

EXTENSIVE STREET WIDENING PROJECT TO BE UNDERTAKEN

The project of widening East Couch street, East Burnside street and Sandy boulevard, and the extension of the latter thoroughfare from the intersection of East Twelfth and Burnside streets to East Sixteenth street, long desired by East Side business interests, will go before the city council in its final form next Wednesday. At that time the city engineer will be instructed to make the necessary surveys and estimates and present a written report to the council.

This is one of the important projects for the East Side territory to provide relief outlets for congested traffic. The entire project may cost the city a total of \$200,000, and it is proposed to create an extensive assessment district for this purpose, reaching to the easterly city limits and extending a few blocks south of Burnside and north of Sandy boulevard. It is possible the project may create almost as much contention as did that of the Foster road trunk sewer and street improvement.

The proposed project would include the widening of East Couch street to 30 feet by acquiring 10 feet on each side of the present street line between the west line of East Twelfth street and the east line of East Third street; widening of East Burnside to 30 feet by acquiring 10 feet along the north side between the west line of East Twelfth street and the east line of East Third street; extending Sandy boulevard, 30 feet wide, from the intersection of East Twelfth and East Burnside streets to the west line of East Sixteenth street, and the widening of Sandy boulevard to 30 feet by acquiring 10 feet along the north side between the west line of East Twelfth street and the east line of East Sixteenth street.

MARSHALL'S REPORT SHOWS LOSS CAUSED BY FIRES

A report from Fire Marshal Grenfell on the value of property lost in Portland during the last month shows:

Buildings involved, \$1,098,500, and contents, \$498,000, totaling \$1,596,500. The loss on buildings involved in fires in Portland during the last month shows: Buildings involved, \$1,098,500, and contents, \$498,000, totaling \$1,596,500. The loss on buildings involved in fires in Portland during the last month shows: Buildings involved, \$1,098,500, and contents, \$498,000, totaling \$1,596,500.

COUNCIL DELAYS ACTION ON PLEA OF AUTOMOBILE MEN

Not until Thursday of next week will the automobile and automobile accessory dealers of North Broadway know whether they will be subject to 30 minute or two hour parking provisions. The city council, after a spirited hearing on the subject Friday afternoon, postponed action one week on the request of these dealers that the 30 minute limit be reduced to the 15 minute limit now in the traffic ordinance.

The request of these dealers was backed by a petition from the Portland Automobile Association and their case was pleaded by Ralph J. Stahl, its secretary, and F. S. Smith of Garbe & Co. They demanded enforcement of the 30 minute parking provision, and the removal of the automobile men to a new section of the city.

The charge was made by Commissioners Bigelow and Peterson, who said that such cars are kept there virtually all day, to the annoyance of general traffic. The automobile men say that 30 minutes does not give time to patrons to transact their business at the automobile shops.

CITY COUNCIL WILL CONSIDER NEW WORK NEXT WEDNESDAY

The city council at its session next Wednesday will take the acceptance of the following public work on which notices of completion have been filed:

Sewer in Forty-first street southeast, from 120 feet west of Fifty-second street southeast to Fifty-fifth street southeast; Lane & Paananen, contractors.

Sewer in Saratoga street, from 100 feet east of East Thirteenth street to East Eighteenth street; Latta & Keady, contractors.

Sewer in Forty-second avenue southeast, from 120 feet west of Fifty-second street southeast to Fifty-fifth street southeast; Lane & Paananen, contractors.

Improvement of Sixty-second street southeast, from Woodstock avenue to Fifty-fifth street southeast; General Contracting company, contractors.

CITY COUNCIL WILL OPEN BIDS ON WORK AUGUST 1

Bids are to be opened at the session on the city council August 1 on the following public work:

Improvement of Humboldt street, from Denver avenue to Interstate avenue.

East Twelfth street and Holman street sewer system.

Sewer in Fifty-second street southeast, from Twenty-second avenue southeast to Twenty-seventh avenue southeast.

Sewer in Buffalo street, from East Fifteenth to East Thirteenth streets.

Improvement of East Nineteenth street, from Oregon to Pacific streets.

East Twenty-second street from Wyant to Alberta streets.

Clay street, from East Forty-fifth to East Forty-sixth streets.

INTERURBAN STAGE MEN STILL LOOK FOR TERMINAL

Owners of interurban stages operated into Portland are still "at sea" regarding their union contract although the time is at hand when they are required to provide terminals in accordance with the provisions of a recently enacted city ordinance.

The plan for a station at Eighth and

Couch streets fell through and since then a new organization has been formed to handle the stage men. L. J. Jelliff appeared as their spokesman before the city council Friday afternoon and asked for a week's extension of time, in order to make a report on the matter.

He stated that the stage men have subscribed \$8000 toward a \$15,000 fund to be used to fit up a terminal and that it is expected that the terminal will be secured within two or three days. Several sites are available, stated Jelliff, and the one selected will be speedily prepared for use. He is to present the report of the stage men to the council at 2 o'clock next Thursday afternoon.

