

The Oregon Register

FRANK S. HARDING, PUBLISHER. FRIDAY SEPTEMBER 2, 1887.

Entered at the Postoffice at Lafayette, Oregon, for Transmission Through the Mails as Second Class Matter.

WAGON ROAD INVESTIGATION.

The commissioners appointed by the government to look into these alleged swindles are pursuing their investigation along the line of the Dalles Military wagon road in eastern Oregon. There are over 2,000,000 acres of land, the disposition of which is dependent upon the findings of the commission. We cannot believe that the government will make innocent purchasers of this land suffer, as some suggest. Speaking of this investigation the San Francisco Chronicle says:

Quite recently a move was made in congress to forfeit these unearned grants, and to restore the land to the public domain, and throw it open to actual occupation and settlement. Secretary Lamar finally came to the conclusion that the only proper way to settle the rights of the wagon road companies was to commence suits to set aside patents issued to them, on the ground of fraud, but as preliminary to commencing such actions, he was persuaded to send a commission to Oregon, not for the purpose of settling titles, but to determine whether or not suit should be commenced. That commission has arrived in Oregon, with instructions to examine more than 1000 miles of so-called wagon roads, to talk with old settlers, and to take notes along the several lines. When the commission reached Salem, where they had to go to procure certain documents and evidence which they need, they were met by an army of attorneys and solicitors, among whom was Mayor Pond of this city, ex-Congressman Barclay Henley, ex-Senator Kelly, of Oregon, and others, who insisted and are still insisting that this commission of inquiry shall resolve itself into a court, and that its formidable array of counsel shall be permitted to appear for the wagon road, corporations, and cross-examine all persons interrogated by the commission. The government is not represented by counsel; the people of Oregon have no attorney there, and yet the land-grabbers insist that they shall be represented by counsel, cross-examine witnesses, and argue questions before the commission as to whether the wagon road companies shall be sued or not. What the result of this proceeding will be is uncertain, but all the proceedings of the commission, concluding with its report to the secretary, will be closely watched and scrutinized. This is not a good time for whitewashing reports, and the people of Oregon are in earnest. They ask nothing but justice, but that they are fully determined to have, if possible to get it.

Charles Alexander Percy, of Suspension Bridge, New York, a young man 28 years old made a safe trip through Whirlpool rapids recently in a life boat, built by himself during the last summer. The boat is about 17 feet long, with air chambers at either end, in one of which Percy made the voyage. The keel is weighted with 240 pounds of iron, and bags of sand are carried in the hold, so it will right itself. An iron weight attached to a long rope trailed from the stern so as to keep the boat straight ahead. Though it keeled in a threatening way, the craft rode the breakers without once upsetting.

The mayor of San Francisco recently refused to grant a permit for a slugging match between two prize fighters. Great scot, what are we coming to when mayors interfere with personal rights in this manner.—Albany Herald.

W. H. Fitzgerald, a printer, "slug 8" on the Little Rock (Ark.) Gazette, has just inherited \$500,000 by the death of an uncle in Lansing, Mich. If he wants to get rid of it easily he should start a daily newspaper.

At Youngstown, Ohio, the extensive bridge works of Morse Bros. were destroyed by fire Sunday morning. The loss is estimated at \$100,000. Insured for \$98,000.

Mr. Joaquin Miller delivered an original poem at the opening of the Mechanics' fair in San Francisco.

A good portion of Lexington, Morrow county, was destroyed by fire Sunday night.

Mrs. George Gould's baby boy has been christened Jay Kingdom Gould.

FIFTEEN HUNDRED CIRCULARS.

If I am correctly informed, in a few days more, there will be issued from the McMinnville press 1,500 circulars, on the question of moving the county seat to McMinnville. I have no idea what argument they will use in these circulars in favor of this move. It cannot be that they have a more central point for the court house. As to the court house being in a dilapidated condition and insufficient for the present need of the county; if it was kept in repair as it should, have been, with few exceptions there is not a better in the state of Oregon; and even in those exceptional cases the counties are exceedingly wealthy and densely populated.

