



PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

H. V. JOHNSON, M. D.

Office on next door to Temperance Parlors.
Tillamook, - Oregon.

E. E. SELPM,

ATTORNEY-AT-LAW.
TILLAMOOK, - - - OREGON.

T. MAULSBY,

Attorney-at-Law.
Notary Public and Real Estate Conveyancer.

A. W. SEVERANCE,

DEPUTY-DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
3rd Judicial District, for Tillamook County
TILLAMOOK, - OREGON.

CLAUDE THAYER,

Attorney-at-Law.
TILLAMOOK, OREGON.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G. & E. THAYER,

BANKERS.

General Banking and Exchange business.
Interest paid on time deposits.
Exchange on England, Belgium, Germany,
Sweden and all foreign countries.
TILLAMOOK, - - - OREGON.

HESS & TOEWS,

WOOD-YARD.

Wood delivered to any part of the city.
TILLAMOOK, ORE.

J. F. LARSON,

BLACKSMITH.

Wagon-making, and all kinds of Wood-work
and General Blacksmithing done. Mill
Machinery Repaired.
Horse-shoeing a Specialty.
TILLAMOOK, ORE.

N. P. ROBERTS,

CONTRACTOR AND BUILDER.

Wagon Shop in connection. Cabinet Work
done.
Shop opposite G. A. R. Hall.
TILLAMOOK, ORE.

Miss L. J. RUGGLES

Mrs. J. JOHNSON

RUGGLES & JOHNSON,

MILLINERY AND DRESS-
MAKING.

Hats, Dress Trimmings and a General Assort-
ment of Millinery Goods. We always keep
the latest styles.
Near Court House, TILLAMOOK, ORE.

TILLAMOOK LAUNDRY.

LESTER HART, PROPRIETOR.

Washing gathered and delivered every
week. Work done on short notice when desired.
Starched shirts 15c each. Common Shirts and
drawers, 5 to 10c each. Family washing and
ironing, 5c per dozen.
Suits cleaned to order.
TILLAMOOK, ORE.

CENTRAL MARKET.

L. H. BROWN, PROPRIETOR.

The best Beef, Veal, Pork and Mutton always
on hand. Eggs, Butter, Vegetables and
Chicken bought and sold.
Satisfaction guaranteed to every one.
Shop opposite the Grand Central.
TILLAMOOK, ORE.

TILLAMOOK LIVERY STABLE.

JONES BROS. PROPRIETORS.

First-class single and double turn-outs kept on
hand. Boarding and transient stock cared
for.
TILLAMOOK, ORE.

ACRE TRACTS AND

TOWN LOTS.

For sale at reasonable prices and on favorable
terms. Location best in the city of Tilla-
mook.
CAPT. WM. D. STILLWELL,
TILLAMOOK, ORE.

THE STR. AUGUSTA.

Will make regular trips, the weather per-
mitting.
TILLAMOOK, ORE.

Tillamook Lumbering Company,

MANUFACTURERS OF AND DEALERS IN ALL KINDS OF

Rough and Dressed Merchantable Lumber.

Moulding of Every Description, Brackets, Etc. Flooring and Rustic a Specialty.

ALL ORDERS FILLED PROMPTLY.

TILLAMOOK, - - - OREGON.

THE best investment you can make
is to insure your life, and thus pro-
vide your estate with cash at your death,
or if you live, give you a sum of money
a few years later.

THE MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.

Write the best policy, guaranteeing you cash and paid up insurance every year,
so you cannot lose your money in case of misfortune. Send me your name and
age and I will send you a sample policy.

W. F. D. JONES, Local Agt.

H. G. COLTON, Gen'l Ag't, 33 Stark St., Portland, Ore.

TRUCKEE LUMBER CO.,

(OF SAN FRANCISCO.)

DEALERS IN

General Merchandise.

They keep on hands at their store in
Hobsonville the largest stock of goods
in Tillamook County.

Our stock consists of Dry Goods, Clothing, Boots and Shoes, Hats, Caps
and Notions, Groceries, Crockery, and Queensware. Doors, Windows, Lime,
Hair, and Cement. Hardware and Nails. Special attention given to
filling orders for goods in jobbing lots.