NEW WORK ON BULL RUN GOING ON SATISFACTORILY

F. M. Randlett, chief engineer of the water bureau, and Ben Morrow, assistant engineer, returned today from an inspection of the Bull Run Lake district—their first trip to that point this season. The lake is located 21 miles above the Bull Run headwaters. Randlett said that there were no many vacant lots that he would not have been able to search them out as carefully as he claimed he had.

"Why didn't you turn the coat over to the authorities?" Hammerly demanded. "Didn't you think they were interested in making the lake?"

"Well, sir," Swing drawled, "from the way they put this woman in jail I judge."

MORROW, COLLIER CLASH

Judge Morrow and Attorney Collier clashed over the case of the woman who had been found dead in the lake. Morrow was of the opinion that the woman had been drowned, while Collier was of the opinion that she had been murdered.

MAN TO CHANGE HIS NAME

Samuel Hochhauser, a business man of Portland, applied to the court of domestic relations today for authority to change his name to Samuel Hauser. He says his present name is difficult for people to pronounce and that he has a Teutonic ring which, owing to the recent war with Germany and to the unpopularity of things German, and of your kindred names, is distasteful to him.

STATE TRAINS GUNS ON BLOODY COAT

(Continued From Page One)

was asked whether he had called upon the services of counsel of private detectives, but denied having had any aid in the matter. He said the time of the fine and said he had had no counsel, and that he knew he was a detective.

J. Maxwell and O. G. Palmer, called by the state, corroborated the testimony of Porter and Swing as to the appearance of the bundle, the appearance of the witness will be to testify that it was found and as to its disposition.

The state harped all morning on the question, "Why did you turn the bundle over to Collier instead of to the authorities?"

"Collier asked us to," was the invariable answer.

The bloody coat and knife have not yet been marked as exhibits. They have been marked for identification by the state. Collier has stated that his next witness will be a chemist to testify that the blood on the coat and knife is human blood. After the chemist has testified, Collier probably will attempt to get the bundle away from the state and will reopen Monday morning at 2.

Swing, white haired and faithful father of Mrs. Agee, was the man who found the bundle. He was the man who found the bundle. He was the man who found the bundle. He was the man who found the bundle.

BUNDLE IS DISCOVERED

The father said he had spent 10 days, following his daughter's indictment, in canvassing people in the neighborhood of the Agee home. When he learned about the man with the overcoat who was the witness stand, for it would not do once he saw a black handkerchief, such as the one found in the front yard with blood on it after the murder.

Mrs. Agee probably will not be called to the witness stand by the state, for John Collier said after he had replied through newspapermen to criticisms leveled at him by the police department that he was delivering to the state a knife and music with which he surprised the courtroom Tuesday night.

"My duty is to Mrs. Agee and not to the police," Collier said. He explained that the startling exhibit had come into his possession only two weeks ago and that he immediately demanded that the state advance the proof that he might give the findings to the police as soon as possible.

"I know that these exhibits might save the life of this woman, and I kept them guarded from all eyes for that very reason. Now that they have been presented I do not believe I will call Mrs. Agee to the witness stand. It would be beneath her dignity to reply to the infamous insinuations and charges that J. H. Klecker has made against her."

Collier said that he had deliberately made up his story of illicit relations with Mrs. Ann Louise Agee in order to get the murder charge more firmly fastened upon the woman.

This is the question which Collier was endeavoring to answer Friday afternoon through witnesses, to the satisfaction of the 12 men who hold the woman's fate in their hands.

Attorneys for the defense called four women from the Babekah lodge to the stand to refute the testimony of Klecker, the state's star witness, that the most famous of the women who had been found dead in the lake. Mrs. Agee on the night of June 4 and took her to Mount Tabor park, where, he stated, their actions were not proper. All four women said they were at lodge the night of June 4 and that Mrs. Agee was there also. One said she remembered distinctly being introduced to Agee that night at lodge. The other three said they could not recall the incident.

Collier called Mrs. Dora Hayward and her two daughters, neighbors to the Agee family, who testified that on the following Thursday night, when Klecker said he saw Mrs. Agee, they were not at Broadway and Washington streets and talked to her a few minutes, and that during the conversation Agee came up to Mrs. Agee and her husband left together, they said.

Testimony of these six witnesses in a direct contradiction of Klecker.

CLARKE TO LABEL 1921 PACK PRUNES

Vancouver, Wash., July 28.—Every box of Clarke county prunes placed on the market this year will bear a label in big letters, "Clarke County Prunes, 1921 Pack."

It is said that speculators have bought up large quantities of small Oregon and California prunes of the 1920 pack and will market them this fall as fresh pack and the label has been decided on for the purpose of protecting Clarke county prunes against such stock.

