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Telephone Service Comes to Deer Park
by Ken Westby & Peter Coffin
(part two)

Whether the first phone service to Deer Park was more than a single phone instrument located in a store is not known for certain, but we have seen that there was telephone service between Spokane and Deer Park well before the turn of the century. In the paper “From Whence We Came,” W. Hodges Short writes that in April, 1904, a phone call from Spokane to Deer Park notified his father that his wife had died in a Spokane hospital. Whether this call went directly to the Short residence or came through the local switchboard is unclear.

--- footnotes ---

(31) Short, William Hodges, 1971, From Whence We Came: Draft manuscript, 66 p.

(32) “Pioneer Days Revisited, Historical Resources of the Deer Park Area,” by Nancy Fisher and Etta Bennett. p. 6
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doing whatever was necessary to obtain it. To understand what that means, we need only look at what was happening throughout rural America in the early 1900’s.

The telephone was becoming ubiquitous in the large population centers. Alexander Graham Bell’s invention had spawned an entire new industry that attracted serious investors and inventors. By 1900 Bell’s original patents had expired and his company had to face numerous competitors, many of which offered better or more innovative products and services. Bell’s response from that time forward was a business model based upon maximizing revenues and stifling competition by whatever means, and ended with the Bell System monopoly’s court-ordered breakup in 1982.[33]

The Bell Telephone System grew in various ways, one of which was to take over smaller, “independent” phone companies that either were willing to sell or were leveraged by economic pressures from Bell, eventually known as AT&T. The larger and stronger independent companies generally avoided take-over, and prospered wherever they established a strong foothold in populated areas well distanced from the Bell localities. The independent telephone companies generally obtained their telephones and switchboards from manufacturers that competed with Western Electric, Bell’s manufacturing arm. Some independents, although their greatest revenues came from populated areas, were boldly ready to serve parts of rural America as well as the towns and cities within their reach. Bell Telephone didn’t want to serve the farms across the country; rather, it was that a greater return on investment was to be had in areas of dense population, where miles of wire would connect to more than just a few customers. Bell’s intent was to eventually serve the farmers, but not until it had established its dominance in the population centers starting with the big cities, then the smaller ones, while at the same time becoming dominant in the long-distance telephone market. Bell expected the farmer to wait in patient isolation until that could happen.

Farmers across America were not willing to wait for Bell to come to them. Why should they? After all, telephones could be purchased easily from a growing number of manufacturers that supplied the independent phone companies. Phoncs could even be ordered from the Montgomery Ward catalog.[34]

Skills needed for farming also equipped the farmer quite well for cutting timber into poles and cross-arms, although these could also be obtained from other local sources. Who knew better than the farmer about stringing wire, and he probably had miles of barbed wire on hand anyway. In fact, the earliest rural telephone lines actually used barbed wire strung along fence posts! It didn’t always work well, but it did work.[35] But the farmer’s greatest asset was his natural inclination toward working alongside his neighbors for the common good, combined with a practical business sense born of necessity.

Farmers, working as a group and donating their labor toward a common goal, could do what would cost the growing Bell monopoly a lot of money to accomplish in rural service areas. The specialized aspects of building a rural telephone system could be learned by the farmer from any of several technical bulletins supplied by equipment manufacturers and others for just a few dollars. These manuals, although technical in nature, often included chapters showing the farmers how to legally organize, establish and incorporate a rural telephone company — called a Co-Op or “Mutual” company — in which the farmer and his neighbors shared equally in the costs and benefits.[36]

Thousands of these rural cooperatives quickly emerged in the early 1900’s. By 1912 over 3200 such systems were established throughout rural America.[37] Among these were several in the Deer Park, Clayton, Milan, Chattaroy, and Dennison area, with names like the Williams Valley Telephone Company, the Wild Rose Telephone Company, the Farmers Consolidated Telephone Company, the Bear Creek Telephone Company, the Blake’s Lake Telephone Company, the Enterprise Telephone Company, the Crab Creek Telephone Company, and the Denison Telephone Company.[38]

The farmer needed the telephone for a variety of reasons. Previously the means for communicating with others were by meeting face to face, which required travel, or by corresponding via mail, which required time. The telephone solved both problems. The farmer needed the telephone to communicate with his neighbors, his customers and his suppliers. By saving time and travel, the farmer’s productivity and operating efficiency increased.[39]

Farm fires were very common in this area. A page from a turn of the century Montgomery Ward catalog.