AGENTS FOR

The Steamer TRUCKEE.

TILLAMOOK, SAN FRANCISCO AND WAY PORTS.

Makes regular trips about every two weeks, the weather permitting.

The fast sailing STEAMER TRUCKEE has been specially fitted up for carrying pas-
sengers. Following are the rates:
CABIN PASSAGE \$15.
ROUND TRIP \$20.
STEERAGE (one way) \$9.
Freight, (General Merchandise) \$4 per ton

J. E. SIBLEY, Manager, Hobsonville, Ore.

MEN! WHY ARE YOU WEAK?

DR. SANDEN'S ELECTRIC BELT
AND SUSPENSORY FOR
WEAK MEN

WHO ARE DEBILITATED, AND SUFFERING
FROM NERVOUS DEBILITY, SEMINAL WEAK-
NESS, LOSS OF SLEEP, IMPOTENCY OR
LOST MANHOOD, RHEUMATISM, LAME
BACK, KIDNEY TROUBLES, NERVOUSNESS,
SLEEPLESSNESS, POOR MEMORY & GENERAL ILL HEALTH

we have a relief and cure
in your ignorance of effects
and vitality - which is
system the elements that
strength and vigor will fol-
low or money refunded.
Dr. Sanden's Electric
after all other treatments
testify, and from many of

THE DR. SANDEN ELECTRIC BELT
is a complete galvanic battery, made into a belt so as to be easily worn during work or at rest, and it gives soothing, prolonged currents
which are instantly felt throughout all weak parts, or we forfeit \$5,000. It has an Improved Electric Suspensory,
the greatest boon ever given weak men, and we warrant it to cure any of the above weaknesses, and to enlarge shrunken limbs, or parts,
Money Refunded. They are graded in strength to meet all stages of weakness in young, middle-aged or old men, and will cure

FAMOUS LIBEL SUITS.

HOW VERY SELDOM THE PLAINTIFF
GAINS ANYTHING.

Editor Godkin's Mishap—Funny Expe-
rience of George Jones, of the New
York Times—Ignatius Donnelly Gets Six
Cents and Mr. Malloy \$20,000.

R. EDWIN L. GODKIN, of the
New York Evening
Post, is a
constitutional re-
former and a vig-
orous assailant.
Add that he is a
north of Ireland
man and began
his literary ca-
reer by writing a

somehow Orangish history of the re-
ligious discussions, and the reader will
readily see why any little accident in his
newspaper career affords much interest
to friends and opponents alike. His re-
cent arrest was just bad enough to be
funny.

There is a politician in New York who
married a sister of the noted Victoria
Woodhull and Tinnie Claffin and is
otherwise locally celebrated. Of him
The Post recently spoke as an "ex-keeper
of a dive." He straightway employed a
lawyer who had various reasons for not
loving Mr. Godkin, and the next Sunday
morning the latter was aroused from a
sound sleep by an officer with a warrant
for his arrest on information for a criminal
libel. But he did not go behind bars.
Friends gathered rapidly, bail was
given, and so "Larry," as his rivals
call him, got away from court in time to
attend church. This incident has once
more started the discussion as to libel
laws, and they are found to be in even
worse confusion than ever.

In a similar case a friend once con-
fided with the late George Jones, of the
New York Times, who replied: "Oh, is
that all? Why there are only six suits
now pending against The Times. This is
a bad year for 'em. I've been in the
newspaper business thirty-five years and
have always had from four to sixteen
libel suits on hand and have never yet
paid one cent damages." Mr. Matthews,
of the Buffalo Express, gave similar
testimony. Out of a dozen heavy suits
but one went against him, and in that
case the verdict was for \$1,000.

Other papers have not been so for-
tunate. The New York Herald paid a
Mr. Malloy, of South Carolina, \$20,000
merely for making this little statement:
"The leading citizens of Edgefield think
that one Malloy, a white man who some
times ago was suspected of burning his
own store for the purpose of obtaining
the insurance, kindled the fire which re-
sulted so disastrously." This is the case
in which Judge William James Wallace,
of the United States circuit court, made
the remarkable decision that The Her-
ald had told so big and palpable a lie
that it did no harm!