MRS. HAWLEY'S CASE CASE APPEAL

(Continued From Page One)

cruel and inhuman treatment. On December 30, 1919, Hawley filed an answer to the complaint, containing a denial of all the alleged acts of cruelty, with a counterclaim for damages of \$10,000 for the cruel and inhuman treatment on the part of his wife.

Records of the case here show that Willard Hawley, Jr. and Miss Marjorie Fraker were married at Trinity church, in Portland, on March 11, 1914. Hawley at that time was 38 years of age and Miss Fraker 24. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hawley, Sr. were originally opposed to the marriage, but finally acquiesced.

DEFEATISM IS MUTUAL

"For nearly four years they lived together as husband and wife," the opinion reads.

"Notwithstanding their apparent devotion for each other they had frequent domestic troubles, and on many occasions defendant requested the plaintiff to leave and to give him his freedom. After several such requests the plaintiff refused to leave, and the defendant, both for her own sake and for the sake of the child, promised to forget."

"Finally during the month of November, 1919, a difficulty arose that was not connected with the domestic troubles, but was of a more serious nature. Defendant denied and counter charged. There was criminal and recrimination for several days. Each forgot how to love and cherish. Each forgot the value of a good name. Duty to the infant daughter was disregarded. A mutual contest of defamation followed."

WIFE GIVES EVIDENCE

"On the conclusion of the trial the court held that the plaintiff had condoned the acts complained of and that she had failed to establish such charges as were necessary to support her claim. Moreover, because of plaintiff's failure to establish one particular charge against defendant, the defendant was granted a divorce and the custody of the child and Marjorie Hawley, at the age of 22, was by decree of the trial court, divested of all interest in the property of Willard Hawley, Jr., known as the Shadow of Death to mother, is that decree equitable?"

In their acts of criminal and recrimination, the court said, the couple overlooked the principle that a divorce is a remedy for the innocent against the guilty and not a relief for wrong against wrong.

CHARGE NOT SUSTAINED

"It was the duty of the plaintiff to prove the averments of cruelty alleged in her complaint, by clear and satisfactory evidence before she would, under any condition, be entitled to a decree of divorce. The evidence of the entire record we are convinced that the plaintiff utterly failed in her attempt to prove that the defendant was guilty of the charges alleged in paragraph 20, (criminal and unnatural conduct)."

"The defendant must establish the allegation in his counter complaint by the same standard of proof required of the plaintiff. In other words, before he is entitled to a divorce, he must establish to the satisfaction of the court by a preponderance of the evidence that the alleged charge of cruelty was false and made maliciously and without proper cause."

Chief Justice Burnett, and Justices Bean and Johns concur in the opinion by Justice Brown.

OTHER OPINIONS GIVEN

Other opinions handed down by the trial court morning were as follows: C. B. Bayne, auditor of the city of Portland, vs. Southern Pacific company, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris. Deceased vs. Denny & Co., appellants, vs. George W. Brown, respondent. Opinion by Justice Harris. Judge F. M. Calkins vs. William Nelson, appellant, vs. Roscoe C. Nelson, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris. Judge F. M. Calkins vs. William Nelson, appellant, vs. Roscoe C. Nelson, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris.

CRUEL AND INHUMAN TREATMENT

On December 30, 1919, Hawley filed an answer to the complaint, containing a denial of all the alleged acts of cruelty, with a counterclaim for damages of \$10,000 for the cruel and inhuman treatment on the part of his wife.

Records of the case here show that Willard Hawley, Jr. and Miss Marjorie Fraker were married at Trinity church, in Portland, on March 11, 1914. Hawley at that time was 38 years of age and Miss Fraker 24. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hawley, Sr. were originally opposed to the marriage, but finally acquiesced.

DEFEATISM IS MUTUAL

"For nearly four years they lived together as husband and wife," the opinion reads.

"Notwithstanding their apparent devotion for each other they had frequent domestic troubles, and on many occasions defendant requested the plaintiff to leave and to give him his freedom. After several such requests the plaintiff refused to leave, and the defendant, both for her own sake and for the sake of the child, promised to forget."

"Finally during the month of November, 1919, a difficulty arose that was not connected with the domestic troubles, but was of a more serious nature. Defendant denied and counter charged. There was criminal and recrimination for several days. Each forgot how to love and cherish. Each forgot the value of a good name. Duty to the infant daughter was disregarded. A mutual contest of defamation followed."

WIFE GIVES EVIDENCE

"On the conclusion of the trial the court held that the plaintiff had condoned the acts complained of and that she had failed to establish such charges as were necessary to support her claim. Moreover, because of plaintiff's failure to establish one particular charge against defendant, the defendant was granted a divorce and the custody of the child and Marjorie Hawley, at the age of 22, was by decree of the trial court, divested of all interest in the property of Willard Hawley, Jr., known as the Shadow of Death to mother, is that decree equitable?"

