and expenses; and that you pay over all moneys so made to the county treasurer of said county, as by law required, and return such Warrant, together with the list aforesaid and entries thereon of all payments so made to you to the County Court on July 5th, A. D. 1898. By order of the County Court.

Witness my hand and Seal of the County Court of said Sherman county 16th day of April, 1898.

[SEAL] Wm. HENRICHS,

County Clerk.

State of Oregon, ss

County of Sherman, ss

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a full and true copy of the original Warrant for collection of Delinquent Taxes as the same now appears in my hands for service.

Dated this 16th day of May, A. D. 1898.

Wm. Holder, Sheriff.

By virtue of a Warrant for the purpose of collecting Delinquent Taxes, of which the above is a true and correct copy, which said Warrant has been issued out of the County Court of the State of Oregon for the county of Sherman by the County Clerk of said county, under the Seal of said Court, bearing the date the 16th day of April, 1898, Commanding me, in the name of the State of Oregon, to levy upon the goods and chattels of Henry Henegan a Delinquent Taxpayer named in the tax list attached to said Warrant; or, if none be found, then upon the real property belonging to said Delinquent as set forth in said tax list, or so much thereof as shall satisfy the amount of taxes levied against said Henry Henegan for the year 1897, to-wit: The sum of 25.32 Dollars, in United States gold coin, together with costs and expenses; and for want of sufficient goods and chattels to satisfy the sum of money aforesaid, I have, by virtue of

said Warrant, levied upon, and will sell at public auction, on the 8th day of July, 1898, at one o'clock in the afternoon of said day, at the Court House door in Moro, Sherman county, and State of Oregon, the following described real property, situated in Sherman county, State of Oregon, to-wit: S. E. 1/4 Sect. 2, Tp. 2, S. R. 17 E. W. M., containing 160 acres more or less.

Dated at Moro, Sherman county, Oregon, this 16th day of May, A. D. 1898.

Wm. Holder,

Sheriff of Sherman county, Oregon.

The execution notice served on Mrs. Henegan is just the same except as to name, amount of taxes, and description of land.

The original receipts, the voucher, and both writs may be seen by any one desiring to inspect their genuineness at the office of the Republic, where they were left by Mr. Henegan in person, until he may call for them. Come and see them for yourselves.

If this be not sufficient more evidence is in waiting to prove that the charge of "other irregularities" in the sheriff's office as set forth in the Republic of the 19th inst. is not groundless.

Now what is the law relative to this instance? It reads as follows:

Sec. 2800.—The sheriff shall on payment to him of any tax, if required, give a receipt for the same, and shall note on his tax roll the payment thereof and if any such sheriff shall wilfully return as unpaid any tax which has been paid to him, he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by fine which fine shall not exceed five hundred dollars, or by imprisonment not to exceed six months, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. Holder further says:

"I will say at this time that I probably should have turned over these taxes sooner, yet by an oversight and neglect did not do so until the dates already stated. Now we will see, even admitting I did neglect my duty, what the county lost by it. Was there a call for warrants made after this money was turned over, until some time in March, 1898?"

After confessing a neglect of duty, our sheriff wishes to know what the county has lost by it. We hope that neither Mr. Holder, his bondsmen, nor the county has lost anything in dollars and cents by it. But suppose Mr. Holder were interested in a railroad; or suppose, since he is interested in our telephone line, he had seen fit to improve his line, and, thinking the money could be easily replaced, he had invested a thousand dollars in this worthy enterprise so that the hustling taxpayer could say: Hello! Bill! Is that you, Mr. Sheriff? according to the improved long distance method, and suppose the enterprise had not proved a financial success, so such enterprises sometimes do not, at least for a time, somebody would have lost.

Again the sheriff is expected to turn the taxes over monthly, not only because it removes all temptation to invest it, but because the county is supposed to need it, and the sheriff is not allowed according to statute to be the judge as to whether our county shall use it. It would require far heavier bonds if the sheriff were allowed to hold back the taxes at his pleasure; moreover, it is due his bondsmen as well as the taxpayer and every man or woman holding a county warrant, that the taxes should be promptly turned over according to law. If the sheriff can hold back three months, why not twelve? Nay, more, many a man holding a warrant would have to discount it, if he had to wait for its payment only three months.

For these reasons, then, as well as to prevent embezzlement if a sheriff should ever feel tempted to commit such heinous crimes, the statute is both rigid and explicit.

Under the title of "Crimes Against the Public Revenue" will be found the following section (No. 1962):—

The sheriff shall pay over all moneys collected by him on any tax list in his hands to the treasurer of the county at least once a month taking a duplicate receipt for the same, which he shall file with the clerk of the county court of his county immediately thereafter; and any sheriff failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not less than one hundred dollars nor more than one thousand.

But Mr. Holder expects you to excuse him on the grounds that it was an oversight! Whenever money becomes so plentiful that from eight to ten hundred dollars can be jingled around in a fellow's pocket for five or six months without its ever occurring to his mind that he ought to deposit or invest it, he needs a first assistant deputy "garden," and the court should see that he gets one.

To those who supported Wm. Holder for sheriff, we say that two years ago you flattered him with a vote that was humiliating to the party of his opponent, you have twice elevated him to the most remunerative office in the gift of the voters of Sherman county, you have compensated him for his four years services with probably more than eight thousand dollars of hard wrung taxes,