

R. D. HUME'S REPLY TO E. B. BURNS.

Shows Up the Sort of a Man Who is Trying to Injure his Chances for Re-Election.

[From Daily COAST MAIL, May 27th.]

A dodger signed by E. B. Burns, captain of the Copper Queen, and making statements intended to injure R. D. Hume in his candidacy for the legislature, was circulated Monday in Marshfield, and Mr. Hume being notified sent the following reply:

ED. MAIL:—This man Burns has been on Rogue river for a number of years chasing phantoms. He has made no success of anything he has undertaken. His gasoline boat the Copper Queen has been disabled many times and repaired at my shop, every accommodation having been given him. His business he has pretended heretofore was mining, but lately he has built a small saw mill up the river. The schooner Free Trade came here for a cargo of about 15,000 feet of lumber about three weeks ago. It had two and a half tons of freight for Mr. Burns and a hold full for the copper mill. The freight was discharged at my warehouse there being no wharfage paid by the schooner Free Trade. When the Copper Queen went to Coos Bay she took a load from my wharf and also paid no wharfage. When the freight was discharged by the schooner Free Trade I asked the captain to haul her up to the end of my wharf where she could lay in safety, and I said to the captain I hope you will leave her at the wharf and not anchor her in the fishing grounds so as to interfere

with the fishermen. After some conversation with Mr. Burns' employees the captain took the Free Trade into the middle of the river and anchored her right in the fishing grounds. My fishermen got their nets fouled besides having them spoiled and torn. I then wrote the captain that if he did not move her I would bring suit against him. He moved to another place which was out of the way, and stayed a day or so, but finally moved back near where he first anchored. The Free Trade was in the river nearly three weeks, and had she been in any other river the fishermen would have set her adrift. Rather than have any trouble I let the matter pass, although the residents here were so indignant that had I brought suit he would surely have been cinched.

I have never meddled with Mr. Burns in any way. Anyone knows that the mouth of the river is open and he can go and come when the weather permits, and he can run his boat up the river just as far as the river will permit in its natural condition. I have put no bounds nor put any obstruction in his way. He has made a great talk of opposition to me while I have said nothing regarding his affairs. I will say however that my method of business makes it difficult for him to run on jaw-bone in this county for any great length of time, as I pay cash, and he gets into the hands of the sheriff every

now and then. His capital stock consists of tales of great mining property he owns but cannot work on account of that man Hume. By these tools he catches a few suckers who dole out for him in homeopathic doses enough cash for him to partially recover from the last sheriff's sale of his property which was paid for by the contributions of a previous run of the same sort.

The men who are working for him at Gold Beach are anxiously awaiting his return, and if the sack does not contain sufficient to pay what he owes them there will be another visit from the sheriff.

My opponent, Mr. Guthridge, was in the employ of Mr. Burns, or of some of the parties interested with him, but he quit him a few days ago, and he had to take his pay in sugar as long as it lasted, but I believe there is not sweetening enough to go round.

Respectfully yours,

R. D. HUME.

In corroboration of Mr. Hume's statements of this man Burns' worthlessness, it may be stated that several of the collectors in Marshfield have had for some time and still have claims against Burns which they are unable to collect, and that some of the Marshfield merchants are in the same boat. This fact is easily verified and names of collectors and merchants can be furnished if desired.

ernment engineers. It was these figures to which I referred in reference to the traffic both at the mouth of the Columbia River and for Coos Bay. The reports of the Engineers are made in about the month of October. As the traffic is for the calendar year, necessarily the last reports we have is for the year preceding the time when the report is made. The latest report before the committee at the time the last river and harbor bill was passed, and the one upon which the appropriation was based was 103,139 tons. The appropriation was not exactly \$1.50 per ton, but nearly enough for all practical purposes.

The last ten years of tonnage given by the report of engineers for Coos Bay is as follows:

1890.....	242,329	tons,
1891.....	136,005	"
1892.....	109,044	"
1893.....	109,152	"
1894.....	128,544	"
1895.....	144,934	"
1896.....	115,896	"
1897.....	103,039	"
1898.....	116,567	"
1899.....	104,291	"

The report for 1901 has not yet been made and was not before the Committee.

But, Mr. Editor, what is the materiality of all this? It is a mere play upon words. My letter to the COAST MAIL was not intended to refine upon percentages, but to refute the claims that I had been negligent of the interests of Coos County. In your reply, you admit practically every statement that I have made. I showed that in the last River and Harbor bill passed before I was a member of Congress carrying \$72,000,000, the whole of the appropriations for streams in which Coos County is interested amount to \$146,390. Even of this \$27,390 was set aside as not to be available. In that Congress, Oregon had a member of the River and Harbor Committee in the House, and on the Committee of Finance in the Senate. It had a full delegation. In 1899, the bill passed after I was elected to Congress, carried but \$30,000,000 in all, while the appropriations for the rivers and harbors within and adjoining Coos County, amounted to \$202,000. In other words, in this small bill, nothing like half as large as the bill of 1899, Coos County received over \$55,000 more than in the bill of 1899. In the bill of 1899, the appropriations for the Columbia River and for Oregon Rivers and harbors, in cash, and authorized contracts, amounted to \$1,064,390 and in that of 1899, \$480,000. Before I became a member of Congress, Coos County received 14 per cent of the amount appropriated for Oregon rivers and harbors, including the Columbia River. In the bill passed after I became a member of Congress, it received 40 per cent. Does this look like neglecting your interests? Yet these facts are admitted. I have said the appropriations for 1899 for Coos County amounted to \$146,390. Of this amount, \$27,390 was for the construction of a dredge, leaving nothing with which to operate it, and so could not be used. At the request of your citizens, I secured legislation making that amount available, and it was used in dredging of the Hogsback. Was that neglecting your interests, or as you intimate in a previous editorial, showing hostility to Coos county? I pointed out in the letter to which you refer, efforts successfully carried out, preventing the importation of 340,000 tons of coal annually into San Francisco, free of duty, competing with your coal, by fraudulent evasion of the laws. There are no other coal producing sections in

Oregon. Was this a neglect of your interests?

