

Read These Want Ads - They May Mean Money

STOP, LOOK, MR. TRAPPER, and listen. I have coyote scent that will bring the wild old coyote to your traps and I have the best bait that is made. I have been trapping in Malheur county for 2 years. I will sell in 1-2 pound cans for \$1.50, and 5 pound cans for \$7.50. Guaranteed catch, or money refunded. N. H. Hamlin, Crowley, Oregon.

5-ROOM HOUSE, TWO BLOCKS WEST of the Court House. Fine bath, lawn, good outbuildings. \$250 cash, balance \$20 per month, until paid.

4-ROOM WELL BUILT PLASTERED House. Cellar, city water and well water. Good outbuildings, lawn and shade. Fine location. Yours at \$25 per month until paid. Both are bargains. See John Hardwick, Realtor, for bargains, Vale, Oregon.

STRAYED OR STOLEN—Fourteen 2 and 1 year old steers. Eighteen cows and calves. Four branded calves. All are branded N-N on left ribs. All have crop of left ear, and dewlaps. Any person seeing or knowing anything about these cattle will confer a great favor by notifying Wm. F. Schaefer, foreman N-N ranch, Jordan Valley, Ore. Jan 14-15

SMALL COUNTRY WEEKLY NEWS paper for sale. Will sell at a sacrifice on account of absence. Paper on 30th year of publication. Best printing in state for printer and publisher is official paper of county. Address, Geo. Sutton, Port Orford, Ore. Jan 14-15

One sorrel horse, branded on left side; about 10 years old; weight 1200 lbs. on right side of neck. Owner can have same by paying feed bill and \$2. Inv-75-6c. R. H. HUFFMAN, Ranch on Coyote River.

LOST WHITE COLLIE DOG; brown splash over left eye and ear. Age 18 months. Any information leading to recovery will be rewarded—F. G. Cleveland. Jan 12

Butter wrappers printed at the Enterprise job shop.

COMMERCIAL PRINTING of superior workmanship at the Enterprise office.

WANTED—MISCELLANEOUS

Professional Directory

ATTORNEYS
C. M. CRANDALL, C. K. CRANDALL
CRANDALL & CRANDALL
Attorneys and Counselors
At Law
Geo. E. Davis, Bruce R. Kestle
Attorneys and Counselors at Law
Nelson Bldg. Vale, Ore.

ROBERT D. LITTLE
First National Bank Bldg.
Vale, Oregon
Phone 6

R. G. WHEELER
Attorney and Counselor at Law
Practice in all
Courts and U. S. Land Office
Nelson Bldg. Vale, Oregon

ENGINEERS
John E. Johnson, J. Edwin Johnson
JOHNSON ENGINEERING CO.
Licensed Real Estate Dealers
Land Locators—Township Blue Prints
Surveying & Engineering
Have building. Vale, Oregon

UNDERTAKERS
T. T. NELSON
Vale, Oregon
Up-to-date Undertaking Parlor.
Fluo line of Undertaking Supplies
Auto Hearse Service Phone 77

Mr. Business Man

WHY not make your appeal for patronage through the columns of this newspaper? With every issue it carries its message into the homes of all the best people of this community. Don't blame the people for flocking to the store of your competitor. Tell them what you have to sell and if your prices are right you can get the business.

MICKIE SAYS

WHAT HAS BECOME OF THE OLD-FASHIONED GUY WHO USED TO BRING IN THINGS "TO HELP FILL UP THE PAPER," WHEN HIS BOSS WUZ RUNNIN' IN CIRCLES, WORRYIN' BEUZ THEY WUZNT ROOM FER WHAT HAD TO GO IN?



County News

Items of Local and Personal Interest, Gathered By The Enterprise Correspondents.

ARCADIA

IS TAKEN TO HOSPITAL
LITTLE LUCILE DALE OPERATED ON FOR APPENDICITIS WEDNESDAY

Lucile, the eight year old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ira Dale, was taken to the Ontario hospital Wednesday night in a very serious condition. She was operated on for appendicitis and at present is doing nicely.

Rev. Blom of Ontario is conducting a series of meetings here.

Ed Wolfe has been quite sick the past week with throat trouble.

Elizabeth Smith is ill with a gripe.

The Misses Florence, Teddie and Ethel Bullard were visiting their aunt in Vale Saturday, Mrs. Chas. Splawn.

Frank Edwards was a Vale visitor Sunday.

Chas. Bullard lost a valuable work horse last week from some unknown cause.

