

## KASLO CONSERVATIVES PRAISE THE PREMIER

Pass Resolution Recording His  
Splendid Achievement Recent-  
ly in London

## CONFIDENCE IN HIS LEADERSHIP

Great Activity Reported From the  
Mining Districts—Properties  
Long Idle, Reopened

On Tuesday last the executive committee of the Liberal-Conservative association of the riding met in session at Trout Lake, says the Kaslo Kootenian. The members present were: F. C. Elliott, president; J. C. Murray, A. M. Craig, F. Munnery, M. Mobs, L. Hanna, J. Anderson and C. H. Bonnor, secretary. Neil F. Mackay, Mr. P. F. accompanied the party and was given a most hearty reception.

Owing to Dr. G. Hartin having left the riding, a vacancy was declared on the executive, and upon motion Eric Johnson of Kaslo was unanimously elected to take his place.

The Kaslo delegates arrived at Trout Lake on Monday evening and were accorded a royal welcome by the local members of the association. A banquet was spread at the Windsor hotel by mine host Dan McLehman, and the affair was a pleasant surprise to the visiting members, who were not looking for such an expression of hospitality.

The banquet was presided over by F. C. Elliott, who in a very graceful manner welcomed the visitors to Trout Lake. He made special reference to the splendid achievement recently attained by Premier Bennett, and urged upon everyone present to neglect no opportunity to place the good old Tory party at the head of the polls at the next Dominion election.

Many speeches were made, the sentiment being that the golden lining is now on the horizon and the future of Dominion politics will be entirely changed as the coming elections.

On Tuesday morning the Kaslo delegates, by the kindness of Trout Lake association, were driven to Ferguson and Five Mile, where they were entertained to lunch by F. C. Murray, superintendent of the Ferguson Mines, Ltd., who spared no pains to make the visit enjoyable.

The following resolution was unanimously passed by the assembled delegates: Moved by F. Munnery, seconded by J. Anderson, resolved: That the Liberal-Conservative association of the Kaslo electoral district desires to place on record its appreciation of the eminent services rendered by the Hon. Richard McBride, K. C., to the province of British Columbia in the cause for better terms, by obtaining a concession in the strike out of the territorial final and unalterable from the bill which was recently brought before the British House of Commons to approve the amendment to the British North America Act, as the instance of the Premier of the Dominion of Canada, in accordance with the resolutions recently passed by the provincial premiers at Ottawa. Be it further resolved,

"That the thanks of the association be extended to him, and the secretary be instructed to forward him a copy of these resolutions. Be it further resolved,

"That this association desires to take this opportunity to place on record its appreciation of the leadership of the Hon. Richard McBride, K. C."

## MINING ACTIVITY

Kaslo Properties That Have Been Idle  
For Years to be Worked

On Monday, two Couer d'Alene and Spokane mining men, A. Anderson and L. B. Salen, were in town purchasing supplies, preparatory to commencing an active summer's development of the Hidden Treasure claim on Skagway Creek, says the Kaslo Kootenian. This property was located by Mr. Anderson in the early days and although promising was not worked extensively. It is situated three miles up the creek from the lake, and is easily reached by a good trail. One vein has been found on the claim. It averages three feet in width and has an 18-inch streak of solid galena running through it. The main idea is, however, to locate a much larger vein which is supposed to cross the property. Pieces of float, nearly solid galena, and in some cases weighing several tons, have been frequently run across and the natural superposition is that there must be a huge dike of ore in the neighborhood.

And now comes the good news that the Wagner Group, on Hall Creek is to be worked. This property is owned by an outside syndicate, and with transportation within reach would be one of the busiest mines in the country. The lease has been secured, and the source, however, that just as soon as the Hall Creek trail is completed, a crew will be set to work on the Wagner and development continued during the rest of the season. A full description of this big property was given in our issue of April 18th last.

This month will mark the resumption of operations at many properties that have been closed by spring water troubles. This is particularly the case in regard to Alsworth and Woodberry. Prospects as well as the hills and new finds will soon be reported. Several mining deals are pending, but naturally the parties chiefly interested are not willing to reveal them. Coming as it does so soon after a protracted hearing of the famous Harris-White case, the decision arrived at in the last Chance suit will have a very wholesome effect on the fact should be made public at the present stage of the proceedings.

## AGREED TO ARBITRATE

Noble Five vs. Last Chance Litigation  
Has Been Called Off

The cheering message came over the wires from Victoria on Friday that the litigation which had been pending re the Noble Five vs. Last Chance suit had been withdrawn and that both companies concerned had agreed to arbitrate. Coming as it does so soon after a protracted hearing of the famous Harris-White case, the decision arrived at in the last Chance suit will have a very wholesome effect on the fact should be made public at the present stage of the proceedings.

The cheering message came over the wires from Victoria on Friday that the litigation which had been pending re the Noble Five vs. Last Chance suit had been withdrawn and that both companies concerned had agreed to arbitrate. Coming as it does so soon after a protracted hearing of the famous Harris-White case, the decision arrived at in the last Chance suit will have a very wholesome effect on the fact should be made public at the present stage of the proceedings.

The cheering message came over the wires from Victoria on Friday that the litigation which had been pending re the Noble Five vs. Last Chance suit had been withdrawn and that both companies concerned had agreed to arbitrate. Coming as it does so soon after a protracted hearing of the famous Harris-White case, the decision arrived at in the last Chance suit will have a very wholesome effect on the fact should be made public at the present stage of the proceedings.

