

**MARTIN WHITE WANTS FULLERTON'S OFFICE**

(Continued from first page)

as aforesaid.

6. And your petitioner, for further cause of contest, alleges that at the close of said election on the 5th day of November, 1918, the Judges and Clerks of election in the different election precincts in said Columbia county, did proceed to canvass and count the votes cast for the respective candidates for the different offices, and among others, the votes cast for the plaintiff and contestant and the defendant and contestee, respectively, and did thereafter certify and return to the County Clerk of said County of Columbia the number of votes so counted by the said Judges and Clerks of election, and did certify the result thereof, as by law required, to said County Clerk; that thereafter the proper officers of the said County of Columbia did canvass the said votes so certified and returned by the said Judges and Clerks of election, and did certify that the said plaintiff and contestant received 783 votes and that the said defendant and contestee did receive 786 votes at the said election; that in the said counting, canvassing and return of said votes so cast at said election the said Judges and Clerks in the several precincts of said Columbia County did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Apiary Precinct 16 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 17 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 21 votes, whereas in truth and in fact said defendant received only 20 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Beaver Falls Precinct 21 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 22 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 13 votes, whereas in truth and in fact said defendant received only 12 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Clatskanie Precinct No. 1, 27 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 28 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 26 votes, whereas in truth and in fact said defendant received only 25 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Clatskanie Precinct No. 2, 35 votes,

whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 36 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 19 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 18 votes; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Deer Island Precinct 40 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 41 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 16 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 15 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Goble Precinct 44 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 45 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 24 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 23 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Marshland Precinct 4 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 5 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 3 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 2 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Mist Precinct 19 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 20 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 20 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 19 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Oak Point Precinct 15 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 16 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 3 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 2 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Prescott 5 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 6 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 36 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 35 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Rainier Precinct No. 1, 38 votes, whereas in

truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 39 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 31 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 30 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Rainier Precinct No. 2, 33 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 34 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 16 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 15 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Rainier Precinct No. 3, 45 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 46 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 28 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 27 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in St. Helens Precinct No. 1, 70 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 71 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 81 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 80 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in St. Helens Precinct No. 2, 109 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 110 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 161 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 159 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in St. Helens Precinct No. 3, 33 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 34 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 76 votes, whereas in truth and in fact, the said defendant received only 75 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Scappoose Precinct 82 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 83 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 81 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 80 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Spitzenberg Precinct 29 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 30 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 4 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 3 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Yankton Precinct 26 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 27 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 31 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 30 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Vernonia Precinct 29 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 30 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 27 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received only 26 votes in said Precinct; that the said Judges and Clerks of election did erroneously count and certify that the said plaintiff received in Warren Precinct 63 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said plaintiff received in said Precinct 64 votes, and the said Judges and Clerks did return and certify that the said defendant did receive in said Precinct 69 votes, whereas in truth and in fact the said defendant received 59 votes in said Precinct.

7. That at the said election the said plaintiff herein received 804 votes, whereas the said Board of Canvassers returned and certified that he only received 783 votes, and at the said election the defendant received 755 votes, whereas the said Board of Canvassers did return and certify that the said defendant received 786 votes; that by reason of the premises said plaintiff received a plurality of 49 votes over and above the number of votes cast for said defendant and was duly elected to the said office of County Judge and is entitled to receive a certificate of such election to hold said office.

8. That the said Board of Canvassers did certify to the election of the said defendant on the 9th day of November, 1918, and not before, and 40 days have not elapsed since the return day of said election and the said certificate of election was made by the said Board of Canvassers; and that if the said illegal votes so cast for the defendant and so counted and returned as votes for the defendant as aforesaid are taken from the number of votes so certified and canvassed as being cast for him, said defendant, it would reduce the number of his legal votes below the number of legal votes given to the plaintiff for the said office of County Judge, and by deducting same would give to the plaintiff 783 votes and would give to the defendant 776 votes and the plaintiff

then and there would have a plurality of seven (7) votes over and above the number of legal votes cast for the said defendant and would be elected to said office and entitled to a certificate thereof and to hold the office of County Judge.

9. That it is necessary and proper, in order that a true and correct return and canvass of the votes cast at said election may be had and a true and correct judgment may be made as to the choice of the electors of said county for said office of County Judge that the legal ballots so cast at said election should be recounted and recanvassed, and the errors and mistakes of said Judges and Clerks of election should be thereafter corrected, and that in order that a true and correct canvass and return of the legal votes cast for the said candidates at said election may be had, the said illegal votes so cast at said election should be deducted from the total number of votes found upon said canvass to have been cast for the said defendant.

