

TRIAL DOCKET OF THE SUPREME COURT JUST FROM PRINTER

Contains Total of 184 Cases, Catalogued by Counties for Convenience Sake.

APPEAR IN THEIR ORDER

Title of Cases, Number on Docket, With Names of Persons Concerned, Are Included in the List.

Salem, Or., Nov. 15.—The supreme court trial docket, which has just been printed, contains a total of 184 cases. The title of the cases, in the order in which they appear on the calendar, follows:
1. Coos county (rehearing) — John M. Foulke, appellant, vs. Henry Bengtsson, et al., respondents.
2. Jackson county — Charles Dodge, respondent, vs. C. W. Root, appellant.
3. Jackson county — Grand Prix Hydraulic Mines, et al., appellants, vs. B. Bowell, et al., respondents.
4. Multnomah county — Zero Snow and Wallace McCannan, respondents, vs. S. Rocco Beard and Mary A. Gray, appellants.
5. Multnomah county — Henry Harbhart, respondent, vs. North Pacific Lumber company, appellant.
6. Marion county — Tallman Dearing, appellant, vs. Ladd & Bush, respondent.
7. Multnomah county — Alice J. Belmont, appellant, vs. John A. Belmont, respondent.
8. Multnomah county — R. J. Freeman, respondent, vs. Southern Pacific company, appellant.
9. Coos county — Thomas J. Clark, respondent, vs. Coos county, appellant.
10. Clatsop county — Columbia River company, respondent, vs. John A. Smith and Susanna Smith, appellants.
11. Clackamas county — Eleonora K. Hill, respondent, vs. James M. Hill, appellant.
12. Lincoln county — Madia Pando, respondent, vs. Jane McCallister, appellant.
13. Crook county — H. A. Goney, respondent, vs. Anton H. Hanson, appellant.
14. Lane county — Society of Independent Doughbors, et al., respondents, vs. B. J. Becker and Ada Becker, appellants.
15. Multnomah county — J. D. Morris, respondent, vs. John P. Leach, appellant.
16. Multnomah county — W. F. Frazier, respondent, vs. L. E. Critter, appellant.


