

OPENING MAY BE DELAYED

Action of South Dakota Officials Complicates Matters on the Yankton Reserve.

NICE POINT OF LAW IS INVOLVED

Just What Interest the Indians Have in the Transaction, However, is a Puzzler
—Numerous Colored Men After a Chaplaincy.

WASHINGTON, April 4.—(Special)—When Secretary of the Interior Smith returns to the city he will most likely find a very delicate case, involving a fine legal point, awaiting his decision. The telegram of Agent J. A. Smith of the Yankton Indian reservation reporting that the state of South Dakota is making an attempt to file on 50,000 acres of land in that reservation has been received at the Indian office and referred to the general land office. No decision has been reached and the matter awaits the attention of the secretary of the interior.

It is now a question whether this complication will delay the issuance of the president's proclamation opening the surplus lands to settlement in accordance with the law. The provision by which the state of South Dakota is authorized to take these lands is contained in the Indian appropriation act of the last congress, which says that "any state territory entitled to indemnity school funds or entitled to select lands for educational purposes under existing law may select such lands within the boundaries of any Indian reservation, except such states as have been taken from the surplus lands thereof purchased by the United States after allotments have been made to the Indians of such reservation, and prior to the opening of such reservation to settlement." The officials of the Indian office say that the law on this point is very clear, and that the state has a legal right to select these 50,000 acres of land before the Indian appropriation is open for settlement. They say that the state probably has this amount of lands due it by reason of former openings years ago, and that it is now attempting to file on the lands in accordance with the law of the last congress.

INDIANS EXHIBIT PECULIAR INTEREST.
The officials, however, cannot assign any reason why the Indians themselves should be interested in what is to become of the land, and they have been told that they and they have been paid for it. It is now a question between the United States government and the state of South Dakota. One reason advanced for the opposition of the Yanktonans is that the Indians claim there was no such provision in the agreement entered into between them and their representatives and the government, and that they understood that the lands would be bought by the government, were to be opened for settlement. It is not known whether the president will issue the proclamation at once. He will probably, in view of the uncertainty, withhold the issuance until after the Indians have been settled in a proper manner in one of the villages involved. The absence of Secretary Smith, however, will delay the issuance, as it was stated at the white house today that the president would sign the proclamation and return it to the Interior department, regardless of the absence of the secretary.

A petition, signed by a number of Indians and by the Indians of the Yankton tribe, has been presented in a proper manner in one of the villages involved. The absence of Secretary Smith, however, will delay the issuance, as it was stated at the white house today that the president would sign the proclamation and return it to the Interior department, regardless of the absence of the secretary.

In reference to the Pago-Pago bay, Mr. Chambers says that the claim of the United States government was examined and confirmed, but that the claims are by no means as valuable as the American public seems to think. The subject matter is one between Great Britain and Venezuela, so that the good offices of the United States are not sought as essential to a settlement, as it is not understood that the United States has assumed a protectorate over Venezuela or has other interests than that of a friendly power.

Chances Recommended in the Chicago.
WASHINGTON, April 4.—The naval inspection board which recently made a care-examination of the United States ship Chicago has recommended to the secretary of the navy suggesting immediate sale. The board expresses the opinion that her battery should be brought up to date. That while the regular eight inch guns must be retained, the six and five inch breech loaders. It is also held that the masts and rigging of the Chicago are of no service.

Japanese Flocking to Hawaii.
WASHINGTON, April 4.—In a report to the State department Ellis Mills, United States consul general at Honolulu, announces that the arrival on March 14 of the German ship "Lippe," with 121 German contract laborers, 111 being women. They are under contract to work at \$12.50 and the women at \$8 per month.

Morton Determined to Stop the Leaks.
WASHINGTON, April 4.—Secretary Morton, in order to prevent the monthly grain reports of the Agricultural department from giving speculators in advance, has made changes in forty-four of the state agencies and further measures will be taken to prevent leaks.

