

WHOLE WORLD IS INTERESTED

Adventurous Girls Get Letters.

Plan to Tour the World on Their Wits Facinates Public.

Souvenir Postal Cards Are in Demand—Trunk Manufacturer Helps Scheme Along.

At the time they accepted the wager of \$20,000 that they could not tour the world in two years and pay their expenses by their own wits, Miss Lu Chamberlin and Miss Vera Lynn Little thought how much attention the plan would attract. A little less than a month ago it was first announced in the Tribune, and since that time the young women, both of whom are Salt Lake girls, have received communications from all parts of the country, including Canada and Mexico, all of the writers being deeply interested in the trip, for one reason or another.

Some of the letters are humorous, some otherwise, but all show that it is not an ordinary undertaking for girls to attempt a trip under such conditions, and some of the writers of letters are eager to help them win the wager; others eager to join the young women as stenographers, bookkeepers, maids, messengers, and what not. Several of the big Eastern and Western papers have also communicated with Miss Chamberlin and Miss Lynn, anxious to secure their services as correspondents for the unique trip, an English paper being among those that have made inquiries.

Although the young women, who are to make a part of their expenses by sending back postal cards, have made no arrangements to secure subscribers for this system, they already have a large number, with promises of many more, when they shall begin work in earnest this week. Thus far the subscribers are business men who have read of the project, and seem anxious to encourage the girls in their effort to win the big wager. The post-cards are to be the best that can be secured and the entire post-card service, covering a period of two years, is being offered at the nominal sum of \$10.

Trunks Furnished Free. Among others who have become interested in the trip of Miss Chamberlin and Miss Lynn are some of the trunk manufacturers of the city, who offered to furnish trunks for the long journey. Out of the many offered, Miss Chamberlin and Miss Lynn have made no selection, but they are to be exhibited in the trunk store of Mr. Meredith on Main street. They will also be exhibited as soon as they are completed, and before the young ladies start on the long trip.

Typewriter manufacturers are also anxious to have their machines carried on the trip around the world, and Miss Lynn and Miss Chamberlin will decide upon one in the near future. The large amount of correspondence they will be called upon to do will make the carrying of a typewriter necessary.

Man Wants to Compete.

Among the funniest letters received by these adventurous travelers are some from near-by residents. One writer asks if he starts on the journey at the same time the girls do, and beats them around the world, if he will receive the \$20,000, while another inquires if the girls are to make their way by singing and dancing in the streets of the various cities and towns visited.

"No," is the answer to both questions. The wager has been made by friends of the girls and only they will be permitted to attempt to win it. One of the conditions of the wager is that the girls travel first-class, stop only at first-class hotels, and the trip has been outlined, with the names of every hotel at which they will be required to stop.

Represent The Tribune.

Miss Lynn and Miss Chamberlin are to represent The Salt Lake Tribune on the trip, and while they will not start until May 1, friends every day are asking questions about the preparations, and will be interested in reading of them from time to time.

WISWELL'S REPUTATION.

Decision of Court Does Not Reflect on His Ability.

The recording, the other day, of a decision handed down by Judge Stewart nearly two years ago in the case of F. A. Wiswell vs. H. A. Rose and the Peacock Mining company was noted in the Tribune. The statement of the case was such as to leave an unjust impression of Mr. Wiswell, and it may be added, in explanation, that he has excellent letters showing his ability as a mechanical engineer and metallurgical expert. At the trial of the above case he was not allowed to introduce into evidence a letter from the defendant showing his satisfaction with the work done, nor testimony as to the success of his teaching process in the face of the most disheartening obstacles. The court did not go into Mr. Wiswell's capability as an expert, and there is nothing in the decision which should militate against his reputation.

GLOBE-WERNICKE FILING CABINETS

build up in sections and grow as your business grows. The Bredon Office Supply Co., State Agents. 60 W. 2nd South.

West Looks Good to the New Bishop

Rt. Rev. Franklin S. Spalding Tells of His Delight on Seeing the Mountains.

"No, I really haven't had a chance to think of anything concerning my plans for work here, as the field is entirely new to me and I am unfamiliar with its needs. But it seems good to get back to the West, after a nine years' residence in the East. You know, I lived in Colorado for a good many years, know nearly every portion of the State thoroughly, and it will probably not be long before Utah, Nevada and the little strip of Wyoming included in the district, will be as familiar as its western portion of Colorado, also included in the district over which the Bishop of Utah presides."

Rt. Rev. Franklin S. Spalding, the general bishop elected to succeed the late Rt. Rev. Abel Leonard, made the above reply when asked if he had any special plans outlined for work before his arrival in the new field. He was seen at the University club, where he is temporarily located, and where he was busy all day yesterday receiving members of the clergy and of his church.