18. Yamhill county — Carrie Coos, appellant, vs. J. A. Coos, respondent.
19. Hood River county — Fred H. Taylor, appellant, vs. Farmers' Irrigation company, respondent.
20. Yamhill county — James Savage, respondent, vs. K. Scroggin, and W. C. Henderson, as sheriff, appellants.
21. Multnomah county — Celia M. Bostad, respondent, vs. M. G. Thorsen, et al., appellants.
22. Clatsop county — Caris Rasmussen, et al., appellants, vs. Caris Winters and wife, respondents.
23. Columbia county — L. A. Jones, appellant, vs. Mrs. Frances Rosa, et al., respondents.
24. Josephine county — Maggie E. Short and Charles E. Short, respondents, vs. Rogue River Irrigation & Power company, et al., defendants, W. R. Sherman, appellant.
25. Multnomah county — Henry Koth, et al., respondents, vs. Troutdale Land company, et al., appellants.
26. Josephine county — In re Water Rights of Sucker creek, Mary Ellen Leonard, appellant.
27. Josephine county — In re Water Rights of Althouse creek, Mary Ellen Leonard, appellant.
28. Douglas county — Simon Caro, et al., appellants, vs. H. Wollenberg, respondent.
29. Multnomah county — The Scott company, et al., appellants, vs. Roman Catholic Archdiocese for the Diocese of Oregon, et al., respondents.
30. Multnomah county — D. B. Ubrand, respondent, vs. J. E. Bennett, defendant; Allan Welch Smith, appellant.
31. Multnomah county — W. J. Mitchell and L. G. Carpenter, respondents, vs. Joe Coach, appellant.
32. Coos county — National Sales company, appellant, vs. H. Masciet and George Mandel, respondents.
33. Multnomah county — Thomas J. Wilson, appellant, vs. Deans Cornier, mayor of the City of Lebanon, respondent.
34. Lake county — F. L. Williams, respondent, vs. The Coosa Lake Valley Irrigation company, appellant.
35. Washington county — H. E. Noble, appellant, vs. Sherman Bacon, et al., respondents.
36. Tillamook county — J. H. Hicks, respondent, vs. F. L. Heals Jr. and Adjutant, Association Credit Men, appellants.
37. Clatsop county — A. F. Chabins, appellant, vs. City of Merrill, respondent.
38. Multnomah county — H. B. Fogarty, respondent, vs. Frank T. Hunter, et al., appellants; W. R. Crawford, et al., respondents.
39. Coos county — C. H. Barrow and Z. C. Strang, respondents, vs. School District No. 5, appellant.
40. Clatsop county — Clarinda Trust & Savings Bank, respondent, vs. M. R. Doty, appellant.
41. Lane county — Eugene Hoffman, et al., appellants, vs. George H. Harris, respondent.
42. Lane county — Ida May Wickes, respondent, vs. H. K. Metcalf and Andrew Brund, appellants.
43. Multnomah county — Martin Johnson, et al., respondents, vs. Josephine Paulsen and W. J. Lemons, trustees, appellants.
44. Clackamas county — Theodore Hagenburger, respondent, vs. Town of Milwaukie, appellant.
45. Clatsop county — C. N. Bennett, appellant, vs. Emma K. Bennett, respondent.
46. Marion county — Britt Asplund, respondent, vs. John S. Dunlay, appellant.
47. Multnomah county — Joseph B. Bowler, et al., appellants, vs. Calvin L. Gantenben, respondent.
48. Columbia county, for use and benefit of O. B. Bennett, respondent, vs. Consolidated Contract company and New England Casualty company, appellants.
49. Multnomah county — George H. Bagley, appellant, vs. Moses Bloch and Bertha Bloch, defendants; Multnomah county, appellant.
50. Multnomah county — William M. Gregan, respondent, vs. Northwestern National Insurance company, appellant.
51. Clackamas county — Edward Summerfield, administrator, appellant, vs. Southern Pacific company, respondent.
52. Multnomah county — Binstger & Co., respondent, vs. Massachusetts Bonding & Insurance company, appellant.
53. Marion county — T. Rosenwald & Co., appellant, vs. Oregon City Transportation company, respondent.
54. Multnomah county — John Wilson Estate Co., respondent, vs. Dammer Investment Co., et al., appellants.
55. Multnomah county — Corvallis & Alsea River Railroad Co., respondent, vs. Portland, Eugene & Eastern Ry. Co., appellant.