Mr. Dupice arrived with his sheep at the Bennall ranch Saturday where he bought hay and will remain until after the lambing season.

Mr. and Mrs. Catz entertained friends Friday afternoon at a four o'clock lunch. A pleasant time was spent.

CRESTON

BODY SHIPPED TO BOISE
DEWEY McDANIELS HAD MANY FRIENDS IN CRESTON COMMUNITY.

Dewey McDaniels, who was killed last week on the old Scott place, was buried in the Boise cemetery. His death has saddened the hearts of friends in this community.

Guy Travis made a business trip to Vale last week.

Mr. Knochingham of Mud Flat was a visitor this week looking after work to be done. He is going to drill for water.

Ezra Roberts and his son Dave were in Vale on land business last week.

IRONSIDE

BABY BOY BORN SUNDAY
MR. AND MRS. LAFE HILL ANNOUNCE ARRIVAL OF BOY.

Monta Crews made final proof on his homestead before Chas. Morfitt at Malheur the first of the week, with Walter Duncan Cloud as a witness.

Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Quinn of Dridport spent the weekend with his mother, Mrs. Chas. Seaton, and returned Monday.

Chas. Seaton returned home from Vale Friday, where he had been on business.

Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Lawrence went to Unity Wednesday, where they visited relatives a few days.

Ben Rutherford came up from Brogan Sunday and will stay at the J. P. Smith ranch this winter.

Bill Cape went to Vale Monday to feed cattle for Ricker and Smith.

Fred Symphon hauled a load of lumber to the company ranch Tuesday for Archie Meyers.

Frank Anderson was an Ironside visitor from Malheur district Wednesday.

Mrs. Fred Lawrence is on the sick list with a cold.

Mr. and Mrs. Lafe Hill are the happy parents of a 7-pound boy, born January 8th. Mother and baby are doing nicely. Dr. Hulceizer of Malheur was in attendance.

Mrs. H. Elms left for Unity Friday to visit friends and relatives there and in Herford a few days.

ask if their trouble is not ours, and see what can be done to improve the situation. Purely from self-interest, if for no higher motive, we should help them. All of us want to get back permanently to "homesteading" but it is reasonable to hope for that condition unless our greatest and most basic industry can be put on a sound and solid permanent foundation? The farmers are not entitled to special privileges; but are they not right in demanding that they be placed on an equal footing with the buyers of their products and with other industries?

Let us, then, consider some of the farmer's grievances, and see how far they are real. In doing so, we should remember that, while there have been, and still are, instances of purposeful abuse, the subject should not be approached with any general imputation to existing distributive agencies of deliberately intentional oppression, but rather with the conception that the marketing of farm products has not been modernized.

An ancient evil, and a persistent one, is the undergrading of farm products, with the result that what the farmers sell as of one quality is resold as of a higher. That this sort of chicanery should persist on any large scale in these days of business integrity would seem almost incredible, but there is much evidence that it does so persist. Even as I write, the newspapers announce the suspension of several firms from the New York Produce Exchange for exporting to Germany as No. 2 wheat a whole shiplod of grossly inferior wheat mixed with oats, chaff and the like.

Another evil is that of inaccurate weighing of farm products, which, it is charged, is sometimes a matter of dishonest intention and sometimes of protective policy on the part of the local buyer, who fears that he may "weigh out" more than he "weighs in."

A greater grievance is that at present the field farmer has little or no control over the time and conditions of marketing his products, with the result that he is often underpaid for his products and usually overcharged for marketing service. The difference between what the farmer receives and what the consumer pays often exceeds all possibility of justification. To cite a single illustration. Last year, according to figures attested by the railroads and the growers, Georgia watermelon-risers received on the average 7.5 cents for a melon, the railroads got 12.7 cents for carrying it to Baltimore and the consumer paid one dollar, leaving 79.8 cents for the service of marketing and its risks, as against 20.2 cents for growing and transporting. The hard annals of farm-life are replete with such commentaries on the crudeness of present practices.

Nature prescribes that the farmer's goods must be finished within two or three months of the year, while financial and storage limitations generally compel him to sell them at the same time. As a rule, other industries are in a continuous process of finishing goods for the markets; they distribute as they produce, and they can curtail production without too great injury to themselves or the community; but if the farmer restricts his output, it is with disastrous consequences, both to himself and to the community.

