

CREAM PRICE CUT PROPOSAL OPPOSED

Farmers of Josephine and Jackson Prefer to Sell to Californians.

GRANTS PASS, July 12.—(AP)—Farmers of Josephine and Jackson counties who are in California strongly oppose an Oregon proposal to cut the price they receive for butterfat, William Doda of Grants Pass declared today.

Doda is local representative for the Del Norte Milk Producers company of Smith River, Calif., one of the two California creameries which send trucks through the Rogue river valley. He declared that a meeting of creamerymen from southern Oregon and northern California, announced by the Oregon department of agriculture at Crescent City, Calif., July 29, is designed to drive competition from the local field and that "Rogue river valley creameries tried to get rid of us for the last four years."

J. D. Mickle, chief of the Oregon division of foods and dairies, announced the meeting last week, saying that Oregon producers receive more money from California creameries because they do not have to comply with the Oregon law, which he said is stricter than California's. The higher price paid by California creameries is unfair to Oregon creameries and to the producers who sell to Oregon creameries, Mickle said.

Doda said he doubted if Oregon law could "hold a candle" to the California law.

Price Rises Cited.

He declared quality and price of butterfat had risen in the Rogue river valley since California creameries entered the market.

"Four years ago, butterfat was selling in the valley as much as five cents a pound," Doda said. "Where the creameries picked up the cream, the producers were charged on-half cent a pound to have it hauled to the creameries. As low as 17c a pound for butterfat was paid to the producer while the consumer was charged 28c a pound for butter. Now the price is one or one and a half cents above Portland prices and butter is selling at not more than five cents more than the price for butterfat."

Doda said his company alone picks up cream from an average of 150 producers for a total of 13,000 pounds average of butterfat per month excluding the Illinois valley district of Josephine county gathered by another truck. He said the company has operated for the past six years in the two counties and now goes as far east as the Ashland territory.

JOHN DAY BANK ROBBERS SOUGHT

(Continued from page 1)

short. It was believed the robbers were driving across an old mountain wagon trail, leading through isolated country.

The robbery took place shortly after 9 p. m., while most of the townspeople gathered to watch a fire in an old barn. Officers said they believed the robbers set fire to the barn to distract public attention from the bank looting.

Most of the silver was reported recovered from the robbers' car, which overturned on the John Day highway.

Not knowing of the robbery, E. Haylock, who lives near the scene of the wreck, approached the overturned car to offer aid and was shot in the head.

Bandits Steal Car.

Later a Mr. and Mrs. Carruthers of John Day reported the men stopped their automobile, forced them to get out, and commandeered their car.

The wrecked car was described as a Plymouth coupe with Washington license plates, and was reported to have contained at least four guns and a number of license plates of various states, in addition to two sacks of coins.

The highway was found lying on the sidewalk in front of the bank, badly beaten about the head and unable to talk.

JAPANESE ATTACK CITY OF PEIPING

(Continued from page 1)

drome eight miles south of this ancient city.

The report was not at once confirmed.

The 29th Chinese route army forced a heavily supported detachment of Japanese troops to retreat toward their Peiping base after they had been driven back on Peiping's southern wall in two hours of hand to hand fighting.

The big sword of the Chinese infantry clashed with the bayonets of the Japanese at the strategic railway bridge a half mile south of the walls.

The Japanese formed one of the advance units of reported 10,000 troops being rushed to the north China battle area from Manchukuo, the state Japan carved out of Chinese Manchuria.

Reliable foreign sources declared 100 Japanese warplanes flew over Shanhaikwan, the border of Manchukuo and Hopei province, en route yesterday to the scene of action.

Japs Hurl Back.

The Japanese detachment was advancing on the Nanyuan air-drome and barracks, eight miles south of Peiping, when they were met half way by Chinese troops and gradually driven back on the southern wall before they turned and retreated toward Fengtai, seven miles to the west.

Before wheeling toward Fengtai, the Japanese headquarters and base in the Peiping battle area, they made a determined stand at the railway bridge where the

FLAPPER FANNY

By Sylvia



"Next time you say 'This one's on the house,' just remember it was my lemon that set us up in business."

heaviest fighting of the engagement took place. Heavy casualties were reported suffered by both sides.

As they retreated, the Japanese were reported to have torn up the railway tracks in the vicinity, halting train service from Peiping.

RUSSIAN FLIERS APPROACHING U. S.

(Continued from page 1)

asked route suggestions and a message had been transmitted advising them to turn east to avoid storm.

Vartanian said later he might recommend the plane make Chicago its flight terminus instead of San Francisco, "depending on storm conditions."

Vartanian said he was collecting weather reports from the entire area as an aid to determining the intended flyers' future course.