56. Multnomah county — Metropolitan Imp. Co., appellant, vs. M. E. Schouweiler, et al., respondents.
57. Multnomah county — Isabella Caldwell, et al., respondents, vs. Bingham & Shiley Co., et al., respondents.
58. Multnomah county — Thomas Wike, respondent, vs. O-W-R. & N. Co., appellant.
59. Multnomah county — Ah Foo, et al., respondents, vs. John Stevenson, municipal judge, et al., appellants.
60. Marion county — Henry Rock, respondent, vs. City of Silverton, appellant.
61. Multnomah county — H. H. Clifford, appellant, vs. Frank L. Smith Meat Co., respondent.
62. Multnomah county — John Wechter, respondent, vs. Charles Fitzgerald, et al., appellants.
63. Lane county — Alfred Todd, appellant, vs. Deans Cornier, mayor of the City of Lebanon, respondent.
64. Multnomah county — L. F. Gerde, appellant, vs. Central Ore. Irrigation Co., respondent.
65. Crook county — State of Oregon, respondent, vs. Ethel Howell and John Collins, appellants.
66. Multnomah county — Lyle B. Speer, appellant, vs. O. H. Smith and Josephine V. Smith, respondents.
67. Marion county — George J. Watson, et al., respondents, vs. City of Salem, appellant.
68. Marion county — J. H. Albert, respondent, vs. City of Salem, appellant.
69. Lane county — George D. Ward, appellant, vs. W. F. James, et al., respondents.
70. Multnomah county — T. Van Orsdol, appellant, vs. R. J. Hitchcock, respondent.
71. Multnomah county — Western Union Telegraph Co., respondent, vs. Thomas M. Burbury, sheriff, appellant.
72. Multnomah county — Mar H. Evans, respondent, vs. Meridian Inv. & Trust Co., city of Portland, appellants.
73. Multnomah county — Mary Somo, respondent, vs. Order of Foresters, appellant.
74. Multnomah county — Yanko Y. Yovovich, appellant, vs. P. W. Wascher, respondents, vs. Est. of William C. Barker, spendthrift, appellant.
75. Wasco county — F. E. Strang and North British & Mer. Ins. Co., respondents, vs. Oregon-Washington R. & N. Co., appellant.
76. Multnomah county — Golden Bond Milling Co., appellant, vs. Joseph Connell, et al., respondents, N. Wheaton and B. L. Young, appellants.
77. Multnomah county — Aaron Holts and Max Holts, appellants, vs. Olds, Wortman & King, respondent.
78. Multnomah county — M. Hetrick and W. Cline, respondents, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car, appellant.
79. Multnomah county — H. D. Hamilton, respondent, vs. North Pacific Steamship Co., appellant.
80. Multnomah county — Baggage & Omnibus Transfer Co., respondent, vs. City of Portland, et al., appellants.
81. Multnomah county — D. V. Mesinger, appellant, vs. Elmore Music House, respondent.
82. Multnomah county — Oregon Art Tile Co., respondent, vs. H. W. Hegeler, and Laurens Theatre Co., appellants.
83. Hood River county — Martin Dragaseth, appellant, vs. A. I. Mason, respondent.
84. Multnomah county — Martin W. Hawkins, Admr., appellant, vs. Anderson & Crowe, respondent, et al., appellants.
85. Multnomah county — Edward Reimers and Eva Reimers, appellants, vs. I. F. Brennan and Price Brennan, respondents.
86. Lane county — Reuben Prosty, respondent, vs. Catherine Burroughs, appellant.
87. Multnomah county — Maryland Casualty Co., appellant, vs. Est. of Herman Klaber, deceased, et al., respondents.
88. Multnomah county — Earl A. Blakney and Lena M. Blakney, respondents, vs. Mary C. Rowell, et al., appellants.
89. Multnomah county — Fred West, respondent, vs. Scott-McClure Land Co., appellant.
90. Marion county — Alice McCoy, appellant, vs. E. A. Thompson, respondent.
91. Multnomah county — N. W. Baldwin, et al., appellants, vs. Union-Pacific Life Ins. Co., et al., respondents.
92. Lane county — William Paulson, appellant, vs. M. Grove, respondent.
93. Yamhill county — Edgar Clare Wigren, et al., appellants, vs. M. LaFollet and J. I. Isham, respondents.
94. Jackson county — Aaron Andrews, respondent, vs. William Westcombe, et al., appellants.