Figure 10. — footnotes

Footnotes


area. A fire on the farm could spread rapidly. It could be devastating, and the telephone afforded a way to summon much needed help quickly. That was also true in the event of a sudden illness or injury. First and foremost was the need to connect quickly with neighboring farms. Second was the need to connect with the nearby town or city. Communicating over longer distances to remote cities was desirable but not a necessity at first. The rural phone system was built on these concepts.

We lack specific details as to how the aforementioned rural companies near Deer Park constructed and operated their telephone systems, but we can look at well-documented rural systems elsewhere to find what was general practice nearly everywhere in the U.S.

There is evidence that our nearby systems followed that general approach. Perhaps widespread uniformity of equipment and methods was due in part to the popularity of those instruction manuals available to the Cooperatives.

Generally the Co-op membership was comprised of between ten and thirty neighboring farms. Each of these member farms had a single telephone, usually located in the main residence. The single shared telephone line connecting all of these phones together was usually #10 steel wire strung atop wood poles set into the ground at equal intervals along the country roads from farm to farm. Occasionally live trees were used in lieu of poles, although this was to be avoided. One of Deer Park’s rural systems a farmer was seriously injured from a fall while attempting to secure a telephone wire to a tree and the branch broke. Glass insulators on wood pegs or brackets anchored the wires to the poles and assured electrical integrity. The wires of the pole line were “tapped” at each member’s location using a soldered connection to the wires leading into the house.

There were two distinct wire-line methodologies in common practice. The earliest, “grounded circuit” method was to use a single #10 wire along the miles of pole line between farms, with an “earth ground” providing a return path for the circuit. This was a practice carried over from early telegraph systems, but experience using this method for telephone circuits would sooner or later result in a conversion to the second and much preferred method. This second method was called “metallic circuit”, and used two wires atop the poles instead of one, thereby avoiding the need for an earth ground return altogether. Yes, it required twice the wire and twice the pole hardware, but the improvement in performance made it worthwhile, especially when electrical power service was brought into an area. Power lines nearby would cause noise that wrecked havoc in one-wire grounded line telephone circuits, but not the two-wire metallic line circuits.

Everyone’s telephone shared the same phone line. The telephone included a microphone or “mouthpiece” and an earpiece or “receiver”, and contained two or three “dry-cell” batteries that powered the phone when in use. It also contained a crank-operated magneto generator and a bell. The generator would operate the bell in that phone as well as all the other phones connected to the pole line along the route. Each member of the Co-op was responsible for maintaining his telephone and the poles and wires that bordered his land. As long as regular maintenance was done, the farmer telephone line performed well.

Three hearty turns of the magneto’s crank would produce a long ring of everyone’s bell. A single turn of the crank would produce a short ring of each bell. With some care in operating the crank a caller could cause a series of long and short rings that would be distinctive for each member on this multi-party line. By recognizing his distinctive pattern of rings, a member would know if he was being called, and would answer his phone.

A multi-party rural telephone system as described here would provide calling capability among all the members of a small Co-op or Mutual phone system. It would be a standalone or “closed system”, meaning there would be no connectivity with other phone systems, or with long-distance services. In order to provide connections with other systems a “switchboard” and a “switchboard operator” were required. The telephone systems here described, however, are often called “closed system” because there were no further connections to other systems in those days.