Charleston Sailed for New Chwang.
WASHINGTON, April 4.—The United States ship Charleston sailed yesterday from Chee-Foo for New Chwang China, where the Petrel has been laid up in winter quarters in mud dock.

Stertory Morton Has Recovered.
WASHINGTON, April 4.—Secretary Morton, who has been confined to his room for several days by a cold, was so far recovered today as to be able to visit the Agricultural department.

Monterey Back for Repairs.
WASHINGTON, April 4.—The Monterey has arrived at Mare Island navy yard, where she will prepare again for her voyage to Callao, Peru.

LATTER DAY SAINTS GATHERING.

Large Number at Independence Attending the International Conference.
KANSAS CITY, April 4.—Every train arriving at Independence brings fresh arrivals for the opening of the international conference of the Latter Day Saints, which begins Saturday. President Joseph Smith will arrive on Friday night or Saturday morning, and will preside at the deliberations. Next to the president the council is highest in authority, and at present consists of Alexander Smith, J. W. Gilham, Henry C. Smith, J. J. Smith, J. R. Lamberton, T. R. Griffith, James Gifford, J. R. Lambert, W. H. Kelley and E. C. Briggs. The conference was presided over by an international conference of Sabbath school which opened today with Prof. Gunson of Lamont, Ia., presiding.

Special Commission to Examine Bills.
WASHINGTON, April 4.—In answer to the advertisement sent out by the Navy department some time ago, calling for proposals for building three torpedo boats, two proposals of bids were received, one for building the boats in the yards of the department, and one on an order of the commissioners submitted by the bidders. Some of the commissioners tried to persuade the secretary of the navy that the designs were better than the department's designs, and realizing that the bureau officers might feel a desire to oppose the designs of their own men, the secretary has created a subcommittee to examine all of the designs and report upon their merits. The board will meet next Monday to begin its work.

San Francisco Wants the Monterey.
WASHINGTON, April 4.—Secretary Herbert has received from the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco a protest against the action of the department in removing from the Pacific coast station the Monterey, a boat especially designed for the protection of the Pacific coast and almost the only armored naval defense. This refers to the order to the Monterey commanding to proceed to Callao, Peru. Secretary Herbert replied in protest by stating that the ship had been ordered simply to make a cruise in the Southern Pacific, and that the department does not contemplate attaching her permanently to a foreign station.

Iowa Postmasters.
WASHINGTON, April 4.—(Special Telegram)—Iowa postmasters were appointed today as follows: Bear Grove, Guthrie county; M. D. Scott, vice Marion Booth, re-appointed; Butler, Keokuk county, J. H. Jones; vice M. V. Gandy, re-appointed; Plymouth county, A. A. Tritz, vice G. E. Rieckert, resigned; Mauch Chunk, Mahaska county; M. M. Dickson, vice Clinton Sherrill, resigned; Portland, Cerro Gordo county, B. F. Felt, vice Harvey Jacoby, resigned.

Reversed a Pension Ruling.
WASHINGTON, April 4.—Assistant Secretary Reynolds of the Interior department has overruled the decision of the last administration as to the line of duty of soldiers, holding that a soldier being engaged in private business and not in the performance of those things which the law required of him as a soldier duty cannot be considered in the line of duty.

Some More Colorful Appointments.
WASHINGTON, April 4.—(Special Telegram)—A postoffice has been established at Lisco, Cheyenne county, Neb., with James H. Crum as postmaster. Two postmasters were commissioned today as follows: Ernest H. Kretschmar, Superior; Ephraim B. Weisch, Horace; Warren H. Terwilliger, Antelope.

Washington, April 4.—(Special Telegram)—Second Lieutenant Ulysses G. Worrow is transferred from company I to company H, 1st Cavalry.

Captain Frank Baker, ordnance department, will proceed from Watertown arsenal, Mass., to the Rhode Island state camping grounds on business pertaining to construc-

tion of a sea coast battery for Rhode Island.