95. Marion county — Juliet M. Lord and Montague Lord, respondents, vs. City of Salem, appellants.
96. Marion county — John A. Carson, respondent, vs. City of Salem, appellant.
97. Multnomah county — Daniel J. Fry and Hattie E. Fry, respondents, vs. City of Salem, appellant.
98. Multnomah county — E. C. Boardman and S. Baris, respondents, vs. The Insurance Co. of Penn., appellant.
99. Washington county — Albert Courts, respondent, vs. T. E. Clark and Mitchell, Lewis & Stever Co., appellants.
100. Washington county — The Hillboro Nat. Bank, respondent, vs. Natalio Garbarino and Rosa Garbarino, appellants.
101. Washington county — James S. Hart, et al., respondents, vs. City of Independence, appellant.
102. Multnomah county — L. O. Herrold, appellant; J. W. Chamberlain, et al., respondents.
103. Multnomah county — Thomas M. Askey, administrator, respondent, vs. Patrick B. Maloney, et al., appellants.
104. Multnomah county — Eugene Marmel, appellant, vs. Henry J. Bellairs, respondent.
105. Multnomah county — F. S. Lawrence, et al., appellants, vs. City of Portland, respondent.
106. Washington county — Walter P. Stewart, appellant, vs. S. M. Mann, et al., respondents.
107. Douglas county — Ada Tharp, respondent, vs. Aura D. Jackson, administrator, appellant.
108. Multnomah county — Frank L. Walker, respondent, vs. City of New York Ins. Co., appellant.
109. Multnomah county — F. E. Rowell, respondent, vs. American Life & Acc. Ins. Co., respondent, N. Wheaton and B. L. Young, appellants.
110. Marion county — J. C. Gregory, respondent, vs. Oregon Fruit Juice Co., appellant.
111. Jackson county — Rogus River Fruit & Nut Assn., respondent, vs. Gillen Chambers Co., appellant.
112. Multnomah county — Wakefield Fries & Co., respondent, vs. Alfred L. Parkhurst, appellant; H. Moomal, et al., respondents.
113. Multnomah county — J. J. Minder, respondent, vs. J. M. Edmundson, appellant.
114. Douglas county — H. P. Marks, respondent, vs. Portland Nat. Bank of Commerce, respondent.
115. Multnomah county — Ralph R. Dunaway, appellant, vs. Clarissa Wiley and Andrew Smith, respondents.
116. Multnomah county — L. P. Hubbard, et al., appellants, vs. William Scott, respondent.
117. Multnomah county — Portland Gas & Coke Co., appellant, vs. Glebach & Joplin, respondent.
118. Multnomah county — Eda J. Lindstrom, respondent, vs. National Life Ins. Co., appellant.
119. Multnomah county — In re appeal of the Weyerhaeuser Land Co. from decision of board of equalization.
120. Multnomah county — W. C. Alford et al., appellants, vs. M. C. Banfield, respondent.
121. Multnomah county — Oscar L. Smith, respondent, vs. Floyd J. Campbell, appellant.
122. Multnomah county — George E. Miller, respondent, vs. State Industrial Accident commission, appellant.
123. Clackamas county — M. I. White, respondent, vs. Portland Gas & Coke Co., appellant.
124. Jackson county — S. F. Reicher, respondent, vs. Josephine Sooy-Smith, appellant.
125. Washington county — J. C. Shane, respondent, vs. J. D. Gordon, appellant.
126. Douglas county — Harry L. Johnson, trustee, appellant, vs. Harry L. Johnson, respondent.
127. Multnomah county — California Trojan Powder Co., respondent, vs. Wadams & Co., appellant.
128. Multnomah county — Frans H. Elling, respondent, vs. Blake McCall Co., appellant.
129. Clackamas county — David N. Bridenstine and Fiebe S. Bridenstine, respondents, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co., et al., appellants.
130. Jackson county — W. H. Stewart, respondent, vs. George F. King, appellant.
131. Jackson county — F. Young, respondent, vs. George F. King, appellant.
132. Marion county — Sherman Swank, respondent, vs. Mart T. Molsan and J. M. Molsan, appellants.
133. Marion county — Arthur Ranzau, by Dorothea V. Ranzau, guardian ad litem, appellant, vs. J. C. Davis and William Eech, respondents.
134. Clatsop county — C. G. Monroe, et al., respondents, vs. James Withcombe, et al., appellants.