The Yamhill County Reporter has accused our people of importuning the county court to spend money around Lafayette and upon these buildings. The policy of some people and placés is, that a lie well stuck to is as good as the truth. Lafayette has never asked anything from the county of Yamhill. Like the people in other parts of the county, we have called the attention of the county court to the condition of the county roads and bridges in this section of the county, and nothing more. And as to importuning the county court to keep the county buildings in repair, for fifteen years we have continually labored for that purpose, while McMinnville—I will not say McMinnville, for I have to much respect for the great mass of the people of that town to refer to them in this manner, but I will say a certain set in McMinnville have labored faithfully, persistently and unceasingly to stop, and prevent and prohibit all repairs upon the county buildings, and to have them sink into decay and ruin. This has been the great pivot upon which this crowd expected to turn the county seat from Lafayette into McMinnville. And whenever from long neglect, these buildings showed that summer's sun and winter's frost and rain had done its work upon them, and they bore that peculiar brown and weather-beaten appearance so grateful to their eyes, they would meet together and with infernal joy hold high carnival over the ruin they had wrought. And the taxpayers would come into the town and point to the public property wasting into ruin, and when we were asked the reason, and explained to them that it was the influence of a certain crowd in McMinnville they would turn away with the expression, "we will see to this," and with our assistance they have seen to it in more than one election. These buildings have been repaired, and to a certain extent protected in spite of everything they could do. And no one knows how hard the task has been except the people of Lafayette. And right here we wish to appeal to the people of this county, for whom should you have the most respect and the kindest regards, the people of Lafayette who have labored constantly to save your property or that particular crowd in McMinnville, who have labored to destroy this same property that cost the county somewhere in the neighborhood of \$30,000? In which community is the county property the safest? Would you trust your property in the hands of a lumber merchant and manufacturer, who would destroy it, in order to furnish you with lumber and material to build anew?

The five-columned man of the Reporter threatens that if the people of Lafayette dare to defend themselves against his assaults, that he will fire into them solid shot and shell until they are riven as by the thunderbolts of heaven. And we have waited with fear and trembling, daily expecting a discharge that would go through us like lightning through a gooseberry bush! But, great heavens! your battery was loaded with spoiled eggs for which we were not prepared. That gentleman like the buzzard which has gorged himself upon the floating scandal against the town of Lafayette, that drifts like floodwood through the streets and into the dives of McMinnville, then turned the putrid contents of his stomach out upon his foe in order to drive him away with the stench. This gentleman tells the people of this

county that all that is required is one per cent. on all of the taxable property of this county; and for the sake of the argument we will concede the point that one per cent. is all that is required, in order that he may carry into execution his pet enterprise in McMinnville, whatever that may be. But before those who are interested in this enterprise waste any more of that peculiar animation of theirs, and in order to test the liberality of the taxpayers would it not be advisable to circulate a subscription. This five-columned gentleman might say to A, you pay taxes on \$1000, we want \$10; and to B, you pay taxes on \$2000, we want \$20 of you; and to C, you pay taxes on \$4000, we want \$40 of you; and wind up with D by demanding of him \$100 because he pays taxes on \$10,000. We think by the time he had made the circuit of the county he would get along with one single paragraph on the county seat question, and that he would devise some other means to push forward his pet enterprise in McMinnville. If these gentlemen who are engineering this pet plan at McMinnville think that the people of Lafayette have set themselves up as a target for them to fire at and that we will retaliate they are mistaken. If they think we are going to lick the hand that smites us, and that they can rob the county of Yamhill, they are mistaken in the material out of which we are formed. Our motto is and will be, "to spoil the spoiler while we may, and from the robber rend the prey."