In their acts of criminal and recrimination, the court said, the couple overlooked the principle that a divorce is a remedy for the innocent against the guilty and not a relief for wrong against wrong.

CHARGE NOT SUSTAINED

"It was the duty of the plaintiff to prove the averments of cruelty alleged in her complaint, by clear and satisfactory evidence before she would, under any condition, be entitled to a decree of divorce. The evidence of the entire record we are convinced that the plaintiff utterly failed in her attempt to prove that the defendant was guilty of the charges alleged in paragraph 20, (criminal and unnatural conduct)."

"The defendant must establish the allegation in his counter complaint by the same standard of proof required of the plaintiff. In other words, before he is entitled to a divorce, he must establish to the satisfaction of the court by a preponderance of the evidence that the alleged charge of cruelty was false and made maliciously and without proper cause."

Chief Justice Burnett, and Justices Bean and Johns concur in the opinion by Justice Brown.

OTHER OPINIONS GIVEN

Other opinions handed down by the trial court morning were as follows: C. B. Bayne, auditor of the city of Portland, vs. Southern Pacific company, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris. Deceased vs. Denny & Co., appellants, vs. George W. Brown, respondent. Opinion by Justice Harris. Judge F. M. Calkins vs. William Nelson, appellant, vs. Roscoe C. Nelson, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris.

CRUEL AND INHUMAN TREATMENT

On December 30, 1919, Hawley filed an answer to the complaint, containing a denial of all the alleged acts of cruelty, with a counterclaim for damages of \$10,000 for the cruel and inhuman treatment on the part of his wife.

Records of the case here show that Willard Hawley, Jr. and Miss Marjorie Fraker were married at Trinity church, in Portland, on March 11, 1914. Hawley at that time was 38 years of age and Miss Fraker 24. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hawley, Sr. were originally opposed to the marriage, but finally acquiesced.

DEFEATISM IS MUTUAL

"For nearly four years they lived together as husband and wife," the opinion reads.

"Notwithstanding their apparent devotion for each other they had frequent domestic troubles, and on many occasions defendant requested the plaintiff to leave and to give him his freedom. After several such requests the plaintiff refused to leave, and the defendant, both for her own sake and for the sake of the child, promised to forget."

"Finally during the month of November, 1919, a difficulty arose that was not connected with the domestic troubles, but was of a more serious nature. Defendant denied and counter charged. There was criminal and recrimination for several days. Each forgot how to love and cherish. Each forgot the value of a good name. Duty to the infant daughter was disregarded. A mutual contest of defamation followed."

WIFE GIVES EVIDENCE

"On the conclusion of the trial the court held that the plaintiff had condoned the acts complained of and that she had failed to establish such charges as were necessary to support her claim. Moreover, because of plaintiff's failure to establish one particular charge against defendant, the defendant was granted a divorce and the custody of the child and Marjorie Hawley, at the age of 22, was by decree of the trial court, divested of all interest in the property of Willard Hawley, Jr., known as the Shadow of Death to mother, is that decree equitable?"

In their acts of criminal and recrimination, the court said, the couple overlooked the principle that a divorce is a remedy for the innocent against the guilty and not a relief for wrong against wrong.

CHARGE NOT SUSTAINED

"It was the duty of the plaintiff to prove the averments of cruelty alleged in her complaint, by clear and satisfactory evidence before she would, under any condition, be entitled to a decree of divorce. The evidence of the entire record we are convinced that the plaintiff utterly failed in her attempt to prove that the defendant was guilty of the charges alleged in paragraph 20, (criminal and unnatural conduct)."

"The defendant must establish the allegation in his counter complaint by the same standard of proof required of the plaintiff. In other words, before he is entitled to a divorce, he must establish to the satisfaction of the court by a preponderance of the evidence that the alleged charge of cruelty was false and made maliciously and without proper cause."

Chief Justice Burnett, and Justices Bean and Johns concur in the opinion by Justice Brown.

OTHER OPINIONS GIVEN

Other opinions handed down by the trial court morning were as follows: C. B. Bayne, auditor of the city of Portland, vs. Southern Pacific company, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris. Deceased vs. Denny & Co., appellants, vs. George W. Brown, respondent. Opinion by Justice Harris. Judge F. M. Calkins vs. William Nelson, appellant, vs. Roscoe C. Nelson, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris.

CRUEL AND INHUMAN TREATMENT

On December 30, 1919, Hawley filed an answer to the complaint, containing a denial of all the alleged acts of cruelty, with a counterclaim for damages of \$10,000 for the cruel and inhuman treatment on the part of his wife.

Records of the case here show that Willard Hawley, Jr. and Miss Marjorie Fraker were married at Trinity church, in Portland, on March 11, 1914. Hawley at that time was 38 years of age and Miss Fraker 24. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hawley, Sr. were originally opposed to the marriage, but finally acquiesced.