Wherefore, the plaintiff and contestant herein prays that it may be determined by the Circuit Court that the said defendant, W. J. Fullerton, was not duly elected and that at said election the plaintiff and contestant, Martin White, was duly elected to the said office of County Judge, for his costs and disbursements herein, and for such other and further relief as to the Court may seem just and legal in the premises.

MARTIN WHITE,  
Plaintiff and Contestant.  
Wilson F. Hume  
Attorney for Plaintiff and Contestant.

It is evident that either White or his attorney are mind readers, for he, him or they can tell just how a man voted. The judges and clerks of elections, according to White's complaint, were very stupid men, for in almost every instance (where a precinct didn't give a majority for White) the count was erroneous. By what ledgerman method White and his attorney arrive at this conclusion, is a profound secret. As a matter of fact, very few of the allegations will stand the limelight. The purpose is to get a recount with the hope that a few errors might be detected and White land a county job for another six years.

**Misunderstood**  
She—Wasn't it awful? I nearly had a bat in my head last night.  
He—That's where you generally have 'em.—San Francisco Chronicle.

Charles M. Schwab, as the director of shipbuilding in the United States, will have under him over 450,000 men.

**Stomach Trouble**  
"Before I used Chamberlain's Tablets I doctored a great deal for stomach trouble and felt nervous and tired all the time. These tablets helped me from the first, and inside of a week's time I had improved in every way," writes Mrs. L. A. Drinkard, Jefferson City, Mo.



Christmas

**Desserts**

should be wholesome and delicious. We have numerous "goodies" to tempt you with.

**Mince Pies**

Puddings, Plum Cakes, Eclairs, Cakes with fancy icing and everything you could desire to add to the Christmas feast. Daintiness and purity combine in everyone of our products.

**CREAM PUFFS  
RAISIN BREAD  
DOUGHNUTS**

**Ramsey's  
BREAD**

We carry a nice line of CANDIES and

LIGHT GROCERIES

Drop in any time and try a cup of our

GOOD COFFEE

**Thank You**

**THE TOGGERY**

Near Postoffice The Workingman's Standard "Dick for Duds"

**We'll Welcome You!**  
Shop Early and get the Benefit of Fresh Stocks



Oil Clothes Here

**A Few Suggestions Just Before Christmas. Our Line of Goods is Exceptionally Attractive**

- Bath Robes ..... \$4.50 to \$10.00
- Bags and Suit Cases ..... \$1.50 to \$15.00
- Belts, in fancy boxes ..... 25c to \$1.00
- Trench Caps, in latest styles ..... \$1.50
- Cuff Links and Tie Clasps in boxes ..... 50c
- COLLARS, both Soft and Linen in the latest shapes

- Garters and Arm Bands, in fancy boxes ..... 25c and up
- Dress Gloves, all sizes ..... \$2.50, \$3.00
- WORK GLOVES, cotton, wool and leather
- Knitted Toques, in all colors ..... 75c and up
- Ladies' Silk Hose, black and white ..... 85c, \$1.00, \$1.50
- Purses and Pocket Books ..... 50c and up

- Suspenders, in fancy boxes ..... 50c, 65c, \$1.00
- DRESS SHIRTS in large variety
- SWEATERS and JERSEYS in all colors
- Umbrellas for Oregon weather ..... \$1.25 to \$5.00
- UNDERWEAR makes an appropriate gift
- Men's Fancy and Plain Silk Hose ..... 65c to \$1.00

- Biggest and Best line of Mackinaws ..... \$8.50 to \$17.50
- STAG SHIRTS, WOOL SOX—in fact Everything for Men
- OIL CLOTHING
- LEGGINGS
- PANTS and SLICKERS
- NIGHT SHIRTS and PAJAMAS, in cotton and outing flannel

**Nifty Holiday Neckwear**  
Our line of Neckwear is beyond comparison. We have, without a doubt, the most exclusive collection of Ties in the county. In fancy boxes  
**50c, 65c, 75c, \$1.00**

**Suits and Overcoats**  
A Suit of Clothes - - \$20.00 to \$50.00  
OR  
Overcoats - - \$20.00 to \$40.00