Captain William L. Pitcher, eighth infantry, is granted ten days' extended leave; First Lieutenant William C. Wren, seventh infantry, four months; Captain John J. Hall, eighth infantry, four months and fifteen days.

Lieutenant Colonel Charles A. Wickoff, Nineteenth Infantry, Post Captain Ruter W. Williams, Second Lieutenant, 10th Ky., and Lieutenant Colonel A. B. Carey, pay department, are in the city on brief visits.

NOT ENOUGH LAND TO GO AROUND.

Claims in Samoa Amount to More Than the Total Acreage of the Islands.

WASHINGTON, April 4.—The report of W. L. Chambers, United States land commissioner to Samoa, dated February 2, 1895, was made public today. Mr. Chambers was one of three commissioners appointed by the treaty powers of Great Britain, Germany and the United States under the provisions of the Berlin treaty to adjust and settle all claims by aliens to lands in Samoa. The annual meeting of the committee was held January 5, 1895, at Apia. The report concludes that the total number of claims filed before the commission was 3,542. Of these 1,422 were German, 1,757 British, 307 American, 329 French and 139 miscellaneous. The total claims aggregated 1,691,892 acres, or 2,687,160 acres, or 1,060,000 acres. Only 8 per cent of the claims were filed in 1894. The vast bulk of acreage claimed by Americans was rejected because of the manifestly inadequate consideration given for it and because the titles were defective under several of the provisions of the law. About 21,000 acres were contributed to Americans. Most of them belonged to a corporation composed of San Francisco stockholders.

"At the time the investigation took place," says Mr. Chambers, "this corporation was under existing law may select such lands within the boundaries of any Indian reservation, except such states as have been taken from the surplus lands thereof purchased by the United States after allotments have been made to the Indians of such reservation, and prior to the opening of such reservation to settlement." The officials of the Indian office say that the law on this point is very clear, and that the 50,000 acres of land being claimed by the Indians are open for settlement.

The officials of the Indian office say that the state of South Dakota is making an attempt to file on the lands in accordance with the law of the last congress.

INDIANS EXHIBIT PECULIAR INTEREST.

The officials, however, cannot assign any reason why the Indians themselves should be interested in what is to become of the land, and they have been paid for it. It is now a question between the United States government and the state of South Dakota. One reason advanced for the opposition of the Yanktonans is that the Indians claim there was no such provision in the agreement entered into between them and their representatives and the government, and that they understood that the lands would be bought by the government, were to be opened for settlement.

Third. The subject matter is one between Great Britain and Venezuela, so that the good offices of the United States are not sought as essential to a settlement, as it is not understood that the United States has assumed a protectorate over Venezuela or has other interests than that of a friendly power.

Second. In addition there are certain portions of the territory to which Venezuela lays claim which under no circumstances can be accepted as the subject of arbitration, as they are recognized as belonging to the British domain and are not therefore a subject on which the judgment of arbitrators can be made.

Third. The subject matter is one between Great Britain and Venezuela, so that the good offices of the United States are not sought as essential to a settlement, as it is not understood that the United States has assumed a protectorate over Venezuela or has other interests than that of a friendly power.

Fourth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Fifth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Sixth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Seventh. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Eighth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Ninth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Tenth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Eleventh. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Twelfth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Thirteenth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Fourteenth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Fifteenth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Sixteenth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Seventeenth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Eighteenth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Nineteenth. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Twenty. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Twenty-one. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Twenty-two. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Twenty-three. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Twenty-four. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Twenty-five. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Twenty-six. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Twenty-seven. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Twenty-eight. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Twenty-nine. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Thirty. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Thirty-one. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Thirty-two. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Thirty-three. Great Britain takes the position that the question of arbitration was once before proposed by Venezuela. At that time the foreign office gave the subject most careful attention and submitted a proposal embodying a proposition to arbitrate certain definite subjects of controversy. To this proposal Venezuela has never made a definite reply, but has rejected the proposed basis of arbitration. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to proceed to a formal proposal of arbitration when the facts are still unknown.

Thirty-four