Heber C. Miller, assistant chief pilot for the United Air line, advised that weather conditions were good and the sky clear from Roseburg, Ore., to San Francisco, and the broken overcast conditions, north of Roseburg, would be clear by nightfall. He said that between the international boundary and Roseburg the ceiling ranged from 1,000 to 2,500 feet, with the top of the overcast at about 5,000 feet.

At the rate they have been flying, the flyers should reach the Puget Sound sector about 3:30 p. m., and San Francisco by midnight, if they continue down the Pacific coast, army officers said.

The plane has been following the 120th parallel since it left the Polar region. It continues that course, officers said, it will cross over Washington state via the Methow valley, Waterville, the Columbia river and Sunnyside, entering Oregon at about Heppner junction.

PACIFIC COAST WEATHER BARRIER TO PLANE'S COURSE

PORTLAND, Ore., July 12.—(AP)—The weather should prove no barrier to a successful termination of the Moscow-San Francisco flight of a second Soviet monoplane, officials said, it will cross over Washington state via the Methow valley, Waterville, the Columbia river and Sunnyside, entering Oregon at about Heppner junction.

The weather bureau predicted partly cloudy atmospheric conditions tonight for this area. Skies were overcast but regular airline traffic was proceeding without interruption.

The first pole vaulting Russians landed at Vancouver, Wash., across the Columbia river from here, on June 29, with Pilot Chelkoff blaming the landing short of the San Francisco goal on rainy weather. Subsequently, Vasily Berthil, Soviet mechanic sent here to dismantle the first plane, said American mechanics had drained all the tanks and they yielded but till gusts of gasoline.

OREGON FARMER OUT FOR CONGRESS

SALEM, July 12.—(AP)—Nicklas J. Zylstra, Polk county farmer, filed his declaration of candidacy today for representative in congress on the democratic ticket.

He said he was "out to stop Pinky Goslin, secretary of Governor Martin, from reviving the

Haying Time!

Get Your Supplies at the
Farm Bureau Exchange

Canvas Water Bags, Pitchforks and Handles, Hay Rope and Hay Carriers, Forks, Track, Pulleys, etc. 2 rebuilt Mowers \$35.00 each. New Mowers, horse and tractor drawn, Bale ties, used Hay Chopper, Clevises, Neckyokes, Single Trees, Eveners, Sickle Grinders, parts and shop service for breakdowns.

"See Us First—We Can Save You Money"

Douglas County
Farm Bureau Cooperative Exchange
Roseburg, Oregon

MINING REDUCES STATE RELIEF LOAD

SALEM, July 12.—(AP)—Many Oregonians, deprived of their jobs during the depression, have lent themselves off the relief rolls by taking off to the hills in search of gold. O. D. Adams, director of the state board for vocational education, said today.

Adams said the board's mining school at Grants Pass, which in the two years it has been operating has trained 2,500 depression victims how to make a living by gold mining, probably would be continued next year, and that an additional school at Baker may be established.

He said a statement by Federal Relief Administrator Harry Hopkins, denouncing a belief that many have been kept off relief by gold mining, did not give a proper picture.

Hopkins said such miners in Oregon earned \$1.50 a day for an average of 45 days a year worked. "That is good pay," Adams said, "considering that the type of men who go into the hills generally work in seasonal labor. In what other seasonal occupation can one earn that much?"

"After men work their gold a while, they go into the fruit and berry fields, where they generally don't make that much."

"Hopkins' statement applies to 'snappers'—men who don't work from an owner to work his claim."

COURT BILL SEEN AS GRAB FOR POWER

(Continued from page 1)

clear.

Attacks Answered

Turning aside to answer some of the speeches made by friends of the bill, Bailey noted attacks on the court by Senators Guffey and McIntire.

"Who made the senate judge of judges?" he asked.

"I take it that the senator from Pennsylvania has never had any political bias," he said. "He has always been non-partisan and of the utmost judicial temperament as well as a person of morality, and so recognized by us all. The supreme court held his act to be unconstitutional and he wants to make the court over. There is the picture, and it places him in high company."

Opposition Claims 44

Forecast of a court bill showed down in ten days or two weeks came today from some senators on both sides.

Opposition leaders, declaring they had 44 certain votes and a half dozen others "within reach," said there was no need for a filibuster.

"We can win without it," commented Senator Wheeler at the start of the fourth day's attack on the controversial measure.

Administration chiefs stuck by their contention that they had enough votes to pass the compromise bill. It authorizes appointment of one additional supreme court justice each year if members over 75 do not retire.

The opposition strategists predicted approval of a motion to send the bill back to the judiciary, which would sidetrack it at least for the remainder of this session. The motion probably will be made as soon as they have finished their case.

Publicly, the lineup still was to against the compromise measure and 39 for it. Several of the remaining 17, however, were committed privately one way or the other.

Substitute No Better

Bailey called the administration substitute just as objectionable as the president's original bill, which would have permitted addition of as many as six justices at once.