The cheering message came over the wires from Victoria on Friday that the litigation which had been pending re the Noble Five vs. Last Chance suit had been withdrawn and that both companies concerned had agreed to arbitrate. Coming as it does so soon after a protracted hearing of the famous Harris-White case, the decision arrived at in the last Chance suit will have a very wholesome effect on the fact should be made public at the present stage of the proceedings.

The cheering message came over the wires from Victoria on Friday that the litigation which had been pending re the Noble Five vs. Last Chance suit had been withdrawn and that both companies concerned had agreed to arbitrate. Coming as it does so soon after a protracted hearing of the famous Harris-White case, the decision arrived at in the last Chance suit will have a very wholesome effect on the fact should be made public at the present stage of the proceedings.

The cheering message came over the wires from Victoria on Friday that the litigation which had been pending re the Noble Five vs. Last Chance suit had been withdrawn and that both companies concerned had agreed to arbitrate. Coming as it does so soon after a protracted hearing of the famous Harris-White case, the decision arrived at in the last Chance suit will have a very wholesome effect on the fact should be made public at the present stage of the proceedings.

Governor and the Last Chance people on their good common sense. We understand that both parties have nominated an arbitrator, who will collaborate, and in the event of a disagreement will call on a third to effect a decision. While the arbitration proceedings are pending no work will be done by the Last Chance company, but the contract for the 200 feet drift will be pushed.

## SALMON SEASON STARTED

Fleet Not Expected to Get Down to  
Work for Some Days Yet

Vancouver, July 8.—Last night was the real if not the official opening of the sockeye season. The calendar said that the season opened on Sunday night, but the holidays and the light catch made a combination that resulted in the delivery of no fish during the first twenty-four hours of the run.

No price has been fixed for fish on the river so far this year, and the canners and fishermen have yet to hold a conference in order to come to an agreement. It is understood that the canners are prepared to pay 25 cents per fish during the month of July, and as this is an off season, according to the experts, there is a probability that this price will continue until the heavy runs that usually come during the latter part of August.

So far the fishing has been done by what are practically scouts for the main fishing fleet, and the first new boats that put out made such a poor catch that the reports were that no fish had been received at the canneries. The fleet will probably not get down to work for some days yet.

As to prices, the fishermen say that this is usually formed from year to year for the purpose of regulating the matters, has as yet not been completed for the present season. No official statement can be given out pending the arrangement of this business. No word has been received from the fishermen as to their season's pack yet on hand that the fishermen will be content with fair prices and not hold out for anything beyond what the canners can afford to pay.

## A VANCOUVER SENSATION

Deliberate Conspiracy Charged in  
Connection With Chinese Case  
in Court

Vancouver, July 8.—"In opening this case I wish to say, your honor, that when it is gone into it will be shown that it is the outcome of one of the most diabolical and deliberate conspiracies that ever occurred, even in Chinese history."

So spoke Mr. J. A. Russell in the police court this morning in the case of Chin Hong Yok, who is accused of procuring a forged document for the purpose of deceiving the courts. Mr. Russell appeared for the prosecution. Mr. Russell went on to say that the accused acted in connection with another person, Chin Jan, who is another Chinaman in connection with an alleged libelous public action in local Chinese newspaper, had prepared a document and forged names thereto, and had got Chin Jan to sign it. "And worst of all," said Mr. Russell, in conclusion, "this document has disappeared from the court records in the case, and this particular document, in which the whole case hinges, is missing. I have all the other records in the case marked as exhibits from A. to Z, but exhibit B, strangely is missing."

He claimed that he had served Mr. Boak, counsel for the defense, with a subpoena, relating to this matter. Mr. Boak said that he had served a subpoena, but it did not call for the production of documents. On hand was the opinion that the document was being used in connection with another case.

Mr. Russell said that he could not go on without a document. This matter was adjourned until tomorrow, and suggested that meantime Mr. Boak be served with a subpoena duces tecum calling for the production of the documents.

In adjourning the case His Worship remarked that it was a good thing that there were no more Chinese newspapers in the city. The one in existence was too prolific in the matter of lawsuits.

## VANCOUVER ASSIZES

Forty Four Cases to be Heard—C. P. R.  
Versus Heinze

Vancouver, July 8.—With forty-four cases on the list, half a dozen promises long jury trials, and but nineteen days to dispose of all before the dawn of welcome vacation, August 1, the assize sittings which open next Tuesday will have to do a record-breaking judicial sprint.

It is however, likely that there will be two judges presiding, two separate courts to accomplish this end. That October may be entered with a clean litigious slate. It is not improbable that the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Morrison will be the judges.

Fourteen cases have been brought over from the unfinished May list, while there are thirty cases on the July list.

One of the most interesting of these is a revival of the DeBeck block litigation, a new and involved phase of the Canada Permanent-Carter-Cotton-DeBeck-Hamilton tangle for the right to redeem the Hastings street block, which has doubled in value since the day Mr. DeBeck gave the Canada Permanent a first mortgage, and Mr. Robert Hamilton, then in the same interest, the second.

Chief Justice Hunter, it will be recalled, decided that the foreclosure proceedings were ineffectual, and that there was still the right to redeem. The full court agreed, and now the Canada Permanent and Hon. Mr. Carter, who are as litigants as the company, have appealed to the supreme court. The appeal will be heard in October.

Another phase of the litigation is an action by Mr. Ward DeBeck against Mr. Robert Hamilton, on the present court list, in which Mr. DeBeck seeks to set aside a deed he gave to Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck's contention is that it was merely a secret transaction, and that with the other suit in which both were in the same interest. Mr. Hamilton having endorsed a note for Mr. DeBeck, Mr. Hamilton on the Hastings street block, which he claims was obtained by fraud. Mr. Hamilton claims that the deed was made known only at the trial. Mr. DeBeck