This is not a burlesque. Here is the
exact language of the judge: "The origi-
nal publication, although its sensational
character and flagrant mendacity were
well calculated to outrage the feelings
of the plaintiff, was so destitute of a
color of truth that it could not seriously
injure him in the estimation of the im-
mediate community in which he lived."

To a good many persons this sounded
like a polite way of saying that The Her-
ald (or its correspondent) was such a
liar that its word could injure no one.
And strangely enough, some people have
an idea that this is law. But it isn't.
No man can take advantage of his own
wrong, and the biggest liar in the com-
munity is as responsible for his words
as a George Washington. There's lots
of fun in a libel suit—for all except the
parties—and by a curious but not well
understood law they seem to run in
groups. About five years ago an article
appeared in the New York Mail and Ex-
press with these scare heads:

SHE MARRIED A NEGRO.
A charming and intelligent young woman
was an illiterate black man!

The date was at a New Jersey town,
the names were given in full and the
local correspondent was known to be re-
liable. A savage letter soon arrived
from an indignant father, then a notice
of a libel suit and next a retraction and
very humble apology. A letter to the
correspondent notified him that if he
ever entered the Mail and Express office
he would encounter an alabodded
janitor with a fair sized club. Scarcely

the last affair to interest the whole
English speaking world was that of Par-
nell and the London Times, in which
Parnell won. Other recent and familiar
cases are more amusing than serious.
Hon. Ignatius Donnelly sued for \$100,-
000 and got six cents. At least nine
times out of ten these suits end in much
the same way. Historically the subject
is of intense interest. In England and
America alike the press has been grow-
ing freer for two centuries, and in read-
ing the old cases one wonders how men
could have published papers at all.

British law has always laid great
stress upon any feature in a libel cal-
culated to stir up strife, whether between
individuals or nations, and under this
law the notorious Lord George Gordon,
"Protestant Champion," was, in 1793,
sent to Newgate for seven years for an
atrocious libel on the queen of France.
He professed conversion to Judaism
and died in prison Nov. 1, 1793. Simi-
larly Tom Paine was indicted in Lon-
don for publishing his "Rights of Man,"
fled to France and was outlawed. The
only attempt at that sort of thing in the
United States took form in the famous
"Alien and Sedition Laws." Since they
expired an American can libel foreigners
at libitum, as witness the "war editori-
als" and speeches at various public meet-
ings. The American press is free in-
deed, but where all are free some will
be licentious, and that the whole law of
libel is in an unsatisfactory condition
none are freer to admit than the editors
themselves.

J. H. BEADLE.

A Costly Thermometer.

The Johns Hopkins university has a
good deal of money invested in weather.
It owns a thermometer which is said to
be worth \$10,000. A powerful magnify-
ing glass is required to read the gradu-
ations on the scale. With this instru-

it hastily, got a false impression and the
result was the misleading heads. Worse
followed. West and south the item was
widely copied, the retraction apparently
overlooked, and so millions of readers
have it in their minds as an actual and
very bad case of New Jersey miscogena-
tion.

The managing editor of The Mail and
Express was just beginning to breathe
freely when The Evening Telegram was
sued by Anthony Comstock, The Times
by a publishing firm, The Herald by a
mining firm and The Sun by Fred Geb-
hard and Pierre Lorillard, the last two
asking for \$50,000 each. At the close of
the week Foster Coates, who recently
left The Mail and Express for The
Press, declared that there was but one
paper in New York not sued or other-
wise in trouble, and that was The Ban-
ner or Zion. The Sun had published
that Pierre Lorillard lost \$25,000 at
baccarat and had spoken of Fred Geb-
hard as a blackguard. None of the
suits amounted to much.