DEFEATISM IS MUTUAL

"For nearly four years they lived together as husband and wife," the opinion reads.

"Notwithstanding their apparent devotion for each other they had frequent domestic troubles, and on many occasions defendant requested the plaintiff to leave and to give him his freedom. After several such requests the plaintiff refused to leave, and the defendant, both for her own sake and for the sake of the child, promised to forget."

"Finally during the month of November, 1919, a difficulty arose that was not connected with the domestic troubles, but was of a more serious nature. Defendant denied and counter charged. There was criminal and recrimination for several days. Each forgot how to love and cherish. Each forgot the value of a good name. Duty to the infant daughter was disregarded. A mutual contest of defamation followed."

WIFE GIVES EVIDENCE

"On the conclusion of the trial the court held that the plaintiff had condoned the acts complained of and that she had failed to establish such charges as were necessary to support her claim. Moreover, because of plaintiff's failure to establish one particular charge against defendant, the defendant was granted a divorce and the custody of the child and Marjorie Hawley, at the age of 22, was by decree of the trial court, divested of all interest in the property of Willard Hawley, Jr., known as the Shadow of Death to mother, is that decree equitable?"

In their acts of criminal and recrimination, the court said, the couple overlooked the principle that a divorce is a remedy for the innocent against the guilty and not a relief for wrong against wrong.

CHARGE NOT SUSTAINED

"It was the duty of the plaintiff to prove the averments of cruelty alleged in her complaint, by clear and satisfactory evidence before she would, under any condition, be entitled to a decree of divorce. The evidence of the entire record we are convinced that the plaintiff utterly failed in her attempt to prove that the defendant was guilty of the charges alleged in paragraph 20, (criminal and unnatural conduct)."

"The defendant must establish the allegation in his counter complaint by the same standard of proof required of the plaintiff. In other words, before he is entitled to a divorce, he must establish to the satisfaction of the court by a preponderance of the evidence that the alleged charge of cruelty was false and made maliciously and without proper cause."

Chief Justice Burnett, and Justices Bean and Johns concur in the opinion by Justice Brown.

OTHER OPINIONS GIVEN

Other opinions handed down by the trial court morning were as follows: C. B. Bayne, auditor of the city of Portland, vs. Southern Pacific company, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris. Deceased vs. Denny & Co., appellants, vs. George W. Brown, respondent. Opinion by Justice Harris. Judge F. M. Calkins vs. William Nelson, appellant, vs. Roscoe C. Nelson, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris.

CRUEL AND INHUMAN TREATMENT

On December 30, 1919, Hawley filed an answer to the complaint, containing a denial of all the alleged acts of cruelty, with a counterclaim for damages of \$10,000 for the cruel and inhuman treatment on the part of his wife.

Records of the case here show that Willard Hawley, Jr. and Miss Marjorie Fraker were married at Trinity church, in Portland, on March 11, 1914. Hawley at that time was 38 years of age and Miss Fraker 24. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hawley, Sr. were originally opposed to the marriage, but finally acquiesced.

DEFEATISM IS MUTUAL

"For nearly four years they lived together as husband and wife," the opinion reads.

"Notwithstanding their apparent devotion for each other they had frequent domestic troubles, and on many occasions defendant requested the plaintiff to leave and to give him his freedom. After several such requests the plaintiff refused to leave, and the defendant, both for her own sake and for the sake of the child, promised to forget."

"Finally during the month of November, 1919, a difficulty arose that was not connected with the domestic troubles, but was of a more serious nature. Defendant denied and counter charged. There was criminal and recrimination for several days. Each forgot how to love and cherish. Each forgot the value of a good name. Duty to the infant daughter was disregarded. A mutual contest of defamation followed."

WIFE GIVES EVIDENCE

"On the conclusion of the trial the court held that the plaintiff had condoned the acts complained of and that she had failed to establish such charges as were necessary to support her claim. Moreover, because of plaintiff's failure to establish one particular charge against defendant, the defendant was granted a divorce and the custody of the child and Marjorie Hawley, at the age of 22, was by decree of the trial court, divested of all interest in the property of Willard Hawley, Jr., known as the Shadow of Death to mother, is that decree equitable?"

In their acts of criminal and recrimination, the court said, the couple overlooked the principle that a divorce is a remedy for the innocent against the guilty and not a relief for wrong against wrong.

CHARGE NOT SUSTAINED

"It was the duty of the plaintiff to prove the averments of cruelty alleged in her complaint, by clear and satisfactory evidence before she would, under any condition, be entitled to a decree of divorce. The evidence of the entire record we are convinced that the plaintiff utterly failed in her attempt to prove that the defendant was guilty of the charges alleged in paragraph 20, (criminal and unnatural conduct)."

"The defendant must establish the allegation in his counter complaint by the same standard of proof required of the plaintiff. In other words, before he is entitled to a divorce, he must establish to the satisfaction of the court by a preponderance of the evidence that the alleged charge of cruelty was false and made maliciously and without proper cause."

