

# MARSH LANDS

50 PER CENT. VEGETABLE MATTER.

# OREGON'S RICHEST SOIL

KLAMATH'S GREATEST BARGAINS AT \$25 PER ACRE AND UPWARDS.

# ABEL ADY

PHONE 303

EASY TERMS

## THE EVENING HERALD

Issued Daily, Except Sunday, by the  
HERALD PUBLISHING COMPANY  
W. O. SMITH, Editor

### SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Daily, by mail, one year	\$5.00
Daily, by mail, six months	3.50
Daily, by mail, three months	2.25
Daily, by mail, one month	1.00
Daily, delivered by carrier, one week	20

KLAMATH FALLS, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1909.

### NEWARR, SAYS CHAMBERS (Continued from Page 1.)

portant provisions of the reclamation act. And, as was developed during the recent trip of the senate committee not only to the Orland and Klamath projects, but also to the Truckee-Carson project in Nevada, the landowners in all three want an extension of the time of repayments, while those of the first two also object to the bona fide settlers' clause, desiring instead that the ownership of land under the federal projects shall be thrown open to all.

It is these two recommendations, in addition to other but less important complaints made, that caused the friends of the reclamation policy of the government to regard the visit of the senate committee as "an unfortunate." They afford, as one will readily see, a club for the hands of the enemies of the reclamation act. And that it has enemies I need only quote Senator Carter, chairman of the senate committee on irrigation, who stated both at Fallon and at Red Bluff his belief that if the matter of repealing the law was now laid before congress it would be carried by a big majority.

If the beneficiaries under the act complain, what better proof, at least of a superficial character, is needed that the law has proved a failure? In the hostile frame of mind congress is said to be, here are good reasons ready at hand. But this is very far from saying that an honest and thorough investigation of the situation would justify the repeal of the reclamation act. Personally, I consider it one of the wisest pieces

of legislation ever approved by the government.

Almost from the inception of the Klamath project there have been wrangling and dissatisfaction there. Two factions have fought each other, and both have joined at times in fighting the officials of the reclamation service. The project is a huge one, contemplating as originally laid out the reclamation of 250,000 acres of land and the expenditure of \$1,500,000.

It is but natural that friction should have resulted under such a great undertaking. The landowners have had some just grounds for complaint, but they have also complained without justice, and when it is considered that in the end they will get a splendid irrigation system at as low a cost, if not lower, as they could have secured from private sources, had such sources been available, it is hard for an outsider to have patience with their continual bickering.

At the time of the formation of the Klamath project, the estimated cost was given as about \$15 per acre; in other words, each landowner concerned would be expected to pay back the money advanced at the annual rate of \$1.50 per acre of his own holdings for ten years. That is to say, if he owned ten acres, he would pay \$15 a year, or in ten years a total of \$150. It now develops, however, that the actual cost will run to \$30 an acre, which means that the man owning ten acres will have to pay the government \$300 in ten years, instead of \$150.

Quite a difference, I will admit, but at the same time the landowner

is getting a perpetual water right under a splendid irrigation system at a minimum of cost.

It is unfortunate that the estimate of \$15 was ever given. The difference between that amount and \$30 means a great deal to a poor man, especially where land has to be brought under initial cultivation, reclaimed from a wild state, yet at the time the \$15 amount was named the cost of material and of labor justified it. On the whole, Klamath has less reason for complaint than for thanksgiving.

The recommendations made by the Orland Unit Water Users association, especially the one relating to the extension of the time in which to repay the government, I really believe was suggested not so much in the belief that the landowners under the rich Orland project would ever need a relief of this character, but in a generous spirit, so that projects less favorably situated as to soil, climate and water supply might be taken care of.

I recall that when Secretary of the Interior Ballinger visited Orland and asked if there would be any trouble there as to the repayments, both Egesdient Greenwood and Secretary Roeger of the Water Users association told him they thought not. Like opinions were given to me before that meeting and since.