But, Mr. Editor, what is the complaint that you are endeavoring to make? In what particular do you mean to claim that I have failed in duty to Coos Bay? The intimation is because I have not been able to secure an appropriation for restoring the height of the jetty at its sea end. It is not always possible for one man in a body composed of 357 members to secure all he attempts to secure, or all he wants to secure. Every effort that I could possibly exert, was used to induce the Committee to appropriate the necessary sum to restore the jetty. Every effort was met by the statement of the Engineers that the money was not needed. They claim that to raise the jetty ten feet high would not increase the depth of water at the mouth of Coos Bay a single inch. They say it was expected to sink more or less, and will probably sink somewhat more, and that it was built higher than necessary for that purpose. The sinking, they allege, has not affected its efficiency, that it has not produced any shallowing of the channel and they believe it will not produce a shallowing of the channel. Colonel McKenzie, who is practically the Chief of Engineers, so far as Oregon improvements are concerned, came before the Committee, and stated very emphatically that he could not recommend an appropriation at this time.

But, Mr. Editor, this is a very large country. There are contemplated improvements of rivers and harbors within the United States, where estimates have been made by the Engineering Department, and where expenditures are recommended by the Engineering Department, aggregating in all, a cost of \$240,000,000, besides those provided for in the pending bill, and for which not one dollar was appropriated. It was impossible with any reasonably sized bill to make all improvements that were needed, or that were recommended. A bill a year ago was practically framed, carrying \$60,000,000. It was understood that the present bill could not exceed that amount. Of an addition was made in one place it must be taken off somewhere else. No member knew but what it would be taken off the improvements within his own State. The result was that every member of the Committee criticised with a great deal of minute care every claim for an increase. I think you can see where the Committee was compelled to decline appropriating money in so many places where it was actually needed, and actually recommended by the Engineering Department, how difficult it would be to secure an appropriation against the recommendation, and over the protests of the Engineering department, and where they assert it is not needed. And yet, this was precisely the situation with which I was confronted. It was impossible to secure the appropriation, though every effort was made that was possible. The Committee felt that it had been reasonably liberal in its appropriations for Coos Bay. Certainly the appropriations have been as large, and probably larger than almost any other improvement in the United States in proportion to the commerce. This was another matter that the Committee took into consideration.

There was still another matter to which the Committee did not fail to call attention. You will notice that the amount of commerce has not increased,

Cont inued on Sixth page.

TONGUE REPLIES TO

COOS BAY NEWS

Shows Again that Coos County's Interests Have Not Been Neglected By Him.

The following letter in reply to an editorial appearing in the Coos Bay News was presented to the editor of that paper with a request that he publish it, but he declined to do so.

Washington D. C. May 9, 1902.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEWS,

MR. EDITOR:—A friend has forwarded to me a copy of an editorial taken from your paper during last month, commenting upon my letter to the COAST MAIL.

While the editorial is somewhat lengthy most of it consists of general comment, and some calling of names. But practically the truth of every statement of my letter to the COAST MAIL but one is admitted. One part seems to call for some reply. You say:

"The appropriation for two years for the entrance to Coos Bay by the bill of 1899, he says, was \$1.50 per ton."

You then proceed to quote figures furnished by Mr. Simpson to the New Year's Oregonian, saying that the ton-

nage of Coos Bay during the last calendar year amounted to 134,634 tons, and that as the appropriation was for nearly three years, it was only a very small portion of \$1.50 per ton, and therefore accuse me of juggling with figures.

Mr. Editor, either through misunderstanding or otherwise, you have certainly not represented correctly the meaning of my letter. Referring to the appropriation for the mouth of the Columbia River, and describing its critical condition, I used this language.

"Yet while the appropriation carried by the present bill is by far the largest ever made for that river, and is intended to cover the expenditures for at least three years, it is only about \$1.00 per ton for the annual traffic in a bill, carrying \$40,000,000. While the appropriations for two years for the entrance to Coos Bay carried in the bill of 1899, of \$30,000,000 were \$1.50 per ton." There could be no other meaning to this except that the \$1.50 per ton referred to the annual tonnage of Coos Bay as well as of the Columbia river.

There is this difference. Of the appropriation for the Columbia river, only one-third of it is in cash, none of the other could be available until after one year. The two-thirds is not appropriated yet. The Secretary of War is authorized to make the contract for it, and the ap-

propriation will at some time be made in the sundry civil bill. It is not expected that this appropriation can be made available, or will be made available, during a period of less than three years. The appropriation of 1899 for Coos Bay was all cash, was available at once, and could have been expended wholly within one year, and was expected and intended to be expended in two years.

You then give a statement of tonnage, which if correct, and had been the tonnage to which I had referred, would show that the appropriation was not \$1.50 per ton. But, Mr. Editor, this is not a fair statement. The figures given by Mr. Simpson may have been correct. I am not inclined to dispute them. But the River and Harbor Committee and Congress both deal with the commerce as reported by government officers. We have no knowledge of tonnage gathered by private parties, no knowledge of the method used to procure it, or of its correctness. It may be as correct as the figures made by the government officers, but we know the methods used by the government officers, they are uniform through the whole of the United States, and in any comparison of commerce in order to judge the merits of rivers or harbors seeking improvement, it is fair to all sections to use the statistics furnished by the gov-