

TENTS ARE PITCHED

All Is Ready for Opening of Chautauqua Assembly.

ATTENDANCE WILL BE LARGE

Inaugural Address by Senator Mitchell Will Be Followed by Speech of Senator Dilliver—Great Feast of Education.

OREGON CITY, Or., July 13.—(Special.)—All is in readiness for the opening of the tenth annual assembly of the Willamette Valley Chautauqua Association, which will be held at Gladstone Park tomorrow morning. The final session will be held Sunday, July 16.

Everything was bustling at Gladstone Park today, where dozens of families were establishing themselves in tents for the session. Proprietors of restaurants and refreshment booths were also active in preparation for serving the thousands that will visit the grounds during the next fortnight.

President W. C. Hawley, of the association, and Secretary Cross, of this city, were on the grounds all day giving information, answering numerous inquiries and preparing for the opening Tuesday. Another session of the association, which has given the Willamette Valley fame throughout the states, Secretary Cross reports that there are more people on the grounds than usual, and that there is every indication of a most successful meeting. Beginning with Tuesday, the opening day, there will be a lecture by United States Senator Jonathan F. Dilliver, of Iowa, and that there will be each succeeding day is changed with attractions of real merit. There are over 25 tents already pitched on the grounds, and more are arriving hourly.

The Chautauqua will be formally opened at 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning with a programme in the auditorium. Music will be furnished by the Chemawa Indian School Band, which arrived in the city today. An address of welcome will be delivered by President W. C. Hawley, of Salem, to which a response will be offered by Colonel R. A. Miller, of this city. The remainder of the morning session will be devoted to the organization of classes and the announcement of instructors. There will be a band concert at 1:30 P. M., and at 2 o'clock Mrs. Harriet Colburn Saunders, of Seattle, will give a reading. "The Making of the Declaration of Independence" will be the subject of a lecture by President Hawley, immediately following the reading. The first game of the Chautauqua baseball tournament will be played at 3 o'clock between the Supnyside Woodmen team, of Portland, and the Chemawa Indians. The principal programme for the first day will be a band concert at 8 o'clock, following a band concert. "United States Senator J. H. Mitchell will deliver the introductory address, and will present the lecturer of the evening, United States Senator Dilliver, the subject of whose address will be: "A Poor Man's Government and a Poor Boy's Country."

BAPTIST CONVENTION ENDS

Mission and Colportage Work Principles Discussed at Closing Sessions.

OAKLAND, Or., July 13.—(Special.)—At the session of the Corvallis Baptist Association the women's mission societies made their reports Friday afternoon, after which the committee on associated missions made a report favoring more mission work on behalf of pastors, and recommended that the association secure a gospel or colportage wagon, to carry the gospel to destitute fields. In the evening the Rev. Leonard W. Riley, state missionary, preached to a large and appreciative audience.

The report from the committee on Sunday schools was read and discussed Saturday morning. At 10:30 o'clock Rev. S. A. Douglas delivered a doctrinal sermon on the distinctive teaching of the Baptists. Rev. W. H. Latourrette, financial representative of McMinnville College, in a forceful address presented the needs and work of the college. B. E. Jones, of the college, in his presentation of the work of the chapel at McMinnville, giving an outline of the work and needs of the hour. Rev. James Edmunds delivered an address on the necessity of aggressive Sunday school work.

In the afternoon the committee on obituaries reported 15 deaths in the association during the past year. The Baptist Young People's Society gave a place in the association, and were assigned Thursday afternoon for their work. By request, the Rev. James Edmunds delivered a lecture on the moral and religious training of the youth.

In the evening the venerable missionary and pastor, the Rev. J. C. Richardson, of Eugene, preached to a large audience, followed by a gospel or colportage wagon work by J. L. Wherry. A collection of \$11 was taken for the benefit of the Heppner church.

WORK ON BIG POWER PLANT

Construction on Eagle Creek to Supply Eastern Oregon Cities.

