

Wm. McBratney

FUNERAL DIRECTOR AND LICENSED EMBALMER

Calls Answered Promptly Day or Night

Day and Night 'Phones

Licensed in Idaho & Oregon

ONTARIO, OREGON

J. H. FARLEY

FUNERAL DIRECTOR AND ENBALMER
LADY ASSISTANT

PERSONAL ATTENTION GIVEN TO ALL FUNERALS
PROMPTLY DAY OR NIGHT

CALLS ANSWERED

Phone 64w

Ontario, Oregon

THE RIGHT DRUG STORE

Is the store that always tries to give you just the things you call for and does not try to substitute something else instead.

IF you ask for a specific article and your druggist tries to persuade you that they have something else just as good, thus substituting before your very eyes, what would you think that druggist would do with your prescription when he is behind the prescription case and you can't see him?

We always try to supply just the things called for and if we do not have it we will get it. We regard substitution as stealing. What do you think?

Buy your drugs from us and get what you ask for.

HILL'S PHARMACY



RIGHT ON THE MINUTE

No time wasted in waiting for rigs from the Ontario Livery. Our service is promptness itself, and our horses and carriages are equal in appearance to the best private outfits. Vehicles clean, comfortable and easy going, and horses of the kind that get there.

The Ontario Livery, G. H. Grimshaw,
Ontario, Oregon

**You Run Your Business
With a Check Book -
How About Your Home?**



"BILLS, bills, bills—nothing but bills!" frequently is the complaint of the head of the family. No man would think of running his business **WITHOUT A CHECK BOOK.** How about YOUR home? The running of the home today is a **BUSINESS PROPOSITION.**

Open a **CHECKING ACCOUNT** With Us at Once
The Ontario National Bank

SOME INDISPUTABLE PROOF REGARDING COST OF BUILDING

Question. Can a suitable Court House be built for \$25,000.00?
Answer. Yes. The floor plans show that this new Court House has almost twice the space of the Court House at Vale and the following letters and affidavits show that Ontario's Court House can be built for \$25,000.00

CERTIFICATE OF ARCHITECT.

We guarantee that the Court House building as shown in the enclosed picture with plans and specifications can be built and all mechanical equipment installed complete ready for occupation for the sum of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars.

Signed **TOURTELLOTTE & HUMMELL,**
Architects,
Boise, Idaho.

UNITED STATES FIDELITY AND GUARANTEE COMPANY,
Baltimore, Md.

Boise, Idaho, Oct. 9, 1914.

Ontario Commercial Club,
Ontario, Oregon.

Gentlemen:

Regarding prospective plans for Malheur County Court House, we desire to say that the firm of Tourtelotte & Hummell of this city are ready to go into contract and guarantee the building of the Malheur County Court House in accordance with their plans as heretofore submitted to you for the sum of \$25,000.00, and we as agents for the United States Fidelity & Guarantee Co., of Baltimore, Md., stand ready and willing to execute a bond for them guaranteeing their faithful performance, and would say in addition that we have known and done business with this firm for a number of years, and know them to be thoroughly reliable in every way, and conservative in their estimates.

Very truly yours,
McREYNOLDS & WHITSON,
By Henry Whitson.

BAKER LOAN & ABSTRACT CO.,
Baker, Oregon.

Wm. Pollman, Pres.

John Schmitz, Vice-Pres.
H. A. Sonne, Cashier.

October 10, 1914.

Ontario Commercial Club,
Ontario, Oregon.

Gentlemen:

Am writing you in reference to Messrs. Tourtelotte & Hummell, who built our Bank Building for us in Baker, which building was completed in every way for less than Mr. Hummell's estimate of cost to us when drawing the plans. Should you have any business with Mr. Hummell, you will find him entirely trustworthy and to be relied upon in every way.

Yours very truly,
WM. POLLMAN.

Copy of letter from Ex-Governor James Hawley.
Boise, Idaho, October 9, 1914.

Ontario Commercial Club,
Ontario, Oregon.

Gentlemen:

It has been called to my attention that an attack is being made upon the competency and reliability of the architect firm of Tourtelotte & Hummell of this city.