--- footnotes ---


(41) Grounded and Metallic Circuits for Telephones, AT&T, March 1, 1891. (http://ns1758.ca/tele/telcircuit.html)
A switchboard operator is needed. A switchboard functions as one of the members of the multi-party line, and has “access” to, or connection with, the lines of other telephone systems. The switchboard operator allows a caller in one system to communicate with a caller in another system by establishing a temporary “connection” between the two separate telephone lines by means of “patch cords” or lever switches and appropriately signaling the called party. At the completion of the call, the operator disables that temporary connection.

A Co-op having a large membership (40 or more) might elect to construct and operate two or more 20-party telephone lines covering separate geographic areas within its franchise area. A switchboard operator would be needed to establish a connection for calls between members of the separate party lines. The switchboard operator could be either a paid employee or a volunteer member of the Cooperative, serving during certain hours of the day and/or night.

In a large rural system that consisted of multiple party lines all the lines would have converged at a single farmhouse. In that farmhouse a wall telephone such as the one in Figure 13 that was specifically designed as a switchboard could route calls from one party line to another as long as there was someone at the switchboard to physically make the connections.

If there were more party lines than a single small switchboard could handle, the larger console-style switchboards were available. And if there were more party lines than one operator could handle — or if the distance those multiple party lines had to be strung to reach the switchboard was excessive — then multiple switchboards interconnected by single lines could allow the creation of systems consisting of hundreds of interconnected phones routed through a multitude of switchboards — and often did.

Whether these smaller “farmhouse” switchboards were employed in any of the local telephone cooperatives is not known, but unlikely. Considering our rural users’ proximity to the Bell System exchange that existed in Deer Park from a very early date, it would make sense to run all the rural party lines to the town’s large switchboard and let that exchange provide any needed connections to phones in Deer Park and long-distance lines to Spokane and beyond. The following example illustrates how the Williams Valley Telephone cooperative did just that.

... Williams Valley Telephone Company ...

One of the best-documented rural phone companies in our area is the Williams Valley Telephone Company. The dairies (“Memoranda”) of Herbert Mason have many daily entries starting on June 18, 1906, about company meetings, maintenance and line construction of the Williams Valley Telephone Company. A 1906 Spokesman-Review entry reported the following: “The Williams Valley Telephone Company is connected up with the Pacific States Telephone Company’s local exchange, and is ready for local and long distance business. Several other lines are projected.” We do not know for certain how many individual farms made up the membership of the Williams Valley Telephone Company (WVTC), or whether it operated any of its own switchboards. But in order to gain access to the long-distance services of the Bell Telephone System through its local operating company, Pacific States Telephone Co. in Spokane, it required connection to a Bell Telephone switchboard, optimally the one in Deer Park.

--- footnotes ---

(43) Mason, Herbert, 1906-1937, Memorandum: Deer Park, personal diary, not paginated.
Park, which by 1906 was operating in the Slat- er Building at 1st and Main Street and had long -distance access via its lines to Spokane.  (Pacific States Telephone Co. was soon renamed Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co. and in 1961 its holdings in Oregon and Washington were named Pacific Northwest Bell.)

Prior to the town becoming incorpo- rated in June 1908, all telephone franchises were granted by Spokane County. WVTC already had a franchise from Spokane County. This is how in 1906 WVTC first connected its system into the Bell System for local and long distance calling. Starting in 1912, the town of Deer Park took over all franchising within the city limits, including that of any telephone, telegraph, or electric utility already operating in the city.

Among the legal notices in the June 13, 1913 Deer Park Union newspaper was the publication of City Ordinance No. 83. In it the WVTC was granted a 25-year franchise to construct and operate its phone line into Deer Park from Crawford at Larch Avenue (the western city limit northward to 1st Street and thence east to Main Avenue, the location of Bell's switchboard in the Slater building.)