BAKER CITY, Or., July 13.—(Special.)—Work is to be pushed on the Eagle Creek power plant, about 30 miles east of this city. This is the power enterprise inaugurated by A. B. Frame, of Portland, something over a year ago. H. H. Andrews, of Calloway, Neb., vice-president of the company, is here to push the work of construction, which was begun several months ago. The machinery for the plant has all been contracted for. The dynamo and water wheels will generate 3000 horsepower.

While the work of constructing the flume and power-house has been under way for some time, it has not attracted much attention in this city, because the scene of activity is in the mountains, over 30 miles away. The payroll, however, for the last month was over \$4700, and for the coming month it will be twice that amount.

The transmission line for this power plant will be 110 miles long, to begin with, and will include La Grande, Union and Baker City. The polls for the transmission line have been cut and will be distributed and set at once.

The company, so Mr. Andrews says, has made no contracts to furnish electric energy, and no attempt will be made to contract for power for some time yet. He thinks the demand will be equal to the supply, and until the company has made further progress and can determine to a certainty just when the plant will be ready to begin operations, it will not offer to contract for the supply of electric power. It is the purpose to have the plant completed and ready to operate by the end of the year. It will depend, however, on the ability of the Westinghouse people, who have the contract, to deliver the machinery.

A careful survey of the water supply has demonstrated that it is possible to develop 10,000 horsepower from the water in the creek at the lowest stage. If there is a demand for more than 3000 horsepower the plant will be increased.

VICTIM OF SCHEMERS

Pathetic Answer of Aged Pioneer to Wife's Divorce Suit.

SEATTLE, Wash., July 13.—B. F. Day, a well-known pioneer resident of Seattle, was on Saturday made the defendant in a divorce suit brought by his wife. Mr. Day is 68 years old and Mrs. Day is 72. They have been married for 44 years. Mr. Day in his answer says that his wife has been

induced to bring the suit by persons who have been meddling in an effort to get part of the property. Day begs the court to set aside the divorce suit, and to enjoin certain persons from visiting his wife and telling her untrue stories that have resulted in the suit. He says that he has all confidence in his wife, but that she is easily influenced, and in the hands of designing persons she can be made to believe most anything, especially since by her old age her mind is not as strong as it used to be. Day's answer is pathetic. He says that he and his wife lived happily for more than 40 years, and that he wants to die still the husband of the woman who has been loved for so long. The well-known B. F. Day School in Seattle was named for the defendant. At one time he was the wealthiest man in the city, but during the past few years ago he lost nearly all his property. However, he is still comfortably fixed, and says that it is his one ambition to be allowed to provide for himself and wife during the remainder of his life. He says that he is sure that he and his wife will get along nicely.

THEY CONDEMN LAWLESSNESS

Friends Adopt Resolution Against Lynching and Barbarism.

NEWBERG, Or., July 13.—(Special.)—Always exponents of the dignity of the law and of the preservation of the institutions of government, the Friends, in session in Oregon yearly meeting, gave attention, at one of their last business sessions, to what they consider an alarming growth of the spirit of lawlessness. They passed the following resolution:

We would express our thankfulness to our heavenly Father for the tranquility and order which our government has enjoyed during the past year, for the peace and quietness that has reigned upon our Nation. No widespread disturbances have visited our land. However, we are compelled to admit that lawlessness and a disregard of the value of human life and orderly procedure in the punishment of criminals has made an alarming growth. In the past 21 years closing with last December 3233 lynchings have occurred within our beloved land. Some of these have been accompanied by barbarities which, have not been equaled except by the most barbarous and savage people. In some places these things have culminated in conflicts between the white and colored races which have resulted in loss of life and destruction of property.

We are united in the belief that no community is ever justified in punishing crime except by due process of law.