The average farmer is busy with production for the major part of the year, and has nothing to sell. The bulk of his output comes on the market at once. Because of lack of storage facilities and of financial support, the farmer cannot carry his goods through the year and dispose of them as they are currently needed. In the great majority of cases, farmers have to entrust storage—in warehouses and elevators—and the financial carrying of their products to others.

Farm products are generally marketed at a time when there is a congestion of both transportation and finance—when cars and money are scarce. The outcome, in many instances, is that the farmer not only sells under pressure, and therefore at a disadvantage, but is compelled to take further reductions in net returns, in order to meet the charges for the service of storing, transporting, financing, and ultimate marketing—which charges they claim are often excessive, bear heavily on both consumer and producer, and are under the control of those performing the services.

It is true that they are relieved of the risks of a changing market by selling once that they are quite willing to take the unfavorable chance, if the favorable one also is theirs and they can retain for themselves a part of the service charges that are uniform, in good years and bad, with high prices and low.

While, in the main, the farmer must sell, regardless of market conditions, at the time of the maturity of crops, he cannot suspend production in toto. He must go on producing if he is to go on living, and if the world is to exist. The most he can do is to curtail production a little or alter its form, and that—because he is in the dark as to the probable demand for his goods—may be only to jump from the frying pan into the fire, taking the consumer with him.

Even the dairy farmers, whose output is not seasonal, complain that they find themselves at a disadvantage in the marketing of their productions, especially raw milk, because of the high costs of distribution, which they must ultimately bear.

Now that the farmers are stirring, thinking, and uniting as never before to eradicate these inequalities, they are subjected to stern economic lectures and are met with the accusation that they are demanding, and are the recipients of, special privileges. Let us see what privileges the government

has conferred on the farmers. Much has been made of Section 6 of the Clayton Anti-Trust Act, which purported to permit them to combine with immunity, under certain conditions. Admitting that, nominally, this exemption was in the nature of a special privilege—though I think it was so in appearance rather than in fact—we find that the courts have nullified it by judicial interpretation. Why should not the farmers be permitted to accomplish by co-operative methods what other businesses are already doing by co-operation in the form of incorporation? If it be proper for men to form, by fusion of existing corporations or otherwise, a corporation that controls the entire production of a commodity, or a large part of it, why is it not proper for a group of farmers to unite for the marketing of their common products, either in one or in several selling agencies? Why should it be right for a hundred thousand corporate shareholders to direct 25 or 30 or 40 per cent of an industry, and wrong for a hundred thousand co-operative farmers to control a no larger proportion of the wheat crop, or cotton, or any other product?

The Department of Agriculture is often spoken of as a special concession to the farmers, but in its commercial results, it is of as much benefit to the buyers and consumers of agricultural products as to the producers, or even more. I do not suppose that anyone opposes the benefits that the farmers derive from the educational and research work of the department, or the help that it gives them in working out improved cultural methods and practices, in developing better yielding varieties through breeding and selection, in introducing new varieties from remote parts of the world and adapting them to our climate and economic condition, and in devising practical measures for the elimination or control of dangerous and destructive animal and plant diseases, insect pests, and the like. All these things manifestly tend to stimulate and enlarge production, and their general beneficial effects are obvious.

It is complained that, whereas the law restricts Federal Reserve banks to three months' time for commercial loans, the farmer is allowed six months on his notes. This is not a special privilege, but merely such a recognition of business conditions as makes it possible for country banks to do business with country people. The crop farmer has only one turnover a year, while the merchant and manufacturer have many. Incidentally, I note that the Federal Reserve Board has just authorized the Federal Reserve banks to discount export paper for a period of six months, to conform to the nature of the business.

The Farm Loan banks are pointed to as an instance of special government favor for farmers. Are they not rather the outcome of inevitable efforts to equalize rural and urban conditions? And about all the government does there is to help set up an administrative organization and lend a little credit at the start. Eventually the farmers will provide all the capital and carry all the liabilities themselves. It is true that Farm Loan bonds are tax exempt; but so are bonds of municipal light and traction plants, and new housing is to be exempt from taxation, in New York, for ten years.

On the other hand, the farmer reads of plans for municipal housing projects that run into the billions, of hundreds of millions annually spent on the merchant marine; he reads that the railroads are being favored with increased rates and virtual guarantees of earnings by the government, with the result to him of an all that he buys. He hears of many manifestations of governmental concern for particular industries and interests. Regulations of the railroads for insolvency are undoubtedly for the benefit of the country as a whole, but what can be of more general benefit than encouragement of ample production of the principal necessities of life and their even flow from contented producers to satisfied consumers?