The new bishop is about 40 years old, of pleasing presence, and with the free and cordial manner characteristic of the West. He is a native of the mountain country of the late Bishop Spalding of Colorado, and before taking charge of the church at Erie, where both his father and himself were ordained as bishops, was rector of a church in Denver, and also was connected with Jarvis hall, the once splendid school for boys conducted by the Episcopal church in Denver, but which was entirely destroyed by fire a few years since and has never been rebuilt.

Bishop Spalding is enthusiastic over the mountains of the West, and is looking forward with pleasure to scaling some of Utah's peaks during the coming spring and summer. He has been in Utah before, but only for a day or two at a time on his way to or from the coast, and so has had no opportunity here to gain the fame which came to him in Colorado and Wyoming because of his feat in mountain climbing. But he has time, or will have later, and his friends are predicting that he will take the first opportunity to find out from practical experience just how high the peaks about Salt Lake City stand.

For a month or more, Bishop Spalding will make his home at the University club, and may decide to remain there longer. Being single, he says he doesn't know what to do with the big house formerly occupied by the Leonard family, and so, while awaiting the arrival of his books and other belongings from Pittsburgh, he will be looking about for a home.

PARSONS WAS ROBBED.

Lost His Spectacles, but Was Not Sure About Blue Handkerchief.

"Help! Murder! Police! I've been robbed! Call the officers! Quick!" claimed James Parsons, as he rushed frantically into the Grand Pacific office last night and informed the night clerk that he had been held up by two bandits. After rattling off something about "two men," "strong arm," and a "gold watch," Parsons sank into a chair and gasped for breath.

Parsons was immediately informed of the occurrence by telephone, and in hurry-up order the patrol wagon was dispatched with four policemen aboard. When the officers reached the hotel Parsons had recovered his composure and was able to explain matters.

"The robbery was committed by the 'red-headed' men," said Parsons, as the policemen gathered eagerly about to hear the details of his coming down here from the Knott's saloon to men who were the strong arm and robbed me of everything I had. Neither of them had a gun, so far as I could see, but the other was the worst type. The ruffian overpowered me, and I was so surprised and frightened that I could not cry out. One of them had a blue coat, striped pants, no mustache, and a blue handkerchief. The other was a flash-head with a red coat and a blue handkerchief. The policemen staggered back aghast, and the newspaper man called plaintively for a drink as he leaned against the wall for support. There was an oppressive silence for several seconds, broken only by the rattling of feet as the officers headed for the door.

"It's lucky for that fellow that he had his coat buttoned, or he'd lost that, too," mused the night clerk, as he followed the man as he climbed into the "hoodlum wagon."

Seed Apples Are Shown.

J. Fell has placed in the windows of the Grand Pacific office a sample bottle of the famous seedling apple of Grand Junction, the fruit was originated by J. F. Spencer at his home near Grand Junction, and is controlled by the Spencer Seedling Apple company. It is a firm, luscious fruit without any seeds or core and is taking the place of seedling oranges. Mr. Spencer experimented with apples until he succeeded in getting a seedling variety and from these he has produced a number of trees which are now ready for bearing. He will introduce the apple in this city and state.

Notice.

The regular annual meeting of the State Bar Association of Utah will be held Monday evening, January 9, 1904, at the Federal courtroom, Dooly block, Salt Lake City, at 7:30 o'clock. Addresses will be made on the subject of the law by the following named members of the association: President's address, Andrew Howat. The Philippine Penal Code, R. W. Young. Some Needed Legislative Corrections, George H. Smith. All members of the association, judges and members of the bar in general, are respectfully invited to attend the meeting.

The regular annual election of officers of the association, for the ensuing year, will be held, and such other business transacted as may properly come before the meeting. ANDREW HOWAT, President. J. WILCOX THOMPSON, Secretary.

IS UNDERWOOD IN THE SALT LAKE?

Eastern Tendency Is Noted Here.

Flats and Apartmenthouses Portend Great Changes.

Those Who Know Say That the Movement Is Bound to Grow.

Will Salt Lake City soon cease to be a city of homes?

The beginning of an apartment house era would seem to answer the question in the affirmative. The universal movement toward flats and apartment houses has already reached this city to an extent of accommodations built during the past year for more than fifty families and more than fifty married pairs. Real estate men say it marks the advent of new conditions. Back East, in cities of size, the private residence is a thing of the past. People live either in apartments or in low suburban houses.

"The Passing of the Home" has been the subject of frequent comment, both in magazines and newspapers. It is an acknowledged fact. Two classes are seeking these big modern lives known as "family hotels" and apartment houses. In such places one gets all modern conveniences and excellent service. This appeals to men and women who work for a living. It also appeals to men and women of means. And in the East both classes can find what they want and for which they can pay.

Has Come to Stay.