135. Marion county — Mollie Albright, respondent, vs. H. L. Keats Auto Co., appellant.
136. Multnomah county — A. J. Parrington, appellant, vs. Andy Weinberger, constable, respondent.
137. Yamhill county — International Harvester Co., respondent, vs. Jean Bauer, et al., appellants.
138. Multnomah county — James A. Kelley, respondent, vs. Oscar Anderson and Annette Anderson, appellants.
139. Marion county — William Mickenham, appellant, vs. H. G. Gralapp and Amelia Gralapp, respondents.
140. Multnomah county — Lillie T. Webb, appellant, vs. William Iversen, respondent.
141. Multnomah county — Charlotte Nelson, appellant, vs. United Railways Co., respondent.
142. Multnomah county — S. E. Emerson, respondent, vs. Portland, Eugene & Eastern Ry. Co., appellant.
143. Multnomah county — First National Bank of Albany, respondent, vs. Elcock Produce Co., defendant; Hazelwood Co., appellant.
144. Multnomah county — Oliver M. Hickey, appellant, vs. John B. Coffey, city clerk, respondent.
145. Marion county — Kohler & Chase, respondent, vs. L. F. Savago and J. S. Sawyer, appellants.
146. Multnomah county — M. Kruse, respondent, vs. H. F. Bush and A. E. Borthwick, appellants.
147. Multnomah county — (Two cases) in re estate of Richard Waco, deceased; Walter Mackay, et al., appellants.
148. Multnomah county — H. E. Taber, respondent, vs. Cold Mfg. Co., appellant.
149. Columbia county — City of Clatskanie, appellant, vs. J. W. McDonald and Charlotte M. McDonald, respondents.
150. Multnomah county — Wm. D. Allen, appellant, vs. People's Amusement Co., respondent.
151. Multnomah county — Mary F. W. V. Matlock, et al., appellants, vs. D. Matlock, appellant.
152. Multnomah county — Seattle Dock Co., respondent, vs. MacIre Fire Proofing Co., et al., respondents, Pacific Surety Co., appellant.
153. Marion county — J. C. Jones, appellant, vs. G. W. Skiles and M. N. Lewis, respondents.
154. Multnomah county — Robert Balfour, et al., appellants, vs. Richard B. Kuglit, respondent.
155. Multnomah county — Josephine Chudinsky, respondent, vs. Momenia Evans, respondent, Mary E. Lent, appellant.
156. Multnomah county — Portland & Oregon City Ry. Co., respondent, vs. W. A. Sanders, et al., appellants, James Withcombe, et al., respondents.
157. Tillamook county — The Henry D. Davis Lumber Co., appellant, vs. A. F. Wooten Lumber Co., respondent.
158. Multnomah county — D. J. Dempsey, respondent, vs. R. L. Ball, et al., defendants, Henry Zorn, appellant.
159. Multnomah county — Mary M. Penning, respondent, vs. Peter Gibson, appellant.
160. Multnomah county — E. L. McKera and M. E. Hines, respondents, vs. Corporation of the Royal Life Assurance, appellant.
161. Marion county — F. J. Hume, respondent, vs. Ever L. Rice and William Beach, appellants.
162. Hood River county — W. H. Roundtree, et al., respondents, vs. Mount Hood Railroad Co. and Ches. T. Early, appellants.
163. Multnomah county — Clara J. Anasod, appellant, vs. Emma M. Austin, respondent.
164. Washington county — F. M. Hield, appellant, vs. J. W. White, respondent.
165. Clatsop county — J. P. Palomaki, respondent, vs. Oscar Laurel, defendant, T. Tillamook, appellant.
166. Multnomah county — Joseph McPherson, appellant, vs. Dr. N. L. Smith, respondent.
167. Marion county — Statesman Pub. Co., respondent, vs. Frank Polin, et al., appellants, H. V. McClean, et al., defendants.
168. Multnomah county — J. Rood et al., appellants, vs. Flegg Standifer Co., respondent.
169. Wasco county — J. W. Cathart, respondent, vs. O-W-R. & N. Co., appellant.
170. Douglas county — (Two cases), Douglas county, respondent, vs. Southern Oregon Co., et al., appellants.
171. Tillamook county — City of Bay City, et al., respondents, vs. J. H. Hicks, respondent, et al., appellants.
172. Multnomah county — George S. Soper, et al., respondents, vs. James Wooten Lumber Co., appellant.
173. Columbia county — Bert Adams, re-

