acknowledged and entered in conformity with the laws of the State of Illinois. Given under my hand and the seal of said Court at my office in Oregon in said County, this seventeenth day of February 1859.

Seal

Elbert K. Light Clerk. By Edwin A. Conty Deputy

And thereupon all further proceedings in the premises aforesaid between the parties aforesaid by order of the Court here, were continued until the first Monday of March next. On which said first Monday of March being the seventh day of the same month in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty nine, comes again into Court here, the Complainant aforesaid by her Solicitors aforesaid. And the said John Highberger and Elizabeth his wife, and Daniel Hill, also come into Court here, by J. S. Blaggett, their Solicitor and filed in Court here, on the 25th day of May 1859, the following Answer to the foregoing Bill of Complaint, to wit.

To the Honorable, The Judge of the Circuit Court for Washington County as a Court of Equity. The joint and several answers of Daniel Hill of Ogle County, State of Illinois, and John Highberger and Elizabeth Highberger his wife of Washington County State of Maryland, to the Bill of Complaint of Sarah Stiffler against them and others in the Circuit Court for Washington County as a Court of Equity exhibited. These defendants now and at all times hereafter saving and reserving unto themselves all benefit and advantage of exception which can or may be had or taken to the many errors uncertainties and other imperfections in the said Complainants said bill of complaint contained, - for answer thereunto or unto so much and such parts thereof as these defendants are advised, is or are material or necessary for them to make answer unto, these defendants severally answering say: These defendants admit that George Stiffler departed this life in the year 1855 leaving Elizabeth and Mary, his daughters and only children and heirs at law, and that the former is intermarried with John Highberger and that the latter intermarried with Daniel Hill and that his daughter Mary Hill has since died, leaving Jonathan S. Hill, Daniel L. Hill, Ellery L. Hill, Mary E. Hill, Martha F. Hill & Augustus S. Hill her children and heirs at law surviving her. They also admit that the said George Stiffler left a last will and testament in which he appointed his said two daughters Mary and Elizabeth Administratrixes thereof, who renounced their executorship and that Daniel Hill and John Highberger were duly appointed by the Orphans Court of Washington County administrators, cum testamento annexo. These defendants also admit that Daniel Hill, and John Highberger and Elizabeth Highberger his wife, filed their Bill of Complaint in the Circuit Court for Washington County as a Court of Equity for the sale of the real estate of which the said George Stiffler was seized in his life time and of which he died in-

testate and that a part of said real estate mentioned in said Bill is a house and lot conveyed to the said George Stiffler by Sarah Stiffler the Complainant by deed bearing date the 7th day of April in the year 1849, which said real estate these defendants admit and insist that the said George Stiffler died seized in fee, and the title to which is good and vested title which descended to the children and heirs at law of the said George Stiffler deceased. These defendants have no knowledge of the facts and circumstances under which the purchase or conveyance of the said house and lot was made other than that published by the said deed duly bearing date the 7th day of April 1849, which said deed was signed acknowledged executed and delivered in accordance with the Act of Assembly in such case made and provided.

That upon the execution of said deed George Stiffler in his life time took possession of the said House & Lot therein mentioned and remained in possession until his death and that his children and heirs at law have been in possession ever since his death and are now in possession of the same. These defendants further answering say that the said George Stiffler was a man of acknowledged integrity and fair dealing and they utterly and emphatically deny that the said deed was procured by misrepresentation fraud, or undue influence, but on the contrary that it was a fair and bona fide transaction, and they insist that the Complainant is estopped by said deed from denying its validity and effect, and that the same is binding upon her and ought not to be vacated and set aside. And these defendants further answering say (protesting against the rights of the Complainant to deny her own deed where solemnly made) that she frequently declared her intention to give all her property to her son George Stiffler in gratitude for his affection and kindness to her, and that she declared frequently prior to the filing of her said Bill of Complaint that she had given all of her estate to the said George Stiffler in rebuke of the gross negligence, inattention and indifference of her other children towards her, and that they do not know whether the true consideration in said deed was love and affection, or whether the consideration set forth in said deed was actually paid or not, but they insist that the said deed ought to be interpreted and construed according to the legal import and meaning of the language contained in the same. And they further insist that the said deed is good and valid whether it was executed for a good or valuable consideration, and that the said Complainant is precluded from denying at this late day, that the consideration is bona fide. These defendants further answering deny that the Complainant was incapable of attending to her own affairs at the time she executed the said deed, but that many years having elapsed since she