Now as to Salt Lake City. Said a well-known real estate man yesterday: "The apartment house has come to stay. It is a modern idea, necessitated by modern conditions. A few years ago we didn't know it. But only a few years before that we didn't know the electric car. Of course, Salt Lake City hasn't many families living in apartments. But more accommodations will be built, and more of them."

Such is the opinion of those whose business keeps them in touch with facts in this line. Now as to the facts themselves: During the past twelve months at least, he has known what to do, or begun and is nearly done, to house more than fifty families, and more than fifty married pairs, in apartment houses and flats. In other words, at least fifty house dwellers will not go into houses, as a consequence of this building. The other fifty pairs will come for the most part from those who now live in downtown hotels. These people, as a rule, belong to the classes who have pretty good incomes. The salary and wages of the young married couples of them, are still hunting out residence locations, and are still building homes, paying for them out of their incomes as these incomes accrue. But nevertheless it is a fact that fifty homes, at least, will be in apartments instead of in separate houses. And this is just the beginning. Other things are to follow. Everyone recognizes that.

Flats have begun to spring up. More will be built, and more of them. And these same men say more apartment hotels will also arise. The movement toward the city's center, the "swarming" tendency, is begun in Salt Lake City, as it has begun in many other cities.

Outcome in Doubt.

Just what this means to the city is hard to say. Men who deal in property don't pretend to know what will come of it. They recognize it as a condition, and shift their plans to meet it. It will not come with a rush. It will be gradual, and yet it will bring great changes in a few years, judging by what it has done elsewhere.

As to the apartment house in Salt Lake City and how men and women live there, and as to its universal accompaniment, the flat building, it is worth while to note that the largest building of its kind in Salt Lake City is a good example of the apartment house as one sees it in the East. This building is six stories in height. It will, when open, house twenty-five families and twenty-five young married couples or bachelors. The rooms will be well-furnished, equipped with modern hotel conveniences. The place will have a dining-room, library and other accessories of comfort in short, the building will be so outfitted that the man who dwells there can get pretty much everything in the way of amusement and comfort within its walls. That means convenience, and convenience is what people look for nowadays. Several flat buildings have been erected this year. These are simply houses within houses—big structures subdivided into separate homes, each having its own kitchen, dining-room, parlor, bedrooms, etc.

Both apartment houses and flats, as they exist in Salt Lake City, enable men and women to live close to the business part of the town. That is one of the main reasons for their existence.

Changes Home Life.

There are many who deary this tendency. They say it destroys home life. Whether this be true or not, one thing is certain: it does change home life. It has done so elsewhere. It will, so say property dealers, do so here in Salt Lake City. The number of individual homes demanded will not increase as fast as the population. More families will live there; only thin walls separating them from their neighbors. More will come to live without dooryards and shade trees. With many, the day of the home as they know it in their childhood is to pass. Whether it be for good or for ill is a question still open for speculation among those who study such things, but at any rate the apartment house and the flat have come to Salt Lake, and their effect is already beginning to be felt.

Witnesses Leave for Washington.

Judge C. W. Morse, Judge William McCarthy of the Supreme court, William Hatfield, R. T. Burdett, and others left yesterday for Washington to testify in the Knott case. O. J. Salisbury, who was subpoenaed to testify, excused himself by making the trip, as his physician advised him to avoid the excitement that would necessarily be occasioned.

Programme for the Jackson Banquet

Local Democracy Will Honor the Memory of "Old Hickory" Tomorrow Evening.

At the Jackson day banquet to be given tomorrow night at the Commercial club, under the auspices of the Utah State Democratic committee, the following programme will be given:

Address, O. W. Powers, chairman committee of arrangements, and introducing Simon Hamberg, tomatist. Jackson, the soldier—"I give and bequeath to my nephew the elegant sword presented to me by the State of Tennessee, with this injunction, that he fails not to use it wisely and bravely in support and protection of our glorious Union, and for the protection of the constitutional rights of our beloved country, should they be assailed by foreign enemies or domestic traitors." Response—W. W. Hay.

Vocal solo, "Mighty Lak a Row" (O'Neill), Miss Leona Pratt. "Anglo-American" Brinnin—Love me, or love me not; hap what might hap My pride and prayers watch thy bright eyes beguile. Thou dost uphold the lessons learned from me, And speak of my Shakespeare's speech; and with Columbia—God go with thee, if thy foes too much fear, Than two great clouds in heaven that hold thee in their hands.

Response, H. H. Roberts. "After Democracy"—"The Flood." Response, H. R. MacMillan. "Women in Politics." "Casting with unpurposed hand" The vote that shakes the turrets of the land."

"When last we met, a century those progress has been most rapid. With the splendid advantages gained, the great liberalizing public sentiment for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner contended that selections by the State were subject to selections by private individuals, the State's right to the land, gained the moment it made its selections under the law, held precedence over subsequent selections for forest reserves, which the Commissioner cont