Actually, the franchise provided for WVTC to continue its system from the Slater Building southward one block to an outdoor call box located on a pole near the corner of the Kelley Building at Main & Crawford. The franchise additionally required WVTC to provide facilities in support of an emergency fire and police call system in the event Pacific Telephone discontinued service in the town.

That is what the call box was intended for. The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph franchise, published in the Deer Park Union a few months earlier, also contains this same re- quirement. The city was making sure that one company or the other would provide ser- vice for the city, including phones at the city hall, fire station and water-pump station, as well as this emergency call box.

The WVTC continued to serve its rural subscribers well into the 1950’s. In 1951 when Pacific Telephone replaced its manually operated switchboard in Deer Park with a rota- tory dial system and automatic switchboard, the multiparty line was no longer compatible with this new exchange. The new equipment could support perhaps four parties per line, but not thirty or forty. It became necessary for WVTC to make significant upgrades in its infrastructure if its members were to have the new dial service, and it did so!

We do not know the acquisition date, but it is believed that Pacific Telephone subse- quently acquired the WVTC infrastructure and thereafter operated it as its own.

...the influence of “Ma Bell”...

In these accounts we have implied the public need having been sometimes ill served by the Bell System’s corporate behav- ior in the evolution of competitive telephone markets. Historical evidence of this is well documented and won’t be repeated here. Cer- tainly, if there is blame to be placed, politi- cians and governmental regulators may share in it. Generally as it evolved to become one of this nation’s largest monopolies, AT&T served its own interests by what it could get away with until slowed or stopped by the courts and regulators. It was allowed by the government to function as a monopoly in exchange for its consent to be regulated, not unlike the rail- roads, with which it shared many characteris- tics.

The original Bell patents were based on the manual “crank-style” telephone and the manual telephone switchboards implemented and operated by the Bell System throughout its operating areas. Western Electric, the manufacturer of the Bell System’s holdings, manufactured that equipment and was a significant source of the telephone giant’s revenue. The Bell System always acquired much of the nation’s expanding and very profitable long-distance telephone network. Thus, while Bell’s local operating companies could readily offer their customers easy access to the long-distance capabilities of its parent company, it was not so easy for Bell’s independent competitors.

Interconnection agreements between Bell and non-Bell companies were likely to contain stipulations that forced the independ- ent companies to utilize Western Electric equipment as a condition for continued access to Bell’s long-distance networks, thereby weakening the independents’ financial ad- vantage in the competitive market and strengthening that of Bell. Since Bell was well ahead of the game in long-distance facili- ties, it usually prevailed. If an independent chose to build its system with newer or more desirable equipment than was available from Western Electric, it stood the risk of losing access to the nationwide long-haul telephone networks. We have already seen in the case of the Spokane & British Columbia Telephone Co. how a breach of its contract with Bell forced that company into in- 

弱点：
- We do not know whether the agreement between Pacific Bell and our neighbor- ing rural Co-op’s contained such exclusionary language, but they likely did, inasmuch as the Deer Park Union for years carried Pacific Telephone Co. ads encouraging local farmers to obtain telephone service, which of necessity would have involved a rural Co-op. One such advertisement (figure 14, page 1242) from the company described the telephone as a tool to “lighten the domestic tasks of the farmer’s wife,” while yet another recurring ad (figure 15, page 1242) promoted the telephone as es- sential for the farmer to call for help getting together a “brigade” in the event of a rural fire. An advertisement for Pacific Tele- phone Co. in the January 5, 1912, Deer Park Union (figure 16, page 1243) stated, “Every Bell telephone is a long-distance station, underscoring the Deer Park telephone ex- change’s access to the toll facilities of AT&T. Of particular significance is an adver- tisement appearing in the Deer Park Union on Feb 2, 1912. The ad, for the Deer Park Pharm- acy, located in the Kelley Building at Main & Crawford. The advertisement for the pharmacy mentioned in the store, including “Kellogg Switchboard Company’s tele- phones.” Kellogg had numerous patents of its own, and was one of several competitors with the Bell System in the manufacture of switchboards and telephones after Bell’s pa- tents expired in 1893-94. Kellogg sold equip- ment mostly to non-Bell independent tele- phone companies, including Mutuals and Co-

footnotes:

(45) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pacific_Northwest_Bell
(46) Deer Park Union, November 23, 1906
(47) Deer Park Union, June 6 and June 20, 1913.
(48) Deer Park Union, March 22, 1912.
(49) Rural telephone companies scrambled in April 1951 to upgrade their “farmer” lines and cables in preparation for dial telephone service from the Pacific Telephone Company in Deer Park. (Deer Park Union, April 5, 1951, p. 2).

footnotes:

(49) Deer Park Union, July 28, 1911.
(50) Deer Park Union, Sep. 1, 1911.
(51) Similar ads in subsequent issues also promote the need for farmers to have Bell Telephone service for the efficiency and convenience of farm operations, benefitting their wives and livestock. (Deer Park Union, Jan 5, 1912.)
(52) Deer Park Union, Feb 2, 1912.
Bell Telephone, under the leadership of CEO Theodore Vail from 1907 to 1920, was seeking to reverse its public image as a self-serving corporate "octopus" to one of reconciliation with the independents in the interest of serving the public good and bringing "universal service" to everyone in the United States.\(^{54}\)

Establishing its telephone exchange at Deer Park in the earliest of times, and negotiating beneficial interconnection agreements with the nearby rural "Co-op" companies serving the farms with local and long-distance access that included eastern Washington communities and population centers statewide, the Bell System had built and expanded its customer base and secured its position as the sole provider of long-distance services until 1982 as well as local and rural land-line telephone.

During that time, at the urging of the public and AT&T competitors, the government began to investigate the company for antitrust violations, thus forcing a landmark settlement in 1913, known as the "Kingsbury Commitment." In that settlement, AT&T agreed that it would no longer refuse to provide long-distance services to the independent companies.\(^{55}\)

—— footnotes ——

\(^{53}\) Kellogg Case Decided for Independents, Telegraphy, Vol. 17, p. 241. (Google Books)


\(^{55}\) (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kingsbury_Commitment)
Letters, Email, Bouquets & Brickbats
—or—
Bits of Chatter, Trivia & Notices All Strung Together

... reunion — class of 1946 ...

Betty Burdette (pictured left), long time member of the CDPHS, is requesting all 1946 graduates of Deer Park High School contact her regarding the possibly holding a class reunion. Betty’s phone number is (509) 276-6709. Part of Betty’s life story can be found in an article beginning on page 16 of the Reports to the Clayton/Deer Park Historical Society, Volume 1. That article, “Growing Up in Williams Valley — Mike and Betty Burdette,” can also be found under a different title in the January 26th, 2005, issue of the Deer Park Tribune.

... the Clayton “Union” Band ...

One of the many mysteries found among the images in Lawrence Zimmerer’s historic photo collection is a picture that self-identifies as that of the “Clayton Union Band.” The first mystery associated with this photo is when it was taken. Using the names of those seen — most of which we are fortunate enough to have — and knowing the birthdates of several of these men, we are guessing that the photo was taken sometime between 1910 and 1920 (a totally subjective estimate, of which opinions may vary).

As for the next mystery; it was society member Chuck Lyons who asked whether the “Union” in the Clayton band’s name referred to a labor union — said “Union” likely associated with Washington Brick & Lime’s Clayton brick and terracotta works. And the answer is — we don’t know. We can say for certain — since at least one newspaper article (Spokane Chronicle, March 31, 1951) reports on a settlement between Washington Brick & Lime and the Northwest Council of Brick & Clay Workers (American Federation of Labor) — that the brick plant workers were being actively represented as of the early 1950s. As for union representation prior to that, we’ve no data at this time.

footnotes

[56] (http://www.elon.edu/e-web/predictions/150/1870.xhtml)
Minutes of the Clayton/Deer Park Historical Society

February 13, 2016

In attendance: Lorraine Nord, Mike Reiter, Roberta Reiter, Betty Burdette, Bill Sebright, Pat Parker, Wally Parker, Marilyn Reilly, Judy Coffin, Pete Coffin, Mark Wagner, Ella Jenkins, Sue Rehms, Roxanne Camp, Tom Costigan, Marie Morrill, and Chuck Lyons.