W. C. T. U. COLUMN. FOR GOD AND HOME AND SAVILE LAND. Mrs. M. E. K. EDWARDS, President and Superintendent.

WHY DO CHRISTIANS VOTE FOR LICENSE? The results of the campaigns in Michigan and Texas force us to believe that a great many Christians voted against a prohibitory amendment. Recently we had an opportunity to ask a man whose Christianity we could not for a moment doubt, why he—as a Christian—voted for license. His answer, in condensed shape, is as follows: "I do not vote for license. I take the stand that if there were no taxing, liquor selling would be absolutely free, and the evils resulting therefrom ten times more appalling than they now are. I vote to restrain, and would, if I could, vote to tax the liquor traffic out of existence. I am willing to climb the ladder of prohibition gradually, but you would people won't be satisfied except with a bound clear to the top of the ladder." Now, there is truth enough in this way of putting the question to make it dangerous. Half-truths always are dangerous. It is quite true that "Common Law" does not say specifically that liquor selling is an indictable offense, and it is also true that without license or prohibition, liquor selling would be open to any one. It is apparent, as well, that complete prohibition could not, at present, be forced on a city like Chicago, for instance, with any hope that it would be a perfectly obeyed law. But all these points must be met in some way, or the license-voting Christian is right and we are wrong.

In the first place, then, look at the free whisky vs license idea. "Common Law" is a term meaning the early statutes and laws of England, so far as defined, which were taken as a foundation by Blackstone for his "Commentaries on Law." It is hardly to be expected that "Common Law," then, would define alcohol-selling as a crime, because alcohol was two-hundred years ago—thought to be the very elixir vite, and only to be praised. The arch enemy of mankind must have grinned with pleasure when he saw how eagerly the world swallowed the snake, worm-made spirit that Shakespeare called "devil." But common law recognized the rights of society, and attempted to defend them by the enactment of such laws as the Decalogue embodied. Hence it is fair to say, since alcohol-making and selling is now, confessedly, a crime against home and society, that it should be put under the ban, and should be prohibited. "But," our license-voting Christian would say, "if license were done away with, prohibition would not follow unless the people said it must." That is true, and here is just the place to say that Christ's law, which is far above common law, demands that we enter a strait gate, and walk upon a narrow way. If we must choose between evil and good, we should choose the good. Does that sound arguing? "But if we have to vote with the minority, we lose our vote, and the cause is hindered."

Why, then, would it not have been good policy for Martin Luther to say, "I'll not oppose the Romish errors openly—not now—not till more people get their eyes open to these errors and join me." "Would that have been a commendable course? Is not the illustration a

fair one? "But the liquor selling will go on if I do vote against license." For a time, yes; but suppose a man living next to you should invent delicious confections flavored with choice wines and United States protected whiskies; suppose your children should learn to dearly love these candies, and take money they should not to indulge in the dangerous article, would you do? Common law says nothing against the sale. Will it help matters to tax the man first fifty then one hundred dollars, with the view of prohibiting him? Would not a parent strive for some prohibitory law at once rather than for a gradual and increasing tax.

Second, granting that complete prohibition in cities would at first be impossible, we would like to see the doors of mirrored, picture, silver-plated saloons closed by the strong arm of the law, even with the certainty that down in the cellar and over behind some foul-smelling beer barrels, beer and whisky could still be found? We pass by one hundred saloons daily, going to our home in the city, and to see these doors shut would be a glad sight. Now the selling is respectable; it should be made a law-breaking, cowardly, full-of-fear business, and if this were done, some good educating would be accomplished by comparatively empty jails and hospitals, reduced tax bills; in other words, facts backed by money in the vaults. Let any one who says this much is not possible, study the prohibitory record recently made in New York City for three successive Sundays. It can be accomplished in time, and in the largest city of our country. And nothing but the party cowardice of our American men prevents the trial being made. Christian men, above all, should not take a ground of expediency in such matters if our arguments are true. The nation never suffers because its men take too high a stand of right voting, and certainly history shows us, that Martin Luther, Calvin, John Knox, Garrison and John Brown, took their places in a present morality because it was right, only to be crowned with laurels by the majorities they helped release. Now issues require new convictions, and now the issue is: alcohol in any shape is a poison and menace. When will Christians fight it unflinchingly? Not for some time, as a body, when so many say that a vote for license is a vote for prohibition. This point has been discussed at such length, and the real effects of license made so apparent, it would seem nothing is so certain that a great many people have incipient brain disease close at hand? Either that or fear that "the other fellow" will get to be president! In any case we call you to witness that it's a pretty hard matter to explain a Christian vote for license, and not at all difficult to show the cause for a party license vote.