I have had a great deal of official and personal business with the members of this firm and particularly Chas. F. Hummel, and feel that he is not subject to any attack whatsoever upon any ground, least of all the grounds that I have mentioned. As Governor of the state of Idaho I had in charge the construction of the central Capitol Building. This was in charge of Tourtelotte & Hummell as architects. Their services were highly satisfactory, to all of the officials of the state connected with the building and the Capitol is a monument to their ability and integrity. More than a million dollars was expended in the construction of this building, and it was built at less than the estimate of the architects, I have also recently ended my duties as Chairman of the Elks' Building Committee. The Elks' Lodge of this city recently built one of the finest homes in the Northwest at a cost of over \$90,000.00. This building was under the architectural supervision of Tourtelotte & Hummell, and is a source of pride and satisfaction to the citizens of this community. It was also built within the estimate of the architects.

Knowing this firm as well as I do I have no hesitancy in strongly recommending them in every way, and I would be pleased to answer any queries that you may desire to make concerning the firm or its managing member, Mr. Hummell.

Yours very truly,
JAMES HAWLEY.

AFFIDAVIT OF CONTRACTOR.

State of Oregon
County of Malheur

We, F. O. Carman and George Closson, Being first duly sworn say on oath: That we are practical contractors and builders and have followed that occupation for many years last past, and are now engaged in that business at Nyssa, Oregon, under the firm name and style of Carman & Closson; that we have carefully examined the plans and specifications prepared by Tourtelotte & Hummell, architects, for the proposed court house for Malheur County, Oregon, to be erected at Ontario if that city secures the County seat of said county; that in our opinion a good substantial building of the dimension and material stated in said plans and specification, including plumbing and heating, can be erected for the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars; that we are ready, able, and willing to enter into a contract, with satisfactory bonds for performance, to construct and finish said building along the general lines specified in said plans, drawings and specification, and to do the work in a good workmanlike manner, and furnish all materials, for the said sum of twenty-five thousand dollars; that if we obtain the contract to construct said building we guarantee that we can and will construct and furnish if for said sum and that the completed building will give general satisfaction to the public.

F. O. CARMAN
GEO. CLOSSON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of October, 1914.

W. W. WOOD,
Notary Public for Oregon.

(Seal)

CONTRACTOR MAKES PROPOSITION.

Ontario, Oregon, October 7, 1914.

To the Building Committee of the City Council of Ontario, Oregon, and to the Voters and Taxpayers of Malheur County:

I hereby tender my bid to build the court house and jail offered by the City of Ontario free to the voters of Malheur County, and agree to build same according to the published plans of Tourtelotte & Hummell, and finish same ready for occupancy by the County Officials for the sum of Twenty-Five Thousand (\$25,000.00) Dollars.

I hereby agree to enter into contract and furnish the following bondsmen as a guarantee of the faith, performance of my contract; J. R. Blackaby, Pres., of Ontario National Bank; A. L. Cockrum, President, First National Bank; H. C. Boyer, of Boyer Bros. Co.; Ray Wilson of Wilson Bros. Co.; E. C. Van Petten, C. R. Smison.

Respectfully submitted,
J. A. DRAPER,
Contractor.

Is the Proposed Building Large Enough?

Many Court Houses costing \$150,000 are no larger than the one to be built by Ontario but are constructed of stone, with marble floors, costly domes surmounted by a goddess of justice, fancy trimmings and drinking fountains scattered around.

The building Ontario is giving the county is a large plain one built of brick and cement with pressed brick on the outside. It is a good looking building, with plenty of room to work in, and that is the main thing in a county building, unless the taxpayers want to throw their money away, it is roomy enough for a county with a population of 50,000 instead of the 10,000 which Malheur County now has. If this same class building was built at a cost of \$150,000 it would take a guide to find the clerk's who now work in the four rooms used steadily in our county building, by the Sheriff, Assessor, County Judge and County Clerk.

If Vale should win this election and keep the county seat, it will not be long until the present court house will be condemned and the county court will be petitioned to erect a stone building with marble trimmings and a big dome, with a cost of not less than \$150,000. The reason they will want such a costly building is that they know that with in a short time the people will again be bringing up the county seat fight, and the only way Vale can hope to hold it will be to get the County to build such a costly court house that they cannot afford to move.

Ontario and the whole Snake River Valley is growing fast, and there is a general demand on the part of the taxpayers to move the County Seat. Vale people realize that they must have a \$150,000 court house to hold the County Seat.

