

RECORD TRAVEL ON THE COAST

Figures of Southern Pacific Show Big Movement of Settlers.

IRRIGATION WORK PROGRESSES

Agreement Reached Between Land Owners and Sacramento Valley Canal Company—Butte-Sutter Ditch Sold.

SAN FRANCISCO, April 1.—(Special.)—The Southern Pacific report shows that in the first thirteen days of the year, the company has received more than \$1,000,000 in fares, which is a record for the same period last year. These figures apply to the Southern Pacific only, and were made public yesterday by E. E. Wade, assistant general passenger agent.

The collector rates went into effect March 10, and the figures are from that date to March 22, inclusive. For a like period in 1910, 7,086 persons came to California, traveling as tourists, and in 1911 the number is 8,323.

So far, according to Wade, there is no sign that the collector travel is becoming less, and it will cause no surprise if the excess this year is more pronounced before the time of selling collector rates elapses. Advertising placed in eastern newspapers and land show displays are given credit for a portion of the gain in travel.

Every ticket sold exclusively to California points and they are one-way tickets only. The difference in the fare amounts to \$16.75 from Chicago and to as much as \$20 from points farther west.

March 16, the first day of the sale of the collector tickets, \$35 were sold. That was the heaviest business since the 1911 sale was inaugurated, but the number has not fluctuated to any great extent. Every year since the collector rates were inaugurated there has been an increase in this class of travel and a decrease in the percentage of those returning.

E. O. McCormick and Charles E. Fox of the Southern Pacific have expressed themselves as particularly pleased with the showing made this year.

According to the railroad statisticians, 80 per cent of the persons holding collector rate tickets remain in California. Another 20 per cent come back the second time, and the other 10 per cent either return east for good or scatter to other points along the coast.

Most of those coming in are destined for interior points, where large numbers have purchased small farms.

IRRIGATION WHIRLWIND ENDS

Land Owners and Canal Company Finally Agree.

WILLOWS, Cal., April 1.—(Special.)—Farmers were relieved today by which all litigation over rights-of-way in the Central Irrigation district between land owners, the Sacramento Valley West Side Canal company and the Sacramento Valley Irrigation company was settled and the companies are now in possession of all rights-of-way needed in the construction of the canal system.

When the conditions of the compromise are carried through by the land owners of the Central Irrigation district the old Central Irrigation bonds of the value of \$1,250,000, which have been for many years a cloud upon the title of the lands, will be cancelled. The bonds are held by the canal company's interests.

Under the terms of the compromise the land owners are to secure for the canal company all rights-of-way needed for the completion of the system and are to convey to the canal company all property and rights of every description of the old Central Irrigation district.

The papers were signed by Fentress Hill as president of the Sacramento Valley West Side Canal company and vice president of the Sacramento Valley Irrigation company and by all the individual land owners from whom it is desired to immediately obtain rights-of-way for carrying on construction work in Glenn and Colusa. The land owners were represented in the negotiations by Attorneys Arthur C. Huston and Ben F. Gels. The canal company and the irrigation company were represented by Attorneys Frank Freeman and D. L. McCall.

The conclusion of these negotiations is the result of a plan outlined by Judge William M. Finch and the outcome is satisfactory to all interests concerned and means that the big construction work that was delayed temporarily will proceed without further interruption.

BUTTE-SUTTER CANAL IS SOLD

New Corporation Takes Over Big Ditch Proposition.

GRIDLEY, Cal., April 1.—(Special.)—The title of the properties of the Butte County Canal company in Butte county and Sutter county was transferred to the Sutter-Butte Canal company late yesterday afternoon in San Francisco and affirmation of the sale was made this morning by W. M. Sheldon, president of the Butte County Canal company and by Gordon Hall, an attorney, who represented the new corporation in the deal, which involves over \$1,000,000.

No cash payment was made and the details of the payment have not been worked out, but the issuance of bonds by the new company to be used in part payment for the system is a part of the plans. The Sutter-Butte company was organized and filed articles of incorporation in Butte and Sutter counties about a month ago. The incorporators are Gordon Hall and J. D. McKensie of San Francisco, J. D. Hubbard and Messrs. Jones and Forsythe and two other capitalists of Chicago. With them is associated George Wingfield, the mining magnate of Nevada.