county that all that is required is one per cent. on all of the taxable property of this county; and for the sake of the argument we will concede the point that one per cent. is all that is required, in order that he may carry into execution his pet enterprise in McMinnville, whatever that may be. But before those who are interested in this enterprise waste any more of that peculiar animation of theirs, and in order to test the liberality of the taxpayers would it not be advisable to circulate a subscription. This five-columned gentleman might say to A, you pay taxes on \$1000, we want \$10; and to B, you pay taxes on \$2000, we want \$20 of you; and to C, you pay taxes on \$4000, we want \$40 of you; and wind up with D by demanding of him \$100 because he pays taxes on \$10,000. We think by the time he had made the circuit of the county he would get along with one single paragraph on the county seat question, and that he would devise some other means to push forward his pet enterprise in McMinnville. If these gentlemen who are engineering this pet plan at McMinnville think that the people of Lafayette have set themselves up as a target for them to fire at and that we will retaliate they are mistaken. If they think we are going to lick the hand that smites us, and that they can rob the county of Yamhill, they are mistaken in the material out of which we are formed. Our motto is and will be, "to spoil the spoiler while we may, and from the robber rend the prey."

W. C. T. U. COLUMN. FOR GOD AND HOME AND SAVILE LAND. Mrs. M. E. K. EDWARDS, President and Superintendent.

WHY DO CHRISTIANS VOTE FOR LICENSE? The results of the campaigns in Michigan and Texas force us to believe that a great many Christians voted against a prohibitory amendment. Recently we had an opportunity to ask a man whose Christianity we could not for a moment doubt, why he—as a Christian—voted for license. His answer, in condensed shape, is as follows: "I do not vote for license. I take the stand that if there were no taxing, liquor selling would be absolutely free, and the evils resulting therefrom ten times more appalling than they now are. I vote to restrain, and would, if I could, vote to tax the liquor traffic out of existence. I am willing to climb the ladder of prohibition gradually, but you would people won't be satisfied except with a bound clear to the top of the ladder." Now, there is truth enough in this way of putting the question to make it dangerous. Half-truths always are dangerous. It is quite true that "Common Law" does not say specifically that liquor selling is an indictable offense, and it is also true that without license or prohibition, liquor selling would be open to any one. It is apparent, as well, that complete prohibition could not, at present, be forced on a city like Chicago, for instance, with any hope that it would be a perfectly obeyed law. But all these points must be met in some way, or the license-voting Christian is right and we are wrong.

In the first place, then, look at the free whisky vs license idea. "Common Law" is a term meaning the early statutes and laws of England, so far as defined, which were taken as a foundation by Blackstone for his "Commentaries on Law." It is hardly to be expected that "Common Law," then, would define alcohol-selling as a crime, because alcohol was two-hundred years ago—thought to be the very elixir vite, and only to be praised. The arch enemy of mankind must have grinned with pleasure when he saw how eagerly the world swallowed the snake, worm-made spirit that Shakespeare called "devil." But common law recognized the rights of society, and attempted to defend them by the enactment of such laws as the Decalogue embodied. Hence it is fair to say, since alcohol-making and selling is now, confessedly, a crime against home and society, that it should be put under the ban, and should be prohibited. "But," our license-voting Christian would say, "if license were done away with, prohibition would not follow unless the people said it must." That is true, and here is just the place to say that Christ's law, which is far above common law, demands that we enter a strait gate, and walk upon a narrow way. If we must choose between evil and good, we should choose the good. Does that sound arguing? "But if we have to vote with the minority, we lose our vote, and the cause is hindered."

Why, then, would it not have been good policy for Martin Luther to say, "I'll not oppose the Romish errors openly—not now—not till more people get their eyes open to these errors and join me." "Would that have been a commendable course? Is not the illustration a

fair one? "But the liquor selling will go on if I do vote against license." For a time, yes; but suppose a man living next to you should invent delicious confections flavored with choice wines and United States protected whiskies; suppose your children should learn to dearly love these candies, and take money they should not to indulge in the dangerous article, would you do? Common law says nothing against the sale. Will it help matters to tax the man first fifty then one hundred dollars, with the view of prohibiting him? Would not a parent strive for some prohibitory law at once rather than for a gradual and increasing tax.

