

## DIG IN SEARCH FOR BABY'S BODY

Police and Father of Blakely Coughlin Handicapped.

EGG HARBOR, N. J., Oct. 12.—Spaded earth in spots near here today marked the trail of the searchers for the body of Baby Blakely Coughlin, who was killed four months ago by kidnaper August Pasquale.

A party hunted for hours around the place where Pasquale, according to his statement to Major Lynn G. Adams of the State Police, placed the infant's body after he had smothered it accidentally, by buttoning it under his coat while he fled from the Coughlin home at Norristown, Pa.

George H. Coughlin, father of the baby, was the grimmest of all the group. Stern and with a set expression, he stood close by while members of the Pennsylvania State constabulary spaded up the earth.

The searchers were handicapped by the fact that Pasquale's directions were vague.

When they left the scene they planned to resume after getting better directions.

## Skeeter on Nose Aid to This Hunter's Aim

WOODSFIELD, Ohio, Oct. 12.—That the League of Nations, or some other competent authority, bar mosquitoes using hunting season is the earnest desire of Charles Yockey, plumber.

Numerous able-bodied representatives of this type of pest infest Monroe County woods.

While on a hunting expedition recently Yockey spied a squirrel in a tree.

But he was kept busy swatting the skeeters.

Just as he had everything ready to bag his game a mosquito lit on his nose.

In the act of swatting the insect he gave his nose a wallop and accidentally fired his gun. Something fell. It was the squirrel.

Yockey went home with both the squirrel and a swollen nose.

## Hunter's Stray Shot Wounds Kokomo Boy

SPECIAL TO THE TIMES. KOKOMO, Ind., Oct. 12.—Clarence Hankins, 11, son of R. M. Hankins, a farmer, was shot in the leg Sunday afternoon while tramping in the country.

A stray shot from hunters is believed to have hit the lad, although no one was seen.

His injuries are not serious, it is said.

## U. S. WANTS NO MORE JAP LABOR

'Gentlemen's Agreement' Declared Not Satisfactory.

WASHINGTON, Oct. 12.—Negotiations over Japanese immigration and anti-Japanese legislation in California were continued at the State Department today.

Roland S. Morris, American ambassador to Tokyo, and Ambassador Shidehara of Japan were carrying on the negotiations.

While the State Department and the Japanese Embassy are maintaining the strictest secrecy, the negotiations were believed progressing toward a settlement.

Japan make take the position that all laws discriminating against her subjects already in the United States, such as the existing anti-alien land law in California, may be wiped out, it was understood here today.

The proposed California law for prohibition of land leasing by Japanese also would be included in this demand.

The United States is not satisfied entirely with the gentleman's agreement by which Japan voluntarily undertakes to restrict immigration and wishes absolute prohibition of Japanese labor immigration.

"I see that beach belle actually took a plunge."

"Yes, somebody told her the ocean was full of heavy swells this morning."

Louisville Courier-Journal.

MIGHT CAPTURE ONE.

"I see that beach belle actually took a plunge."

"Yes, somebody told her the ocean was full of heavy swells this morning."

Louisville Courier-Journal.

## State's New Ruling Victory for Women

Names of women candidates for office in Indiana, who had no opposition in the primary election, and whose names were not placed on the primary ballots, may be placed upon the ticket in the general election and the women may legally hold office, according to an opinion of the State board of election commissioners, given yesterday.

In about twenty counties in the State women had filed their declarations of candidacy in the proper manner, and since the primary election, the nineteenth amendment, granting full right of franchise to women has been passed, thus legalizing the placing of these names on the general election ballots.

## Noblesville Pastor Can't Pay Up Alimony

SPECIAL TO THE TIMES. NOBLESVILLE, Ind., Oct. 12.—A bench warrant has been issued here for the arrest of the Rev. Paris Cox, a minister in the Friends Church, on the charge of contempt of court.

Early last spring the wife of the Rev. Mr. Cox obtained a divorce and the custody of their two children and Cox was ordered by the court to pay \$30 a month for the support of the children. It is charged that he has not made the payments.

## Asks \$10,000 Damages From Wife's Parents Injunction on Shoe Machines Is Lifted

WASHINGTON, Oct. 12.—The United States Supreme Court has suspended the operation of the injunction granted by the St. Louis Federal District Court against enforcement of the leasing clauses of the United States Shoe Machinery Company's contracts for use of its machines and set the case for hearing on appeal by the Supreme Court, Jan. 3.

The company is attacked by the Government under the Sherman act.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

## ORDER NEW TRIAL OF BRIDGE CASE

Appellate Court Sends Suit Back to Hamilton County.

A new trial has been granted by the Appellate Court in the case of Edwin J. Roberts against Leo K. Fesler, auditor; Ed G. Sourbier, former treasurer; Louis W. George, Carlin H. Shank and Joseph G. Hayes, commissioners of Marion County, and the American Construction Company, in which an injunction is asked to prevent the defendants from making payment for the construction of a bridge over Fall creek on Senate avenue.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from where it was appealed, for retrial, after the appellant had shown prima facie error in the failure of the appellees to file a brief in the case.

It was alleged by the plaintiff that the defendants in 1917, after advertising for bids for the construction of the bridge, failed to make any entry on the records of the awarding of the contract, after the county council had appropriated \$125,000 for payment.

The defendant set forth that he had examined the records of acts of the commissioners, and that he failed to find any entry of awarding of the contract.

Judgment was rendered by the lower court in favor of the defendants.

The Appellate Court reversed the action of the lower court.

The Appellate Court sent the case back to the Hamilton County Circuit Court, from