Chief Justice Burnett, and Justices Bean and Johns concur in the opinion by Justice Brown.

OTHER OPINIONS GIVEN

Other opinions handed down by the trial court morning were as follows: C. B. Bayne, auditor of the city of Portland, vs. Southern Pacific company, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris. Deceased vs. Denny & Co., appellants, vs. George W. Brown, respondent. Opinion by Justice Harris. Judge F. M. Calkins vs. William Nelson, appellant, vs. Roscoe C. Nelson, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris.

CRUEL AND INHUMAN TREATMENT

On December 30, 1919, Hawley filed an answer to the complaint, containing a denial of all the alleged acts of cruelty, with a counterclaim for damages of \$10,000 for the cruel and inhuman treatment on the part of his wife.

Records of the case here show that Willard Hawley, Jr. and Miss Marjorie Fraker were married at Trinity church, in Portland, on March 11, 1914. Hawley at that time was 38 years of age and Miss Fraker 24. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hawley, Sr. were originally opposed to the marriage, but finally acquiesced.

DEFEATISM IS MUTUAL

"For nearly four years they lived together as husband and wife," the opinion reads.

"Notwithstanding their apparent devotion for each other they had frequent domestic troubles, and on many occasions defendant requested the plaintiff to leave and to give him his freedom. After several such requests the plaintiff refused to leave, and the defendant, both for her own sake and for the sake of the child, promised to forget."

"Finally during the month of November, 1919, a difficulty arose that was not connected with the domestic troubles, but was of a more serious nature. Defendant denied and counter charged. There was criminal and recrimination for several days. Each forgot how to love and cherish. Each forgot the value of a good name. Duty to the infant daughter was disregarded. A mutual contest of defamation followed."

WIFE GIVES EVIDENCE

"On the conclusion of the trial the court held that the plaintiff had condoned the acts complained of and that she had failed to establish such charges as were necessary to support her claim. Moreover, because of plaintiff's failure to establish one particular charge against defendant, the defendant was granted a divorce and the custody of the child and Marjorie Hawley, at the age of 22, was by decree of the trial court, divested of all interest in the property of Willard Hawley, Jr., known as the Shadow of Death to mother, is that decree equitable?"

In their acts of criminal and recrimination, the court said, the couple overlooked the principle that a divorce is a remedy for the innocent against the guilty and not a relief for wrong against wrong.

CHARGE NOT SUSTAINED

"It was the duty of the plaintiff to prove the averments of cruelty alleged in her complaint, by clear and satisfactory evidence before she would, under any condition, be entitled to a decree of divorce. The evidence of the entire record we are convinced that the plaintiff utterly failed in her attempt to prove that the defendant was guilty of the charges alleged in paragraph 20, (criminal and unnatural conduct)."

"The defendant must establish the allegation in his counter complaint by the same standard of proof required of the plaintiff. In other words, before he is entitled to a divorce, he must establish to the satisfaction of the court by a preponderance of the evidence that the alleged charge of cruelty was false and made maliciously and without proper cause."

Chief Justice Burnett, and Justices Bean and Johns concur in the opinion by Justice Brown.

OTHER OPINIONS GIVEN

Other opinions handed down by the trial court morning were as follows: C. B. Bayne, auditor of the city of Portland, vs. Southern Pacific company, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris. Deceased vs. Denny & Co., appellants, vs. George W. Brown, respondent. Opinion by Justice Harris. Judge F. M. Calkins vs. William Nelson, appellant, vs. Roscoe C. Nelson, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris.

CRUEL AND INHUMAN TREATMENT

On December 30, 1919, Hawley filed an answer to the complaint, containing a denial of all the alleged acts of cruelty, with a counterclaim for damages of \$10,000 for the cruel and inhuman treatment on the part of his wife.

Records of the case here show that Willard Hawley, Jr. and Miss Marjorie Fraker were married at Trinity church, in Portland, on March 11, 1914. Hawley at that time was 38 years of age and Miss Fraker 24. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hawley, Sr. were originally opposed to the marriage, but finally acquiesced.

DEFEATISM IS MUTUAL

"For nearly four years they lived together as husband and wife," the opinion reads.

"Notwithstanding their apparent devotion for each other they had frequent domestic troubles, and on many occasions defendant requested the plaintiff to leave and to give him his freedom. After several such requests the plaintiff refused to leave, and the defendant, both for her own sake and for the sake of the child, promised to forget."

"Finally during the month of November, 1919, a difficulty arose that was not connected with the domestic troubles, but was of a more serious nature. Defendant denied and counter charged. There was criminal and recrimination for several days. Each forgot how to love and cherish. Each forgot the value of a good name. Duty to the infant daughter was disregarded. A mutual contest of defamation followed."