The people of the Orland project, in their whole-hearted desire to aid others, have placed themselves in a wrong light, I am convinced, and unintentionally have put a weapon into the hands of the enemies of the policy under which they are being taken care of and benefited.

So, too, as to the amendment or elimination of the bona fide settlers' clause. Under the reclamation act no one can own more than 160 acres in a project. This, of course, means the cutting up of big holdings and the coming in of new people. But there are many people seeking small farms who know nothing of farming, and the Orland idea is that in instances of this kind artisans and others not accustomed to farm life should be permitted to own land and place it in the hands of practical cultivators until brought to a stage where they could step in and be assured of a living from it.

I do not think any one at Orland favors the taking down of the bona fide settlers' clause entirely, but to a certain extent only, as suggested. In other words, they would like to see the bona fide settlers' clause amended, not eliminated.

Over in the Truckee-Carson project there has been trouble, too, almost from the start. There the estimated cost per acre was given as \$22 and now it is planned to charge \$30. The advance in the cost of material and labor is given as the reason. In fact, Director Newell of the reclamation service is quoted as saying that the estimated cost was known to be too low when made, and that it was always intended to raise it when sufficient data had been secured to justify a final figure—the first amount was merely to get the project started.

The Truckee-Carson people are torn into factions, too, as in the Klamath country. In fact, the president of the Water Users' association there refused to sign the report prepared in advance of the senate committee's coming, not deeming it fair to the service and regarding it as an injury to the project.

So much as to Klamath, Orland and the Truckee-Carson. It will be seen that the senate committee heard complaints in each instance. Congress will be given a report by it, when the various recommendations made by the different projects will be open to all—to enemies as well as to friends of the reclamation act.

Senator Carter, both at Fallon and at Red Bluff, laid stress upon the hostility of congress. But yet, while professing to believe that the act would be repealed if put to a test, he insisted that congress should provide a lump sum at once for the completion of the projects now under way.

If, however, congress is as hostile as the senate committee's chairman contends, why seek such aid when the probability is, if he be correct, that the act itself is in danger? Why invite a battle at this time?

Fifty millions have been put into these projects, and as much more will be required to complete them. At the present rate of income from the sale of public lands and repayments from projects, it will take five years to secure enough money to finish the work under way. Would it not be better, then, to wait (especially when even with money available it will take several years to complete many of the projects), rather than risk the life of the law by asking a bond or warrant issue of \$10,000 at this time?

Why does Senator Carter lay such stress upon congress providing money at once? Certainly, it would be a fine thing for congress to do, but in view of the presumption that it not only will not do so, but may even repeal the law now in force, Carter's insistence takes on a peculiar hue. Is he a friend of the reclamation policy or not?

At Fallon, speaking of the situation in congress, he said: "At the last special session WE OF THE WEST were gravely concerned lest the law's active enemies might make such a proposal with success"—that is, a proposal to repeal the law.

Carter, be it remembered, is from Montana. Again, while still at Fallon, he declared: "The members of the senate committee on irrigation, with two exceptions, are Western men who REALIZE THE VITAL NECESSITY OF THE CONTINUANCE OF THE RECLAMATION POLICY."

Yet at Red Bluff he advised the promoters of the Iron Canyon project to go slow, to get private help if they could, and, if not, not to attempt to start their project, at least as one of the units of the Sacramento Valley project, until all the money necessary was on hand and available. His speech there was very discouraging in tone.

And while being driven over the great Cone ranch, near Red Bluff, on his way to Los Molinos, he replied, in answer to a query if he would favor coming under a government project such as the Iron Canyon if he owned such a splendid piece of property as the Cone ranch: "I'm frank enough to say I would not." He made it plain all along that the government had no money for new projects, and would not have at the best under five years, unless congress came to the rescue by a bond issue or by authorizing the use of warrants or certificates.