Second, granting that complete prohibition in cities would at first be impossible, we would like to see the doors of mirrored, picture, silver-plated saloons closed by the strong arm of the law, even with the certainty that down in the cellar and over behind some foul-smelling beer barrels, beer and whisky could still be found? We pass by one hundred saloons daily, going to our home in the city, and to see these doors shut would be a glad sight. Now the selling is respectable; it should be made a law-breaking, cowardly, full-of-fear business, and if this were done, some good educating would be accomplished by comparatively empty jails and hospitals, reduced tax bills; in other words, facts backed by money in the vaults. Let any one who says this much is not possible, study the prohibitory record recently made in New York City for three successive Sundays. It can be accomplished in time, and in the largest city of our country. And nothing but the party cowardice of our American men prevents the trial being made. Christian men, above all, should not take a ground of expediency in such matters if our arguments are true. The nation never suffers because its men take too high a stand of right voting, and certainly history shows us, that Martin Luther, Calvin, John Knox, Garrison and John Brown, took their places in a present morality because it was right, only to be crowned with laurels by the majorities they helped release. Now issues require new convictions, and now the issue is: alcohol in any shape is a poison and menace. When will Christians fight it unflinchingly? Not for some time, as a body, when so many say that a vote for license is a vote for prohibition. This point has been discussed at such length, and the real effects of license made so apparent, it would seem nothing is so certain that a great many people have incipient brain disease close at hand? Either that or fear that "the other fellow" will get to be president! In any case we call you to witness that it's a pretty hard matter to explain a Christian vote for license, and not at all difficult to show the cause for a party license vote.

Call and see us. We will sell you better Boots and Shoes than you can buy in Yamhill County for less money. If you are the habit of going to Portland or elsewhere.

With Your Cash, Try Us, And see if you cannot save money by trading at home. Harris & Haney.

THE COUNTY SEAT. Go to NEWBERG. MOORE BROS' DRUG STORE. Fresh, Clean and Pure Drugs, and Family Medicines. Also TOILET ARTICLES. Paints and Oils.

MOORE BROS' DRUG STORE. Fresh, Clean and Pure Drugs, and Family Medicines. Also TOILET ARTICLES. Paints and Oils.

MOORE BROS' DRUG STORE. Fresh, Clean and Pure Drugs, and Family Medicines. Also TOILET ARTICLES. Paints and Oils.

MOORE BROS' DRUG STORE. Fresh, Clean and Pure Drugs, and Family Medicines. Also TOILET ARTICLES. Paints and Oils.

MOORE BROS' DRUG STORE. Fresh, Clean and Pure Drugs, and Family Medicines. Also TOILET ARTICLES. Paints and Oils.

MOORE BROS' DRUG STORE. Fresh, Clean and Pure Drugs, and Family Medicines. Also TOILET ARTICLES. Paints and Oils.

MOORE BROS' DRUG STORE. Fresh, Clean and Pure Drugs, and Family Medicines. Also TOILET ARTICLES. Paints and Oils.

MOORE BROS' DRUG STORE. Fresh, Clean and Pure Drugs, and Family Medicines. Also TOILET ARTICLES. Paints and Oils.

MOORE BROS' DRUG STORE. Fresh, Clean and Pure Drugs, and Family Medicines. Also TOILET ARTICLES. Paints and Oils.

LAFAYETTE FURNITURE STORE! W. I. WESTERFIELD, Prop.

LAFAYETTE FURNITURE STORE! W. I. WESTERFIELD, Prop.

LAFAYETTE FURNITURE STORE! W. I. WESTERFIELD, Prop.

LAFAYETTE FURNITURE STORE! W. I. WESTERFIELD, Prop.

LAFAYETTE FURNITURE STORE! W. I. WESTERFIELD, Prop.

LAFAYETTE FURNITURE STORE! W. I. WESTERFIELD, Prop.

LAFAYETTE FURNITURE STORE! W. I. WESTERFIELD, Prop.

LAFAYETTE FURNITURE STORE! W. I. WESTERFIELD, Prop.

LAFAYETTE FURNITURE STORE! W. I. WESTERFIELD, Prop.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.

SUMMONS. In the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon, for Yamhill County.