However, assuming some notations of any union activities that may have had an impact on the company were included in Washington Brick & Lime’s records, it’s probable that such could be found in the library archives at Eastern Washington University, where the entirety of WaCo’s books are stored.

As for extracting that data from the archives, that’s just another project we’ll need to add to a “things to do” list already several lifetimes long. We know those records are a rich resource for this area, and I would dearly love to have copies of everything. But at least we can be consoled by the fact that they are currently stored in about as safe an environment as imaginable.

… and speaking of labor …


“Minors under the age of 14 years were laid off at the mill and frame factory late last week pending a decision of the State Board of Labor and Industries relative to the legality of employing minors. Many of these boys are in high school and were taking advantage of the opportunity to earn money for school purposes during the summer. Whether they will be permitted to work further is not yet known.

Lumbermills were and still are places of high hazard. Whether employees younger than 14 were routinely assigned dangerous duties at Deer Park isn’t known — though if they worked alongside adults, they most likely were.

The action of the State Board of Labor might have at least partially been in response to the fact that in the spring of 1924 the Congress of the United States was preparing to put to a vote of the states a constitutional amendment outlawing child labor. Assuming this federal action reflected a strong feeling within Washington State, the State Board of Labor may have simply been exercising caution. More research would be needed to respond to this question.

The Twice Told Tales segment of the May 5th, 1921, edition of the Deer Park Union noted, "Louis Olson, Jr., last week completed the installation of a power driven milking machine at the Arcadia Valley Stock Farm owned by F. F. Parks. The new machine works under a vacuum system and is said to be the last word in up-to-date dairying apparatus, making it possible to milk twenty cows in 35 to 40 minutes."

— Wally Lee Parker —
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Society President Bill Sebright called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM. He reported:
1) He met with Joe Feist and emailed him about having a high school student help with cataloging pictures and artifacts. Bill talked to Kelli Demarest. When and if we are ready to have a student help us, he will talk to her again.
2) He received an email from Wally Budge asking for information about a Washington Brick & Lime medallion. It has the possible likeness of Henry Brook, one of the original owners of Washington Brick & Lime, very, very complimentary of the mortarboard’s content.
3) He received an email from Deer Park Union newspaper. I will circulate this alphabetized list at the meeting. I have digitized the 1969 to 1975 newspapers online. There is an invaluable resource for his research into the history of the area. He was very, very complimentary of the society’s editor.

Print editor Wally Parker reported:
1) One hundred copies of the February Mortarboard (#94) have been printed for distribution.

The main checking account ended the period September 1, 2015, through August 31, 2016, at $3,650.14. Checks written during the period were for $1,425.50. There were deposits of $2,824.82. The web hosting account had a withdrawal of $10.95 for web hosting and ended the month at $857.18.