As I have stated, it would be a fine thing if congress would come to the relief of the reclamation service, but are the leading proponents of such a course sincere? Senator Carter seems open to suspicion. The idea originated with Secretary of the Interior Ballinger, who is not considered any too friendly to the government's policy of reclamation. At least, he so told me himself at Orland several weeks ago, saying that President Taft's speech in favor of a \$10,000,000 bond issue had been inspired by him.

If he is against the reclamation policy, did he make this suggestion that the whole matter might be taken before congress and the original act itself repealed? Is he, in company with Carter and other alleged friends of the service, working, as a matter of fact, against it, fighting it from within instead of from without?

Senators Warren and Jones were the only other members of the senate committee on irrigation who visited this section. Warren was outspoken in his opposition to the reclamation policy, as now carried on. He said the law did not suit him when passed and did not now. He advised the people of Red Bluff, for instance, not to try to secure government aid, but to interest private capital. His whole tone was inimical to the reclamation policy. Jones did not attend the Red Bluff meeting, preferring to go auto-

ing instead, but he is not considered a warm champion of the law.

It is evident, therefore, that with the complaints made by the landowners of the Truckee-Carson, Orland and Klamath projects, the senate committee—or at least its powerful chairman and the two senators who accompanied him here (admitting that they are really unfriendly to the reclamation service)—are in a position to strike hard blows against the act.

While I have nothing of a positive nature to base the statement upon, I felt while on the trip through the valley that the most cordial relations did not exist between the three senators on the one hand and Director Newell and Engineers Davis and Henny on the other. The last three are wrapped up in their work. Able, honest and hard working, they have done the best they could under an imperfect law. With Roosevelt in the White House and Garfield in his cabinet, they were given every encouragement. With these two big men gone, they are confronted with an administration they do not understand and by attacks on all sides—attacks, too, which they cannot well reply to. Ballinger is their superior officer, while it is from congress they must get their financial support.

If the leaders of the latter body and the Secretary of the Interior are against them, or at least the service they represent, it is high time the friends of the reclamation policy began to show themselves. Public opinion alone can hold the balance of power under such circumstances.

### HOME REALTY CO.

Watch this Space for  
"REAL SNAPS"

For Rent—5-room furnished house; choice location, close in; new; very well furnished.

\$16,000—California peach and grape ranch for trade for Oregon ranch or city property.

\$3,000—Modern Bungalow; perfectly constructed; well located; constantly increasing in value; a fine home.

### TIMBER CLAIMS HOMESTEADS

"THE RED FRONT"  
Office, Main St. Phone 511

### WANT ADS.

#### FOR SALE—Miscellaneous.

For Sale—Ticket to Los Angeles. Address "Ticket," Evening Herald.

FOR SALE—\$850.00 Steinway grand piano, practically new, for \$700.00; \$100.00 down, balance easy installments at 6 per cent. Inquire at "The Oregon," Klamath Falls. tf

FOR SALE—Or will exchange for Klamath county property, small farm in Mendocino, near Ukiah; well improved; nice location. For particulars address H. T. BARNETT, Midland.

FOR SALE—Toledo range, almost new. Inquire two doors north of Methodist church.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

WANTED—Hand ironers at the Klamath Falls Steam Laundry.

WANTED—Laundry. Call Mrs. W. S. Wiley, Hot Springs, addition. 3t

FOR RENT—Storeroom at corner 7th and Main sts. Inquire of C. W. Harlow on premises.

FURNISHED Room for rent, Ninth and Bush streets. J. H. Hamilton.

ROOMS TO RENT—Mrs. Nelson has 2 front rooms, furnished and with stove, to rent; cor. 6th and Walnut.

WANTED—Two or four work horses to winter for their use, on ranch; good feed and care guaranteed. W. P. SOULE, Klamath Falls.

Lost—Gold watch, open face, with gold chain attached. Liberal reward paid if returned to this office. 4t

Lost—Bunch of keys, name check attached. Finder please leave them at Herald office. Suitable reward.