Mr. Taxpayer: VOTE FOR ONTARIO AND GET A COURT HOUSE FREE VOTE FOR VALE AND YOU WILL PAY FROM \$150,000 to \$200,000 FOR A NEW ONE.

Vale is asking for sympathy now BUT if they win this election YOU will be the one asking for sympathy.

Not Possible for Vale.

Question. Is Vale in a position financially to erect and donate a Court House to the County?

Answer. No. That city is already bonded for over twenty per cent of the assessed valuation of its property, and could not market additional bonds for any purpose.

Ontario is Prepared.

Question. Is Ontario in a position financially to erect and donate a court house to the county?

Answer. Yes. Ontario is only bonded for five per cent of the assessed valuation of her property and the bonds for the court house will increase this to about eight per cent. As the character limit of its bonded indebtedness is fifteen per cent of its taxable property, she can erect this court house and still be 7 per cent short of her limit.

How You Are to Know.

Question. How do we know that Ontario will erect and donate a Court House to the County if she secures the County Seat?

Answer. Because the city has already voted \$30,000 in bonds for this purpose, and the bonds have been sold, and that amount of money is now on hand to be used for the purpose. Her citizens have promised to do this and will carry out that promise. It would be very disastrous to the business interests of Ontario to repudiate this contract with the taxpayers of the county, even though it were possible for them to get out of paying this thirty thousand dollars. In fact if Ontario should try to take such an unwise course, it would be a clear case of deceiving the voters and would be getting the county seat under false pretense. Which would cause the election to be set aside at the suit of the injured taxpayers.

Moving the Records.

Question. What will it cost to move the records, furniture and fixtures from the present court house to the new one at Ontario?

Answer. Anywhere from \$150.00 to \$250.00 would be liberal estimate for this purpose. The chairs, desks, filing cabinets, safe's record books, etc., could be rapidly and easily moved. They would be just as useful and necessary in the new building as in the old. No new additional records would be required. The people would simply cease going to Vale and transact their county business and would come to Ontario instead. It would be just such a job as moving from one residence into another, only it would be on a little larger scale. The expense of the moving would be very small.

Who Owns the County Seat?

Question. Does the county seat belong to any particular town?

Answer. Certainly not. It is the property of the citizens and taxpayers of the county. They have a right to locate it wherever it is the most convenient for them and no town has a right to complain if this is done. As such moves usually create considerable friction and disturbance in a county, the law has provided that a genuine demand for the removal must exist before such a removal can be had. This is accomplished by providing that it shall take a sixty per cent vote to obtain such removal. It is only fair and just that the citizens of a county should have a right to change the location of their county seat when sixty per cent or more of their number desire such change.

Why in Ontario?

Question. Why is Ontario a better location for the county seat than Vale?

Answer. There are many reasons. In the first place it is better situated, being on the main line of the railroad. It has three large and modern hotels and numerous private boarding houses and restaurants. People desiring to attend to county business will find better accommodations at Ontario than at Vale.

Two out of every three persons having county business to transact are now compelled to pass through Ontario and on to Vale. There is a better and less expensive service by telephone from Ontario than there is from Vale. Ontario is the largest city in the county and growing all the time. County property in Ontario would constantly increase in value; whereas in Vale its value is continually decreasing. We have a better point for trading purposes than Vale. People coming to court nearly always come to Ontario to trade and for other business. It would be cheaper for them to attend to both at the same time and in the same place.

Is it Bribery?

Question. If a town offers to donate a court house and grounds to a county as a consideration for the location of a county seat at that town, does such an offer constitute bribery or corruption.

Answer. No. Because the offer is made to the entire public and does not influence any one elector more than another. The Corrupt Practice act of Oregon, among other things, makes it an offence to offer to an Elector to induce him to vote for or to refrain from voting for any measure submitted to the people. If any individual elector was to be offered ten dollars to vote for Ontario for the county seat that would be bribery and corruption. It would be a benefit flowing to that elector to influence his vote and would not benefit the public or the other electors at large. But to offer a court house to the county benefits all alike, and does not influence one more than any other in the county. The Supreme Courts in many states in the Union have passed on this question. The very great weight of legal authority is to the effect that an offer of a court house and grounds to the county as a consideration for a location of a county seat does not amount to bribery or corruption. This conclusion has been reached by the highest courts in the states of Montana, Iowa, Wisconsin, Kansas, Texas, Kentucky and many other states.

(Continued on Page Seven)