Society Vice President Pete Coffin reported that:
1) I received my order of the book “Pend Oreille County,” and found that all but one of the pictures in the book are sourced from the Pend Oreille County Historical Society’s files. I did a search in the Arcadia Publishing Company’s one hundred and seventy Washington State titles in their “Images of America” series and found the following of possible interest to members of the Society: “African Americans in Spokane,” “Bridges of Spokane,” “Cheney,” “Early Spokane,” “Grand Coulee Dam,” “Grant County,” “Mount Spokane,” “Spokane Hot Rodding,” and “Stevens County.” I have the Spokane Hot Rodding book.
2) I have compiled an Excel list of the 455 names of individuals signing up for the Settlement Picnic as area settlers in late 1922 and early 1923 issues of the Deer Park Union newspaper. I will circulate this alphabetized list at the meeting. I have digitized the 1969 to 1975 lists that Betty Burdette gave me some time ago. 3) I have been in contact with the research associate at the North Butte Mining Company, Mr. Jack Taryo and James McGinty of Elk about the Arcadia Orchards. Mr. McGinty may have more and new information. 4) I have had coning this fedations with a Dave Campanella, a member of the Monsions franchise, and he indicates that the C/DPHS website is an invaluable resource for his research into the history of the area. He was very, very complimentary of the Mortarboard’s content.

Webmaster Marie Morrill reported by...
email that: 1) She uploaded the February newsletter. She found there was a problem loading the file and will correct it. There has been a small change in the method but a big improvement in publishing. Where it used to take as long as 10 minutes, this time it only took maybe 2 minutes! In January there were 63,956 Website hits and 5,132 visits. So far in February, 20,167 hits and 1,769 visits.

Penny Hutten reported that this month at the Westerners Don Popejoy will be speaking about Alonzo Victor Lewis. He was a famous northwestern artist. If you would like to go or have questions contact Penny, Roxanne Zimmerer, Lynn Wells, or Bill.

Wednesday, February 10th was the first Brickyard Day Committee planning meeting. The big news is that Brickyard Day will be JULY 30th this year. All of the community floats will be in Penticton, BC, on August 6th. The Settlers Picnic is July 23rd. We are planning to have entertainment at the Clayton School Park during the BBQ Picnic. Loren and Jody Lentz will provide a stage and generator. The Clayton Community Church will supply the sound system. The next Brickyard Day planning meeting will be March 9th, 6 PM, at the Real Estate Marketplace.

Mike Reiter reported that Don and Mary Jo Reiter have sold their cows. This is the first time in many, many years hasn’t been a dairy at Reiter’s farm.

Betty Burdette said: 1) This year is her DPHS Class of 1946’s 70th reunion. Call Betty at (509) 276-6709 if you have questions. 2) The Settlers Picnic fund raiser will be at the Deer Park Eagles, Saturday, March 5th. There will be a dinner and silent auction. Pork steak will be served, and will cost $10.00. Diane Allard wanted to let everyone know that there will be a meeting pertaining to HWY 395’s passage through the Deer Park area, and the myriad safety issues thereby raised. The meeting will be Tuesday, March 1st, 7 PM, at the old Deer Park Elementary School gymnasium. Attendees will have a chance to ask questions and provide input.

Next meeting: Saturday, March 12, 2015, at 9 AM at the Clayton Drive-In. Meeting adjourned at 9:52 AM. The Society meeting minutes submitted by Mark Wagner, acting Secretary.

Society Contacts
We encourage anyone with observations, concerns, corrections, or divergent opinions regarding the contents of these newsletters to write the society or contact one or more of the individuals listed below. Resultant conversations can remain confidential if so desired.

C/DPHS, Box 293, Clayton, WA 99110
Bill Sebright, President — sebrightba@gmail.com — (509) 276-2693
Peter Coffin, Vice-President — pcffn@q.com
Wally Lee Parker, Editor of Print Publications — bogwen100@msn.com — (509) 467-9433

Editorial and Copyright Policy
Those contributing “original” materials to the Clayton/Deer Park Historical Society retain copyright to said materials while granting the Mortarboard and the Clayton/Deer Park Historical Society durable permission to use said materials in electronic and print media — including permission to reprint said materials in future Clayton/Deer Park Historical Society publications. Under certain conditions proof of ownership of submitted materials and/or a signed release allowing use may be requested. No compensation for materials submitted is offered or implied. All materials submitted are subject to editorial revision for content, language, legal exposures and so forth. Any material published as an exception to these general understandings will be clearly marked as to the nature of the exception.
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