The Chicago Times has probably spent
more money on libel suits than any other
American journal. And a strange fea-
ture is that its worst losses were in cases
where it had been artistically deceived.
Several years ago The Times received
an elaborate account of a fearful scan-
dal at Rockford, Ills., involving one
prominent politician and the daughter
of another. The editor hesitated, but
the next day several letters came, all in
different hand writings, giving details
as if from different standpoints, and so
next morning an article appeared. There
was not a word of truth in the story. It
was a most ingenious fraud and the
author was never certainly discovered.
Of the many resulting suits some were
tried five times. The final payment of
damages was very small, but Mr. Storey
admitted that he had paid out many
thousands of dollars in lawyers' fees and
hunting evidence.

A still more curious case convulsed an
eastern city some years ago. An even-
ing paper gave a thrilling account of
four attempts to murder a young mar-
ried woman by connivance of her hus-
band. When suit was brought and the
reporter was called on for his proof, it
was discovered that his main witness
was in the penitentiary at Joliet, Ills.,
the next in importance in the New York
penitentiary at Auburn, and the third
was a police sergeant, who declared he
had told the reporter no such thing.
Ruin to the publishers seemed certain.



W. F. STOREY.

At this juncture a statesman of emi-
nence who owed much to the paper
came to the rescue. He had been pub-
lic prosecutor for years, knew the record
of every crook and criminal in the coun-
ty and held in his hands the power to
crush many of them. He summoned
them one by one to his office and made
each detail his knowledge of the plain-
tiffs. The result was a record which
caused the judge to declare that during
the progress of the trial he had to pinch
himself to be sure he was not dreaming.
The original case was practically ig-
nored. It was shown that the plaintiff
were of a family of professional criminal-
isms, one that had been such for four
generations. Judge and jury agreed
that such people could not be libeled.
And it turned out after all that the origi-
nal publication was true, though it was
not proved on the trial.

The last affair to interest the whole
English speaking world was that of Par-
nell and the London Times, in which
Parnell won. Other recent and familiar
cases are more amusing than serious.

There remains, then, but one point,
namely, Does the consumer pay a
greater price for any domestic product
because of the tariff? To this we answer,
No. We do not mean to say that the
duty is not in some instances added to
the price paid in the foreign market.
We do maintain, however, that if the
tariff were abolished we would have to
pay an equal if not a greater price than
we now pay for the protected article.
Imagine the tariff on woolen goods abo-
lished tomorrow. Foreign woolen mills
would find for their output a new market
wider and richer than all their other
foreign markets combined. The capacity
for producing would remain the same,
while the demand would be largely
increased. Under such conditions
must not prices rise? That is to say, if
the tariff were abolished we could not
buy in the foreign market at present
prices under existing tariff conditions.
That countless American products are
cheaper now than foreign products
would be under Free-trade would hardly
admit of a doubt. In these cases the
foreigner pays all the tariff.

We have had many cases of this kind
in our history, and in every instance
where the tariff has been removed or
reduced below a Protective basis the
foreigner has put up the price and we
have had to pay it; therefore we con-
clude that while denying in toto that
the tariff on imported goods is a tax on
domestic products, as the Honorable
Grover Cleveland contends, we are very
far from admitting that it is always a
tax even on imported goods. Foreign
mill owners would be the greater gain-
ers by Free-trade. Their eagerness to
break down our tariff walls ought to be

IS IT A TAX?

DOES THE TARIFF INCREASE THE
COST OF GOODS?

It Depends Upon the Kind of Tariff—How-
ever Duties Are Paid by the Consumer
Protective Duties by the Foreigner—Ev-
erything Cheaper Under Protection.

If a revenue or Free-trade tariff, such
as the former duty on sugar or tin plate,
we pay it all; if a protective tariff, we
may pay a part of the duty at first, but
eventually the foreigner pays nearly if
not quite all of it on goods actually im-
ported. If we prefer to buy English
goods, however, even though the Ameri-
can goods are better and cheaper, then, of
course, we pay the duty. This is a tax
on anglo-man, but on ordinary prod-
ucts, brought in to compete with domestic
products made on a large scale and al-
ready in practical possession of the do-
mestic market, the importer, the foreign
manufacturer and the foreign laborers
pay the duty.