Saturday afternoon was given up to the subject of higher education. The programme being furnished by the alumni of Pacific College. C. J. Edwards, '33, spoke of higher education in relation to the home; M. O. Pickett, '36, in its relation to the business arena; Miss Neryia Wright, '32, in relation to society; R. W. Kirk, '34, in its relation to the church. Interesting addresses were also made by Rev. Mr. Barr, of California, and others. The educational reports were read, showing the work of Pacific College to be prospering. A subscription was taken, amounting to over \$100, to help meet the running expenses of the institution the coming year.

FOUND DEAD IN BED.

Samuel R. Withrow, of Lane County, Dies Suddenly.

EUGENE, July 13.—(Special.)—Samuel R. Withrow, a pioneer resident of this county, residing near Elmira, was found dead in his bed last evening, apparently having died Saturday night. The cause of his death has been pronounced by a coroner's jury to be natural. It is supposed that he was attacked by heart trouble and passed away unable to get help.

While passing the place Sunday evening, a young man named Smith noticed that the stock had been secured, and he decided to investigate. He forced an entrance to the house and was confronted by the sight of the dead body of Mr. Withrow in his bed. In a position to indicate that he died after retiring Saturday night. Coroner King was notified and went to the scene and held an inquest.

Samuel R. Withrow was an old-time resident of Lane County. He came from Missouri to Oregon and Lane County in 1879 and had since that time been a resident here. He was 73 years of age, respected and honored by all his neighbors. At the time of his death he was living alone. He had been twice married and the following children survive him: Charles Withrow, of Eugene; Mrs. Bettie Dougherty, of Washington; Clinton W. Withrow, of Eugene, is a brother, and Mrs. D. R. Lankin and Mrs. M. A. Donaldson are sisters of the dead man.

THREAT TO KILL HIS WIFE.

New Arrival From Arkansas Accused of Brutal Conduct.

ENTERPRISE, July 13.—(Special.)—Cam Robertson, a recent arrival from Arkansas, was today placed under \$500 bonds to keep the peace and to appear at the October term of court on a charge of threatening to kill his wife.

It appears that a family row was in progress one day last week and the husband threw the wife to the floor, choking her and saying he would kill her. She begged for her life, and he let her up after three little children, and he let her up after a time. He then started for a neighboring building, where she knew he kept his rifle, and she started out over the hills toward Enterprise, a distance of 10 miles, and today swore to a complaint in the Justice Court charging him with the above crime.

This was about the most sensational trial ever held in Judge Oak's court. One of the attorneys used language that was very offensive to his honor, and was fined \$5 for contempt. The wife, in her testimony, related the fact that her husband, while living in the State of Arkansas, before their marriage, attempted the life of a man, and on another occasion that of a woman, by shooting at him with a pistol.

DENOUNCED BY HIS PARTY.

Union Labor Committee Adopts Resolution Against Mayor Schmitt.

SAN FRANCISCO, July 13.—Resolutions denouncing Mayor Eugene Schmitt were adopted by the State Central Committee of the Union Labor Party at a meeting held yesterday. It was by a unanimous vote of the committee that this action was taken, and came as the termination of a lengthy and spirited discussion. The resolutions bear the signatures of James O'Brien, chairman, and A. W. Atherton, secretary, of the committee, both of whom are prominent in the council of the Union Labor Party.

In the resolutions the Mayor is accused of allying himself with "so-called boss politicians," and being a part of a "combination of traitors and enemies" to the party's interests. The suggestion is made in conclusion that the county committee of San Francisco "seriously consider the advisability of reading Eugene Schmitt out of the Union Labor Party."

As Mayor Schmitt was nominated and elected by the Union Labor Party with Republican assistance, and as the Republicans are not now likely to nominate him, this seems to be a final blow to his aspirations for re-election.

THIEVES' EARLY MORNING HAUL.

SHERIDAN, July 13.—Thieves broke into the house of C. W. Cline, a Southern Pacific Railway conductor, about 5 o'clock this morning and got away with \$50 in cash. They forced an entrance through the woodshed, grabbed Cline's pants containing \$50, and discarded the pants but took the money.