"You say that appointments year by year would not be such a grave matter," he said. "Compromise murder on that basis and see how soon you get convicted."

Both bills, he declared, clearly are unconstitutional. Their purpose, he contended, is to control the court's decisions, for which there is no provision in the constitution.

Postmaster General Farley predicted passage of the bill in a statement at South Bend, Ind.

"There will be no party split in any state because of any action by any senator," he said.

Oregon Senators Listed.

Republican opponents of the administration court reform bill listed Senators Charles McNary and Frederick Steiwer of Oregon today for leading parts in the floor debates.

Senator Borah of Idaho, ranking republican on the judiciary committee, will head the minority's opposition. McNary, minority floor leader, and Steiwer, one of the three republicans on the judiciary committee, will follow.

OPPOSES RUSS FOR DAM ADMINISTRATOR

WASHINGTON, July 12.—(AP)—Representative Nan Wood Hooten of Portland prepared to go before President Roosevelt at the white house today with a protest against the possible selection of J. D. Ross, manager of the Seattle municipal power plant, as administrator of Bonneville dam.

"Mr. Ross is competent and experienced," Mrs. Hooten said, "but why go to Seattle for an administrator? I will tell President Roosevelt that Mr. Ross would be a logical selection as a director when the Columbia valley authority is created, as a representative for Washington state, but to bring him from Seattle, where he has devoted years to building a municipal plant and expect him to manage Bonneville to the disadvantage of his Seattle 'baby' is ridiculous."

"His heart, naturally, would be with his Seattle undertaking," she said. "Members of the Oregon delegation have received letters urging the selection of an Oregon man. Names mentioned include C. C. Hockley, Thomas W. Delzell and E. G. Robinson."

SALEM, July 12.—(AP)—Governor Martin said today that Oregon "has lost Bonneville dam to the Seattle interests" through the proposed appointment of J. D. Ross, head of the Seattle city light plant and member of the securities exchange commission, as administrator of the project.

He said Ross was certain of obtaining the job because Oregon interests have "sold out to Seattle."

"We are bound to have postage stamp rates, and thus Bonneville is through. Oregon will lose all its benefits to Washington."

"Oregon, as usual, is being deprived of the benefits of its God-given rights. It is an outrage."

The governor long has fought for switchboard rates, which he says would enable the state to develop industry and offset the state's dependence on agriculture.

Rep. Walter M. Pierce, La Grande, has opposed the governor's stand and is reported to be supporting Ross.

The governor, as he outlined his position to newspapermen this morning, appeared downcast, but was strong in his denunciation of the "Seattle and the Washington state interests which propose to tie in Bonneville with Seattle city light plant."

Governor Martin said he would fight for the appointment of an Oregon man as administrator, but did not say whom he preferred.

DRIVE-YOURSELF CITY TAX UPHELD

SALEM, July 12.—(AP)—The state supreme court reversed today until September after upholding a Portland city ordinance regulating automobiles rented for hire without drivers.

The "Covey Drive Yourself & Garage" charged the law was invalid, the company objecting to payment of \$12 per car a year and posting a \$1,000 bond. The ordinance also provided payment of an occupation tax and required inspection of all such cars.

Judge Hall S. Lusk, Portland, held the act was valid, and was sustained unanimously by the high court in a unanimous opinion written by Justice Rossmann.

"Without further analysis, we express our belief that the city police power authorized it to enact this ordinance, and that the latter is valid," the opinion said.

The court also upheld the First Congregational church in Portland, which W. P. Neper sued for damages allegedly received when he fell down a stairway in the basement of the church while attempting to find a lavatory.

Judge Robert F. Tacker, Portland, who dismissed the suit, was sustained in an opinion by Justice Kelly.

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

DRIVE-YOURSELF CITY TAX UPHELD

SALEM, July 12.—(AP)—The state supreme court reversed today until September after upholding a Portland city ordinance regulating automobiles rented for hire without drivers.

The "Covey Drive Yourself & Garage" charged the law was invalid, the company objecting to payment of \$12 per car a year and posting a \$1,000 bond. The ordinance also provided payment of an occupation tax and required inspection of all such cars.

Judge Hall S. Lusk, Portland, held the act was valid, and was sustained unanimously by the high court in a unanimous opinion written by Justice Rossmann.

"Without further analysis, we express our belief that the city police power authorized it to enact this ordinance, and that the latter is valid," the opinion said.

The court also upheld the First Congregational church in Portland, which W. P. Neper sued for damages allegedly received when he fell down a stairway in the basement of the church while attempting to find a lavatory.

Judge Robert F. Tacker, Portland, who dismissed the suit, was sustained in an opinion by Justice Kelly.

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building hunting for a lavatory and in doing so opens a door at the head of a stairway and falls down the stairway is not entitled to recover damages for the injuries he thus sustains."

The opinion said "one who is wandering around in a church building