

EASTERN CLACKAMAS NEWS

Devoted to the Interests of Eastern Clackamas County

VOLUME 10; NUMBER 20

ESTACADA, OREGON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1917

\$1. PER YEAR

HERE'S A CONUNDRUM

What's The Difference Between Judge Grant B. Dimick and Opportunity

Answer—opportunity Knocks But Once. But, it remained for the Eastern Clackamas News and ye editor to listen to the gentle tappings of both last Thursday evening, when the Hon? Grant B. Dimick, on the floor of the Legislature and before an audience of several hundred legislators and Clackamas County taxpayers, denounced the Eastern Clackamas News as being largely responsible for the present Cascade County movement.

It was another instance of the old adage, that Every Knock Is A Boost and when the Hon? Grant B. characterized the Eastern Clackamas News—"The Fire Brand"—he paid us a compliment, which gave public recognition of the fact that our labors have not been in vain.

Despite a strong tendency towards murdering the English language and overlooking the fundamental rules of grammar, all hats have to be taken off to the Hon? Grant B. (excepting the hats of Walter Givens, Ed Bartlett and other local orators) as some young speech-maker. And, as even the most beautiful flower oft springs from the dung heap, so, the publicity given the Eastern Clackamas News, sprung forth as a peerless advertisement, from amidst the mess of oratorical promises, exaggerated statements and distorted figures, presented by the human megaphone of the pulpy city.

The News would not feel quite as elated and complimented, had this knock come from any ordinary mortal, but when given statewide publicity by an ex-County Judge, a defeated candidate for the nomination for Governor and a man who thinks he is one of the leading politicians of the state, the knock is doubly welcome.

In appearing as the principal speaker for the Oregon City opposition at Thursday's meeting, Hon? Judge Dimick was doubly qualified for the responsibility, not only being able to voice the sentiments of the ruling, predatory county-seat politicians, but appearing in the role of a personal defendant against the attacks and exposures made by the Cascade County faction.

During the oratorical fireworks, Judge Dimick qualified his attack on the News by explaining that one consolation lay in the fact that it only occupied about twenty minutes of the reader's time to read the News from cover to cover—but he probably forgot to mention that during that third of an hour, enough seed for thought had possibly been absorbed, to warrant a few hours of deliberation.

Just how Judge Dimick comes to be so conversant with the Eastern Clackamas News and its policy of protecting and fighting for the interests of Eastern Clackamas County, is a question—for the subscription of said Dimick was duly stopped a year or so ago, along with those of a few other Oregon City politicians, who felt it was unnecessary for them to pay for their newspapers as ordinary readers do. But the Hon? Grant probably has been spending his allotted twenty minutes perusing the free copy of the News, in the city library or sneaking a glance at his neighbor's paid-in-advance copy, but last and not least, if all of the twenty minute periods in his working days were as profitably employed, there would be less foundation for such movements as the Cascade County cause.

The Judge's characterization of the News as a Fire-Brand in no way hurts our feelings, for Fire-Brands are used to start things—Fire-Brands are used as beacons and Fire-Brands are used to throw light into those dim recesses where lurk the cobwebs and dust of corruption and if the glow cast into the decay-filled, stinking corners of the Clackamas County politics, illumines the beatific, refined, stately features of the Hon? Grant B. Dimick, and others of his ilk, the Fire-Brand has not burned its oil for naught.

True, Judge Dimick has done Clackamas County farmers much good and others by the name of Dimick have done Clackamas County taxpayers good, and if the next twenty years finds the name of Dimick on the county pay-rolls, as the past twenty years has, the farmers will continue to be done good—but let's hope the farmers will be beyond their influence and domination long before that time.

Of course Judge Dimick hates the News, for the News has not

Concluded on Page 3

EXPERT ACCOUNTANTS MAKE REPORT

STATISTICS SHOW CASCADE COUNTY ROAD DISTRICTS RECEIVED LESS THAN THEIR SHARE OF TAX MONEYS

With Districts Near County Seat Receiving More Than Their Share

Road Districts in Group No. 1, Include the districts in the vicinity of Oregon City, being those districts which have received most of the hard surfaced paving in the past two years.

Road Districts in Group No. 2, Include all districts not included in the proposed Cascade County or in Group No. 1.

Group No. 3—Includes all road districts within the proposed Cascade County.

Whitfield, Whitcomb & Co.
Certified Public Accountants

Portland, Oregon,
January 27, 1917.

To the—
Members of the Committees on Counties, of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oregon.

Gentlemen:

At the request of the Farmers and Merchants Club of Eastern Clackamas County, we have made a careful examination of the records of Clackamas County for the past seven years, for the purpose of determining the proportion of taxes for road purposes levied on lands in the territory embraced in the proposed new County of Cascade, and the amount disbursed within such territory as compared with the remainder of the County.

A county map was furnished us, which purports to show the location of the various road districts and the boundary lines of the proposed new county. Assuming same to be correct we have divided the road districts into three groups and given each group a distinctive color on the map. The districts in red are those immediately adjacent to Oregon City and are designated as Group I; those in green are within the limits of the proposed Cascade County and are designated as Group II; while the remainder of the county has been put into Group III.

Taking the records in the office of the County Clerk as accurate, without in any way vouching for them, and for purposes of comparison using the total amount of tax levied in each district instead of the amount actually paid in, which it would require much time to compile, we

arrive at the following results which we also place before you in the form of graphic charts.

GENERAL ROAD TAXES

Chart I

	Total Amounts Levied	Statutory Proportion	Disburse. Charg. to Districts
Group I—	\$447,590	\$234,386	\$296,820
Group II—	614,492	325,710	386,498
Group III—	252,770	134,414	157,336

£ 70% for 1915 and 50% for prior years.

From these figures it will appear that Group I received 26% more than its statutory proportion, while Group III received but 17% more than its proportion, the excess going to the Oregon City territory, thus being relatively 50% greater than the excess going to the Cascade territory.

SPECIAL ROAD TAXES

Chart II

	Total Amounts Levied	Disbursements Charged to Districts
Group I	\$ 67,783	\$ 61,785
Group II	153,437	138,587
Group III	160,631	132,481

From these figures you will note that, while neither of the three groups received as much as its assessment, the percentage of shortage for Group III is double that for Group I.

ANALYSIS OF AVERAGES

Chart III

The disparity is further set out when it is noted from this chart that the Cascade Group, while having had an average assessed valuation of less than 60% of Group I and barely over 40% of Group II, actually taxed itself a greater sum for special road work than either of the other groups and at an average rate of more than four times that of Group I and two and a half times that of Group II.

	Average Assessed Valuation	Average Special Road Tax	Average Rate of Levy
Group I	7,888,215	9,683	.0012
Group II	10,825,063	21,919	.0020
Group III	4,443,038	22,947	.0052

Concluded on page 2