WINS HIS HEART'S DESIRE

MARRIAGE ENDS IDAHO POLITICIAN'S ROMANCE.

Woman for Love of Whom Senator Watt Attempted Drowning, Is at Last His Wife.

BOISE, Idaho, July 13.—(Special.)—At noon today William H. Watt and Mrs. Vivian F. Stowe, both of Hailey, were united in marriage in this city, the ceremony being performed by Justice Herrick in the presence of two witnesses. The contracting parties arrived in Boise Sunday.

News of the wedding will come as a surprise to many in this city, who have known Mr. Watt for many years. The union is an act in a somewhat sensational drama that came near culminating in a tragedy. Prompted by infatuation, as alleged, for the woman who now his wife, Mr. Watt went to Portland and attempted suicide. He leaped into the river, and was fished out half

WILL SPEAK AT CHAUTAUQUA TODAY



SENATOR J. P. DILLIVER, OF IOWA.

dead. The newspaper accounts of the affair at the time stated that Mr. Watt had become temporarily deranged. This derangement seems to have continued for a time, as he was for a long period afterward in a private sanitarium in Oregon. He returned to Hailey recently, the announcement being made that he was restored to health.

Mr. Watt is president of the Watt Banking Company, at Hailey, and has been for years prominently connected with various business enterprises in that section. He has also taken an active part in politics, having been at one time one of the leading Democrats of the state. He was a member of the Third Legislature, and was one of the two who threw their politics to the wind and voted for Senator Shoup. He has also been chairman of two Democratic state conventions.

ORE IN THUNDER MOUNTAIN.

Rich Strikes Made and Many Prospected in Paving In.

WEISER, Idaho, July 13.—(Special.)—Sam Wilson arrived from Profile Creek, Thunder Mountain district, this afternoon, bringing the first authentic news of recent big strikes in that district. At the Glasgow, one of the properties sold by Mr. Wilson to mining men of Joplin, Mo., a strike has been made in a tunnel started last winter. A large body of high-grade ore was encountered about 125 feet from the face of the tunnel at a depth of about 100 feet from the surface. Mr. Wilson estimates that there is over \$100,000 worth of ore in sight in the tunnel. At the Wardenhoff properties, on Smith Creek, a splendid showing has been made. In every case where development work has been made, the results have been satisfactory. The trail is open and in good condition the entire distance. Men and animals are going over it daily. Mr. Wilson came out to meet a party of Eastern capitalists who are the owners of the Glasgow and Dundee properties. They will leave here for the camp Wednesday or Thursday morning. A great many moneyed men are going into the camp now.

ALL WILL GO TO HUNTINGTON.

Transfer of Los Angeles Street Railways to Be Completed Wednesday.

LOS ANGELES, July 13.—It is stated today that the transfer of the Huntington-Hellman Street-Railway syndicate will, on next Wednesday, assume control of all the street-railway lines in Los Angeles, including the Los Angeles traction system. The price paid is stated as \$1,785,000.

MAN WHO IS ACCUSED OF BRINGING BOGUS DAMAGE SUITS AND HIS ALLEGED CONFEDERATE



Charles R. Lane.

the Glasgow and Dundee properties. They will leave here for the camp Wednesday or Thursday morning. A great many moneyed men are going into the camp now.

ALL WILL GO TO HUNTINGTON.

Transfer of Los Angeles Street Railways to Be Completed Wednesday.

LOS ANGELES, July 13.—It is stated today that the transfer of the Huntington-Hellman Street-Railway syndicate will, on next Wednesday, assume control of all the street-railway lines in Los Angeles, including the Los Angeles traction system. The price paid is stated as \$1,785,000.

It was definitely stated, Saturday, that the Clark option on the Traction Company's system was transferred to the

HUNTINGTON-HELLMAN SYNDICATE BEFORE H. E. HUNTINGTON LEFT LOS ANGELES.

