

### "For Bonds—Yes."

An evening paper makes a feeble, frantic and entirely unsupported outcry against the proposition to vote Court-house bonds at to-day's election. It recklessly charges that the scheme is a "job." We have no evidence of this, or the TIMES would promptly and strongly oppose the issuance of bonds. The necessity for a new courthouse is admitted on all hands. That necessity is imperative and urgent. There can be no "job" in the act of issuing the bonds. It is only in the awarding of the contract and in the construction of the building that crookedness will have a chance to play, if at all. This can be guarded against, we believe, by the new Board of Supervisors, which we have no right to assume, in advance, will be anything but an honest and vigilant body.

It would be foolish, it seems to us, to refuse to vote for the bonds on the mere unsupported suspicion that a "job" may grow out of the work of building the new Courthouse. Some better reason ought to be found. We think it is possible to have a good building honestly put up, and we know the county needs such a building.

Therefore we feel justified in advising the electors of the county, without regard to party, to vote to-day, "*For Bonds—Yes.*"