WIFE GIVES EVIDENCE

"On the conclusion of the trial the court held that the plaintiff had condoned the acts complained of and that she had failed to establish such charges as were necessary to support her claim. Moreover, because of plaintiff's failure to establish one particular charge against defendant, the defendant was granted a divorce and the custody of the child and Marjorie Hawley, at the age of 22, was by decree of the trial court, divested of all interest in the property of Willard Hawley, Jr., known as the Shadow of Death to mother, is that decree equitable?"

In their acts of criminal and recrimination, the court said, the couple overlooked the principle that a divorce is a remedy for the innocent against the guilty and not a relief for wrong against wrong.

CHARGE NOT SUSTAINED

"It was the duty of the plaintiff to prove the averments of cruelty alleged in her complaint, by clear and satisfactory evidence before she would, under any condition, be entitled to a decree of divorce. The evidence of the entire record we are convinced that the plaintiff utterly failed in her attempt to prove that the defendant was guilty of the charges alleged in paragraph 20, (criminal and unnatural conduct)."

"The defendant must establish the allegation in his counter complaint by the same standard of proof required of the plaintiff. In other words, before he is entitled to a divorce, he must establish to the satisfaction of the court by a preponderance of the evidence that the alleged charge of cruelty was false and made maliciously and without proper cause."

Chief Justice Burnett, and Justices Bean and Johns concur in the opinion by Justice Brown.

OTHER OPINIONS GIVEN

Other opinions handed down by the trial court morning were as follows: C. B. Bayne, auditor of the city of Portland, vs. Southern Pacific company, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris. Deceased vs. Denny & Co., appellants, vs. George W. Brown, respondent. Opinion by Justice Harris. Judge F. M. Calkins vs. William Nelson, appellant, vs. Roscoe C. Nelson, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris.

CRUEL AND INHUMAN TREATMENT

On December 30, 1919, Hawley filed an answer to the complaint, containing a denial of all the alleged acts of cruelty, with a counterclaim for damages of \$10,000 for the cruel and inhuman treatment on the part of his wife.

Records of the case here show that Willard Hawley, Jr. and Miss Marjorie Fraker were married at Trinity church, in Portland, on March 11, 1914. Hawley at that time was 38 years of age and Miss Fraker 24. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hawley, Sr. were originally opposed to the marriage, but finally acquiesced.

DEFEATISM IS MUTUAL

"For nearly four years they lived together as husband and wife," the opinion reads.

"Notwithstanding their apparent devotion for each other they had frequent domestic troubles, and on many occasions defendant requested the plaintiff to leave and to give him his freedom. After several such requests the plaintiff refused to leave, and the defendant, both for her own sake and for the sake of the child, promised to forget."

"Finally during the month of November, 1919, a difficulty arose that was not connected with the domestic troubles, but was of a more serious nature. Defendant denied and counter charged. There was criminal and recrimination for several days. Each forgot how to love and cherish. Each forgot the value of a good name. Duty to the infant daughter was disregarded. A mutual contest of defamation followed."

WIFE GIVES EVIDENCE

"On the conclusion of the trial the court held that the plaintiff had condoned the acts complained of and that she had failed to establish such charges as were necessary to support her claim. Moreover, because of plaintiff's failure to establish one particular charge against defendant, the defendant was granted a divorce and the custody of the child and Marjorie Hawley, at the age of 22, was by decree of the trial court, divested of all interest in the property of Willard Hawley, Jr., known as the Shadow of Death to mother, is that decree equitable?"

In their acts of criminal and recrimination, the court said, the couple overlooked the principle that a divorce is a remedy for the innocent against the guilty and not a relief for wrong against wrong.

CHARGE NOT SUSTAINED

"It was the duty of the plaintiff to prove the averments of cruelty alleged in her complaint, by clear and satisfactory evidence before she would, under any condition, be entitled to a decree of divorce. The evidence of the entire record we are convinced that the plaintiff utterly failed in her attempt to prove that the defendant was guilty of the charges alleged in paragraph 20, (criminal and unnatural conduct)."

"The defendant must establish the allegation in his counter complaint by the same standard of proof required of the plaintiff. In other words, before he is entitled to a divorce, he must establish to the satisfaction of the court by a preponderance of the evidence that the alleged charge of cruelty was false and made maliciously and without proper cause."

Chief Justice Burnett, and Justices Bean and Johns concur in the opinion by Justice Brown.

OTHER OPINIONS GIVEN

Other opinions handed down by the trial court morning were as follows: C. B. Bayne, auditor of the city of Portland, vs. Southern Pacific company, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris. Deceased vs. Denny & Co., appellants, vs. George W. Brown, respondent. Opinion by Justice Harris. Judge F. M. Calkins vs. William Nelson, appellant, vs. Roscoe C. Nelson, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris.

CLARKE TO LABEL 1921 PACK PRUNES

Vancouver, Wash., July 28.—Every box of Clarke county prunes placed on the market this year will bear a label in big letters, "Clarke County Prunes, 1921 Pack."