"The corporation owns no land under the system," said Gordon Hall. "It will endeavor to furnish the best possible service to the owners of land under the irrigating system. The managers will carry out all policies and assume all obligations of the Butte County Canal company."

The holdings of the company consist of fifty-seven miles of main canal and 131 miles of laterals. These are to be extended and placed in the best possible condition for giving good irrigation service. The Sutter-Butte company does not now own nor is it acquiring any land under the system and so the purposes of the corporation cannot be misconstrued or complicated.

SPECIALS FOR THE CONVENTION

Excursion Trains Will Carry Sunday School Teachers West.

SAN FRANCISCO, April 1.—Arrangements have just been completed for special trains from New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, New Orleans, Cleveland, Denver, Toronto, Vancouver and other American and Canadian cities to carry representatives from the east to the thirteenth international Sunday school convention, which opens in this city June 20-27. This was the word received at the convention headquarters from James Ridpath, Jr., of the passenger department of the Southern Pacific railway and chairman of the publicity committee of the Sunday school convention. Eight of these excursion specials will

Nebraska's New Initiative and Referendum Law

Section 1. That at the general election for state and legislative officers to be held for a period longer than ninety days, and elections thereon shall be held at the first regular state election held not less than thirty days after such filing.

Section 2. That the referendum may be ordered upon any act except acts making appropriations for the expenses of the state government, and state institutions exist at the time such act is passed. When the referendum is ordered upon an act or any part thereof it shall suspend its operation until the same is approved by the voters; provided, that emergency acts or acts for the immediate preservation of public peace, health, or safety shall continue in effect until rejected by the voters or repealed by the legislature. Filing of a referendum petition against one or more items, sections, or parts of an act shall not delay the remainder of the measure from becoming operative.

Section 3. That the initiative shall be continued to derive any member of the legislature of their right to introduce any measure. The whole number of votes cast for governor at the regular election last preceding the filing of any initiative or referendum petition shall be the basis on which the number of legal voters required to sign such petition shall be computed. The veto power of the governor shall not extend to measures initiated by or referred to the people. All such measures shall become the law or a part of the constitution when approved by a majority of the votes cast thereon, provided, the votes cast in favor of said initiative measure or part of said constitution shall constitute thirty-five per cent (35%) of the total vote cast at said election and not otherwise, and shall take effect upon proclamation by the governor, which shall be made within ten days of the completion of the official canvass. The vote upon initiative and referendum measures shall be returned and canvassed in the same manner as is prescribed in the case of presidential electors. The method of submitting and adopting amendments to the constitution provided by this section shall be supplementary to the method prescribed in the article of this constitution, entitled "Amendments," and the latter shall in no case be construed to conflict herewith.

Section 4. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 5. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 6. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 7. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 8. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 9. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 10. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 11. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 12. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 13. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 14. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 15. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 16. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 17. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 18. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 19. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 20. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 21. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 22. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 23. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 24. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 25. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 26. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 27. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 28. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 29. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 30. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 31. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 32. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 33. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 34. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 35. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 36. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 37. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 38. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 39. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 40. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 41. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 42. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 43. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 44. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 45. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 46. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 47. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 48. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 49. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

Section 50. That the initiative and referendum shall be in force and effect upon the adoption of the amendment to the constitution of the state, and when so declared the amendment herein proposed shall be in force and self-executing.

WORK ON BATTLESHIP MAINE

Hull of Sunken Warship Will Be Exposed to View Within Two Months.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 1.—The hull of the sunken battleship Maine in Havana harbor will be exposed not later than June 1, according to Frank M. Daniels, the contractor who built the coffer dams around the ship. He returned here today from Havana. Then it can be determined whether the explosion which destroyed the ship was from without or within.

MUST PAY CASH TO MISS BAY

Defendant in Breach of Promise Case at Sioux Falls Is Denied a New Trial.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.

SIoux FALLS, S. D., April 1.—An opinion of Judge Charles A. Willard was filed in the federal court here today denying a motion of the defendant for a new trial in the case of Ella B. Bay of Menominee, Mich., against James S. Sanborn, a wealthy resident of Pukwana, S. D. Last fall Miss Bay was awarded a \$25,000 judgment against Sanborn for breach of promise to marry her.