LEAGUE FOR PURPOSE OF PERMANENT PEACE APPROVED BY BRUCE

Says Britain Not to Be Ready Until Decisive Victory but Is Making Ready.

London, Nov. 15.—Approval of the proposal that "a combination of peace-loving nations" be formed at the close of the war for the purpose of establishing a permanent peace was voiced last night by Viscount Bryce, former British ambassador to the United States, at the meeting of the Mayflower club, an organization of Americans and Britons in honor of the Pilgrims.
"Already many leading statesmen have proposed such a scheme," he said. "Both Mr. Wilson and Mr. Hughes have given their hearty approval; public opinion in both parties alike is daily growing in its favor.
"Here in Great Britain we cannot take practical steps till this war has been won; it certainly will be fought through a decisive victory. But meantime we may begin to consider what those practical steps would be and we can assure our friends in America of our sympathy with their scheme and our willingness to cooperate in a work to which our common ideals turn."
Professor Gilbert Murray of Oxford discussed the American attitude as he discovered it during a recent visit to the United States, giving his approval to the proposed peace league and saying that he did not believe hatred would be lasting between the nations at war.

174. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
175. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
176. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
177. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
178. Marion county — J. W. Leavitt & Co., appellant, vs. R. M. Dimmick, respondent.
179. Yamhill county — Everding & Farrell, respondent, vs. Gebhardt Lumber Co., appellant.
180. Multnomah county — J. W. Leavitt & Co., appellant, vs. R. M. Dimmick, respondent.
181. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
182. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
183. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
184. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
185. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
186. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
187. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
188. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
189. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
190. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
191. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
192. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
193. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
194. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
195. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
196. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
197. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
198. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
199. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
200. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
201. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
202. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
203. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
204. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
205. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
206. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
207. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
208. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
209. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
210. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
211. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
212. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
213. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
214. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
215. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
216. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
217. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
218. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
219. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
220. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
221. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
222. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
223. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
224. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
225. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
226. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
227. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
228. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
229. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
230. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
231. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
232. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
233. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
234. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
235. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
236. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
237. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
238. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
239. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
240. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
241. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
242. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
243. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
244. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
245. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
246. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
247. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
248. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
249. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
250. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
251. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
252. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
253. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
254. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
255. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
256. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
257. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
258. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
259. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
260. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
261. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
262. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
263. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
264. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
265. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
266. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
267. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
268. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
269. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
270. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
271. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
272. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
273. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
274. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
275. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
276. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
277. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
278. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
279. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
280. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
281. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
282. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
283. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
284. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
285. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
286. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
287. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
288. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
289. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
290. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
291. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
292. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
293. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
294. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
295. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
296. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.
297. Multnomah county — Columbia Realty Investment Co., appellant, vs. Alameda Land Co., respondent.
298. Lane county — H. D. Critter, appellant, vs. Elbert Bede and J. W. Grant, respondents.
299. Multnomah county — J. C. Fleming, appellant, vs. Gerlinger Motor Car Co. and Seymour H. Bell, respondent.
300. Douglas county — M. S. Doerflinger, respondent, vs. First National Bank of Roseburg, appellant.



That's why Chesterfields are like a good cup of coffee—they taste fine and, in addition, they satisfy!
But, besides letting you know you've been smoking, Chesterfields are MILD, too!
Chesterfield is the one cigarette that can give you this new delight (satisfy, yet mild), because no cigarette maker can copy the Chesterfield blend—an entirely new combination of tobaccos and the greatest advance in cigarette blending in 20 years.
Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.
"Give me a package of those cigarettes that SATISFY!"

Chesterfield CIGARETTES
They SATISFY! and yet they're MILD
20 for 10¢
Illustration of a Chesterfield cigarette pack and a pack of 20 cigarettes.

THANKSGIVING! CHRISTMAS!

Surely These Are Times for New Clothes

IF EVER there was need for thought and care in clothes buying, it is in these times. For stores are full of merchandise which has been cheapened to meet a price—merchandise with all the worth-while qualities nibbled out of it—merchandise without the name of a maker who stands in the American public eye for something definite and concrete.

What the name Kirschbaum means in a Suit or Overcoat



- FIRST—All-wool fabrics, 100 per cent and no compromise.
SECOND—The highest standard of materials—canvas, linings, interlinings, even down to such details as the thread and buttons.
THIRD.— Good tailoring, and by that we mean a spirit of genuineness, of intelligence in every one of the scores of operations which a garment represents, whether you pay \$15, \$20, \$25 or up to \$40.

The new hats—the new shirts—the new neckwear—the new gloves—everything needed to make a man comfortable these brisk November days—here at the moderate prices for which we are known.

Phegley & Cavender
At the Sign of the Cherry Tree
CORNER FOURTH AND ALDER STS.

Your Best Bargain Today Is a Carton of EDISON MAZDA LAMPS
MORE LIGHT—LESS CURRENT
10 TO 40 WATT 27c
50 WATT 28c
60 WATT 36c
75 WATT NITROGEN . 65c
Illustration of an Edison Mazda lamp.
Discard your old carbon lamps today and fill every socket with these current saving, shock resisting MAZDA LAMPS. If you do this you will reduce your light bill two-thirds. We carry these lamps in all sizes and types. Let us help you choose the right lamps for every room in your house.
STUBBS ELECTRIC CO
SIXTH AT PINE BOTH PHONES WE DELIVER