## Goodrich's Cash Store

C. F. GOODRICH, Proprietor

Dealer in Dry Goods, Clothing, Shoes, Hats, Carpets, Rugs, Wall Paper and Groceries

Flour Table Salt, 50 pounds for	8.75
Snap Soap, 100 bars for	8.50
Coffee, per pound	15c to .50
Tea, per pound	40c to .45
Star Tobacco, per plug	.45
Horseshoe Tobacco, per plug	.40
Spear Head Tobacco, per plug	.40 and .11
Rice, per pound	.06 and .07
Beans per pound	.06 and .07
Columbia Oat Flakes, piece to chinaware in, each package	.35
Violet Oats, package	.15
Violet Pancake Flour	.15
Roller Oats, in bulk, 10 pounds for	1.00
Dried Prunes, 20 pounds for	1.00
Sugar, per sack	6.75
Gold Dust	.35

Highest Price Paid for Hides and Produce

## Have You Had Any Trouble With Your Heater?

No, of course not, if you have one of our

"CHEERFULS" WITH CAST LINING

That don't have to be replaced every season. They burn for years without repairs. We also have a fine line of medium and cheap heaters at prices which are right

ROBERTS & HANKS, HARDWARE DEALERS

Don J. E. NEWALL, President  
F. M. Bean, Vice-Pres. and Treas.  
Maps, Plans, Blue Prints, Etc.

## Klamath County Abstract Co.

Surveyors and Irrigation Engineers

Best E. WITBROW, Secretary  
Klamath Falls, Oregon

## Helping the Town . . .

By banking your money in a bank in your own community you increase the community's power to do business. If established farmers want to borrow money there is more to loan them. If you bank your money away from home it is loaned to other farmers, merchants and manufacturers. Help your home people. Money hidden at home helps no one. Placed in a bank it is put to work in ways that help all.

## The First National Bank of Klamath Falls

Is a good bank to put your money in—safe and reliable.

## A Savings Account . . .

In a rainy day fund, a life insurance policy, a sick benefit, a funeral benefit, and an old age pension. There is no fortune clause in the postbook, and it is under the owner's control at all times. It will take him over old age, it will care for his family when he must go; it will see him through old age, and buy him when he dies. It is a simple business proposition. Regularly saved money is worth more than the desert, it will supply him in the emergency.

Now is the time to open an account with the

## First Trust and Savings Bank

NOTICE FOR PUBLICATION  
Department of the Interior, U. S. Land Office at Lakeview, Oregon, October 6, 1909.

NOTICE is hereby given that James B. Humphrey, whose postoffice address is Klamath Falls, Oregon, did, on the 23d day of April, 1909, file in this office sworn statement and application, No. 01827, to purchase the 2 1/2 of NE 1/4, W 1/4 of SE 1/4 section 23, Township 37 South, Range 9 East, Willamette meridian, and the timber thereon, under the provisions of the act of June 3, 1878, and acts amendatory, known as the "Timber and Stone Law," at such value as might be fixed by appraisal, and that, pursuant to such application, the land and timber thereon have been appraised, June 14, 1909, the timber estimated at 545,000 board feet at \$0.75 per M. and the land \$150.80; that said applicant must offer final proof in support of his application and sworn statement on the 9th day of December, 1909, before R. M. Richardson, United States Commissioner, at Klamath Falls, Oregon.

Any person is at liberty to protest this purchase before entry, or initiate a contest at any time before patent issues, by filing a corroborated affidavit in this office, alleging facts which would defeat the entry.  
ARTHUR W. ORTON, Register.  
10-9-12-5  
Phone—Residence 322. Office 1091

Dr. J. E. Taylor,  
PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON.  
Postoffice Building.

DR. C. F. MASON  
Dentist  
American Bank and Trust Co.'s Bldg.

D. V. KUYKENDALL  
Attorney at Law  
Klamath Falls, Oregon

Dr. Amos C. Graves  
A. S. O.—OSTEOPATH.  
Klamath Falls, Ore.  
Postoffice Bldg., Second and Main Sts  
Phone 1091.