It is said that speculators have bought up large quantities of small Oregon and California prunes of the 1920 pack and will market them this fall as fresh pack and the label has been decided on for the purpose of protecting Clarke county prunes against such stock.

MRS. HAWLEY'S CASE CASE APPEAL

(Continued From Page One)

cruel and inhuman treatment. On December 30, 1919, Hawley filed an answer to the complaint, containing a denial of all the alleged acts of cruelty, with a counterclaim for damages of \$10,000 for the cruel and inhuman treatment on the part of his wife.

Records of the case here show that Willard Hawley, Jr. and Miss Marjorie Fraker were married at Trinity church, in Portland, on March 11, 1914. Hawley at that time was 38 years of age and Miss Fraker 24. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hawley, Sr. were originally opposed to the marriage, but finally acquiesced.

DEFEATISM IS MUTUAL

"For nearly four years they lived together as husband and wife," the opinion reads.

"Notwithstanding their apparent devotion for each other they had frequent domestic troubles, and on many occasions defendant requested the plaintiff to leave and to give him his freedom. After several such requests the plaintiff refused to leave, and the defendant, both for her own sake and for the sake of the child, promised to forget."

"Finally during the month of November, 1919, a difficulty arose that was not connected with the domestic troubles, but was of a more serious nature. Defendant denied and counter charged. There was criminal and recrimination for several days. Each forgot how to love and cherish. Each forgot the value of a good name. Duty to the infant daughter was disregarded. A mutual contest of defamation followed."

WIFE GIVES EVIDENCE

"On the conclusion of the trial the court held that the plaintiff had condoned the acts complained of and that she had failed to establish such charges as were necessary to support her claim. Moreover, because of plaintiff's failure to establish one particular charge against defendant, the defendant was granted a divorce and the custody of the child and Marjorie Hawley, at the age of 22, was by decree of the trial court, divested of all interest in the property of Willard Hawley, Jr., known as the Shadow of Death to mother, is that decree equitable?"

In their acts of criminal and recrimination, the court said, the couple overlooked the principle that a divorce is a remedy for the innocent against the guilty and not a relief for wrong against wrong.

CHARGE NOT SUSTAINED

"It was the duty of the plaintiff to prove the averments of cruelty alleged in her complaint, by clear and satisfactory evidence before she would, under any condition, be entitled to a decree of divorce. The evidence of the entire record we are convinced that the plaintiff utterly failed in her attempt to prove that the defendant was guilty of the charges alleged in paragraph 20, (criminal and unnatural conduct)."

"The defendant must establish the allegation in his counter complaint by the same standard of proof required of the plaintiff. In other words, before he is entitled to a divorce, he must establish to the satisfaction of the court by a preponderance of the evidence that the alleged charge of cruelty was false and made maliciously and without proper cause."

Chief Justice Burnett, and Justices Bean and Johns concur in the opinion by Justice Brown.

OTHER OPINIONS GIVEN

Other opinions handed down by the trial court morning were as follows: C. B. Bayne, auditor of the city of Portland, vs. Southern Pacific company, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris. Deceased vs. Denny & Co., appellants, vs. George W. Brown, respondent. Opinion by Justice Harris. Judge F. M. Calkins vs. William Nelson, appellant, vs. Roscoe C. Nelson, et al., appeal from Multnomah county in suit to compel defendant by force of writ of mandamus to issue to realtor city warrant for arrest of defendant. Opinion by Justice Harris.

CRUEL AND INHUMAN TREATMENT

On December 30, 1919, Hawley filed an answer to the complaint, containing a denial of all the alleged acts of cruelty, with a counterclaim for damages of \$10,000 for the cruel and inhuman treatment on the part of his wife.

Records of the case here show that Willard Hawley, Jr. and Miss Marjorie Fraker were married at Trinity church, in Portland, on March 11, 1914. Hawley at that time was 38 years of age and Miss Fraker 24. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hawley, Sr. were originally opposed to the marriage, but finally acquiesced.

DEFEATISM IS MUTUAL

"For nearly four years they lived together as husband and wife," the opinion reads.

"Notwithstanding their apparent devotion for each other they had frequent domestic troubles, and on many occasions defendant requested the plaintiff to leave and to give him his freedom. After several such requests the plaintiff refused to leave, and the defendant, both for her own sake and for the sake of the child, promised to forget."

"Finally during the month of November, 1919, a difficulty arose that was not connected with the domestic troubles, but was of a more serious nature. Defendant denied and counter charged. There was criminal and recrimination for several days. Each forgot how to love and cherish. Each forgot the value of a good name. Duty to the infant daughter was disregarded. A mutual contest of defamation followed."

WIFE GIVES EVIDENCE

"On the conclusion of the trial the court held that the plaintiff had condoned the acts complained of and that she had