While it may be conceded that special governmental aid may be necessary in the general interest, we must all agree that it is difficult to see why agriculture and the production and distribution of farm products are not accorded the same opportunities that are provided for other businesses; especially as the enjoyment by the farmer of such opportunities would appear to be even more contributors to the general good than in the case of other industries. The spirit of American democracy is unalterably opposed, as to the special privilege of unequal opportunity that arises automatically from the failure to correct glaring economic inequalities. I am opposed to the injection of government into business, but I do believe that it is an essential function of democratic government to equalize opportunity so far as it is within its power to do so, whether by the repeal of archaic statutes or the enactment of modern ones. If the anti-trust laws keep the farmers from endeavoring scientifically to integrate their industry while other industries find a way to meet modern conditions without violating such statutes, then it would seem reasonable to find a way for the farmers to meet them under the same conditions. The law should operate equally in fact. Repealing the economic structure on one side is no injustice to the other side, which is in good repair.

We have traveled a long way from the old conception of government as merely a defensive and policing agency; and regulative, corrective, or equalizing legislation, which apparently is of a special nature, is often of the most general beneficial consequences. Even the First Congress passed a tariff act that was avowedly for the protection of manufacturers; but a protective tariff always has been defended as a means of promoting the general good through a particular approach; and the statute books are filled with acts for the benefit of shipping, commerce, and labor.

(To be concluded next week.)

COUNTY STATISTICS

MALHEUR COUNTY REAL ESTATE TRANSFERS RECORDED JAN.

Will E. Brown et ux to Evan A. Brown, Und. Int. in E1/2SE1/4 NE1/4 Sec. 22, SW1/4 NW1/4 Sec. 23-16-44, 1-12-21, \$100.

W. W. Ladd et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

COUNTY STATISTICS

MALHEUR COUNTY REAL ESTATE TRANSFERS RECORDED JAN.

Will E. Brown et ux to Evan A. Brown, Und. Int. in E1/2SE1/4 NE1/4 Sec. 22, SW1/4 NW1/4 Sec. 23-16-44, 1-12-21, \$100.

W. W. Ladd et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Stephen G. Braniff et ux, Lot 29, Block 3, Riverside Addition to Ontario, 11-21-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to Almer Edwards, S1/2 NW1/4 Sec. 25-16-38; Lot 4, Sec. 20; Lot 2, Sec. 21-16-39, 1-12-21, \$100.

Robert Raney et ux to James M. McGreevy, 70 acres in SW1/4 Sec. 16-16-47, 2-17-20, \$100.

dated the 3rd day of December, 1921, in a certain action in the Circuit Court for said County and State, wherein Walf Hardware & Implement Company, a corporation, was plaintiff, recovered judgment against Grover Carley, as defendant, for the sum of One Hundred Sixty-two and 46/100 Dollars (\$162.46), with interest thereon at the rate of six per cent per annum from the 3rd day of December, 1921, and the further sum of One Hundred Fifteen and 82/100 Dollars (\$115.82), with interest thereon at the rate of six per cent per annum from the 22nd day of December, 1921, in which judgment it was further ordered by the Court that the property described in said action and hereinafter described, be sold for the satisfaction of said judgment in the manner provided by law, and judgment was rendered and entered in the Clerk's office of said Court on the 3rd day of December, 1921.

TREASURY NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, That I will on the 31st day of January, 1922, at the hour of 11 o'clock in the forenoon of said day, at the main entrance door of the County Courthouse in Vale, said County and State, sell at public auction to the highest bidder or bidders for cash, the following described real property, to-wit:

The southeast quarter of the Southeast Quarter (SE1/4SE1/4) of Section Twenty-eight (28), Northwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (NW1/4NW1/4), Southeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (SE1/4NE1/4), and Northwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter (NW1/4SE1/4) of Section Nine (9), West Quarter of Township Sixteen (16), Range Forty-six (46), E. W. M., in Malheur County, Oregon.

Taken and levied upon as the property of said above named defendant, Grover Carley, or his assigns, and the same is offered to satisfy said judgment in favor of said plaintiff, and to pay the costs of a corporation, and against the said above named defendant, with interest thereon, together with costs and disbursements, that have or may accrue.

Dated at Vale, Oregon, this 28th day of December, 1921.

H. LEE NOE, Sheriff.

By C. W. GLENN, Deputy.