In this connection we quote the fol-
lowing from a recent number of London
Fair-Trade:

"If we are to retain a hold on foreign
markets, slight though it may be, wages
must be kept down that the high foreign
tariffs may be overcome. One of the
greatest arguments against the theory
that the consumer pays the import duty
is to be found in the fact that when a
foreign nation increases the tariff on a
British product, the establishment
charges as well as the wages on this side
of the water are lowered, in order to
give the manufacturer or the merchant
a chance to deal successfully with the
change. If the consumer paid the duty
there would be little cause for our ex-
porter to grumble. But our manufac-
turers and work people do make sacri-
fices to meet the extra duty, and we ac-
cordingly hear grumbling from both."
This is plain enough, certainly, and
need only be verified by actual facts.
Ask the Canadian farmer who pays the
American duty. Ask the Sheffield man-
ufacturer, the Chemnitz workman, the
pearl button makers of Vienna, the tin
plate makers of Wales, the foreign man-
ufacturers of silk and linen and cutlery,
and scores of other articles. They will
all admit that they pay the duty if they
put their goods on our market. Here is
an admission from the New York Times
of Feb. 2, 1891. We produce it as be-
ing good Free-trade testimony indorsing
our own assertions:

"A statement issued by the depart-
ment of agriculture giving the exports
to the United States from Canada for
the year 1890, shows that the Dominion
exported \$11,219,043 worth of agricul-
tural products to the United States last
year. The average rate of duty collected
by the United States customs upon
agricultural products is about 20 per
cent., and it is easy to prove from the
speeches of Sir John Macdonald and
other Conservative leaders that the
duties imposed by the Americans upon
Canadian products exported to the United
States come out of the pockets of the
Canadian farmer. Hence we find that
during the fiscal year 1890 no less than
\$2,243,800—that is, 20 per cent. of \$11,-
219,043—went into the Washington
treasury, which would have gone into
the pockets of Canadian farmers if the
Dominion enjoyed unrestricted reciprocity."

It seems useless to pursue the matter
further. In the face of the many ar-
ticles selling for less than the duty, the
Free-trader still cries "the tariff is a tax."
Is the tariff on wire nails a tax,
selling at \$1.00 a keg while the duty is
two dollars? Is the tariff on a yard of
calico a tax, selling at 45 cents while
the duty is five cents? Is the tariff on a
yard of cloth a tax, selling at seventy-
five cents while the duty is 75 cents?
We deny that the tariff is ever a tax—
that is, a burden. In cases where the
tariff has been increased with a view to
create and develop a new industry, even
if prices are temporarily enhanced, it is
simply an investment which will be re-
paid many fold as soon as the industry
is established. The farmer does not be-
grudge the price of the seed in the spring
which will pay him bushels of grain in
the fall.

There remains, then, but one point,
namely, Does the consumer pay a
greater price for any domestic product
because of the tariff? To this we answer,
No. We do not mean to say that the
duty is not in some instances added to
the price paid in the foreign market.
We do maintain, however, that if the
tariff were abolished we would have to
pay an equal if not a greater price than
we now pay for the protected article.
Imagine the tariff on woolen goods abo-
lished tomorrow. Foreign woolen mills
would find for their output a new market
wider and richer than all their other
foreign markets combined. The capacity
for producing would remain the same,
while the demand would be largely
increased. Under such conditions
must not prices rise? That is to say, if
the tariff were abolished we could not
buy in the foreign market at present
prices under existing tariff conditions.
That countless American products are
cheaper now than foreign products
would be under Free-trade would hardly
admit of a doubt. In these cases the
foreigner pays all the tariff.

We have had many cases of this kind
in our history, and in every instance
where the tariff has been removed or
reduced below a Protective basis the
foreigner has put up the price and we
have had to pay it; therefore we con-
clude that while denying in toto that
the tariff on imported goods is a tax on
domestic products, as the Honorable
Grover Cleveland contends, we are very
far from admitting that it is always a
tax even on imported goods. Foreign
mill owners would be the greater gain-
ers by Free-trade. Their eagerness to
break down our tariff walls ought to be