The holdings of the Los Angeles Traction Company, which include the California Pacific Railway, with a trackage of 29 miles, consists of 40 miles of street track, together with power-houses, substations and rolling stock valued at almost \$2,000,000. The gross earnings last year amounted to \$270,750, and the net earnings were \$118,000. Most of the city franchises of the Traction Company run until 1940.

NORTHWEST DEAD.

Dr. R. H. McDonald, Formerly of San Francisco.

SAN FRANCISCO, July 13.—A dispatch has been received here from Montreal announcing the death of Dr. R. H. McDonald in that city at an advanced age. Dr. McDonald was formerly president of the Pacific National Bank in this city, the failure of which in 1930 caused widespread panic and resulted in sensational charges against its president. The body will be brought to this country for burial.

Dr. A. H. McDonald amassed a small fortune from the manufacture of a patent medicine, and later became president of the Pacific Bank. Subsequently he took in two sons, Richard, Jr., and Frank V.

MUST PAY INSURANCE

SUPREME COURT DECIDES AGAINST ARTISANS.

Report of Officers of Subordinate Lodge Is Conclusive Evidence Against Supreme Assembly.

A statement of facts regarding a deceased member by the officers of a subordinate assembly of the Order of Artisans to the supreme assembly, in accordance with the by-laws and prescribed forms, is admissible in evidence against the society in a suit to recover on the beneficiary certificate.

One who signs a receipt for property which the Sheriff attempts to take under writ of attachment will not thereafter be permitted to deny that he had possession of the property.

Where the execution of a note is denied, there is no presumption that it was regularly executed, but the burden of proof is upon the plaintiff.

SALEM, Or., July 13.—(Special.)—Leo J. Patterson, by J. P. Finley, guardian, respondent, vs. United Artisans, appellants, from Multnomah County; M. C. George, Judge, affirmed. Opinion by Justice Bean.

This was a suit to recover \$1000 alleged to be due upon a beneficiary certificate. The defense was that the insured committed suicide. On appeal the error alleged was that in the court below the trial judge admitted in evidence the statement made by the officers of the subordinate assembly to the supreme assembly. This statement gave the date and cause of death, that the deceased joined the order, that he was in good standing, etc., and that they believed that Leo J. Patterson was entitled to recover upon the beneficiary certificate. The Supreme Court holds that this statement was properly admitted, for it was made by the officers of the local assembly in accordance with the by-laws of the order, upon blanks provided by the supreme secretary, and being thus made by agents of the order, it was properly treated as an admission against the interest of the defendant.

Error was found in the amount of costs and disbursements allowed in the court below, but the plaintiff having offered to remit the overplus, the judgment thus corrected is affirmed with costs allowed to the plaintiff.

Sears vs. Daly.

Van B. Sears, respondent, vs. Phya Daly, appellant, from Marion County; George H. Burnett, Judge, reversed. Opinion by Justice Wollverton.

This was an action against several defendants upon a promissory note alleged to have been executed in behalf of plaintiff as administrator of the Isaac Ball estate. Mrs. Phya Daly answered, denying the execution of the note by her, and alleged that her signature on the note was a forgery. In his reply the plaintiff alleged that Mrs. Daly had ratified the signature. After trial verdict and judgment were rendered for plaintiff, and Mrs. Daly appealed.

In the court below the trial judge instructed the jury that there is a presumption that a note regularly executed, but that the presumption may be overcome by other evidence. The Supreme Court holds that this was error, and says: "In an action upon a promissory note, where its execution is denied by the defendant there is no presumption that it was regularly executed. In such case the plaintiff must establish the fact that it is the note of the defendant, and on this point the burden of proof is upon the plaintiff. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the plaintiff's proposition he has the burden of proof throughout. In case an instrument in form a promissory note is shown or admitted to have been executed, certain presumptions are regularly created in the hands of the holder—such as that it was made for a valuable consideration, regularly indorsed for value before maturity, etc. But where the making of the note is the point in issue, and the