

islands, and serious land title disputes have arisen between the French and British inhabitants. These are to be decided by a joint commission to be appointed by the two governments under the treaty just signed.

Some portions of Siam, another of the subjects of this Franco-British treaty, have been a French protectorate since 1893. An arrangement was made in 1896 between France and Great Britain whereby they guaranteed to Siam the integrity of the territory embraced in the basins of the Megam, the Meklong, the Pechaburi and the Bangpakong rivers, together with the coast from Muong Bang Tapan to Muong Pase, including also the territory lying to the north of the Menam basin, between the Anglo Siamese border, the Mekong river, and the eastern watershed of the Me Ing. It is needless to say that this guaranty of territorial integrity was, as usual, for the benefit of the two European powers rather than the protection of the native people. But friction has resulted, and the present treaty is to determine amicably between these powers the precise meaning of the treaty of 1896 with reference to the matters in dispute.

Regarding Newfoundland, another subject of this new treaty, the island is under British jurisdiction; but by the treaty of Utrecht, 1713, France retains some fishery rights which she has insisted upon as exclusive, thereby perpetuating ill-feeling among the inhabitants and disturbing amicable relations between the two European powers. Under the treaty just reported, France relinquishes her claims to exclusive fishery rights, in consideration of indemnities to the private owners. Some additional adjustments of disputes are made.

So much of the new treaty as relates to West Africa is supplemental to the Franco-British treaty of 1898-99, which provided for the determination of the respective possessions and spheres of influence (vol. i, No. 8, p. 10, and No. 11, p. 10) of these two Powers in that part of Africa. By this supplementary adjustment France acquires access to the Zambesi river where

it is navigable by ocean-going vessels, she secures certain islands on the Lagos coast, and she is to have the benefit of such a readjustment of the frontier line between the river Niger and Lake Tchad as will open up to her a fertile country her claims to which Great Britain has hitherto disputed.

Egypt and Morocco are the other portions of Africa to which this Franco-British treaty relates. Great Britain has occupied Egypt for a quarter of a century under pledges to withdraw when a stable Egyptian government should have been established there. France has not been inclined to look with satisfaction on the failure of Great Britain to redeem these pledges. But by the treaty now reported France appears to acquiesce in the British occupation of Egypt in consideration of Great Britain's approval of the French pressure (vol. iii, p. 152, vol. vi, p. 152) upon Morocco. In making their concession regarding Morocco the British exact of France an agreement not to erect any fortifications on the Morocco coast between Melilla and the mouth of the Sebu river, it being the object of the British in this respect to retain exclusive control of the mouth of the Mediterranean.

Reports of another collision of German troops with Hereros in German Southwest Africa (vol. vi, p. 809) have been received. It occurred at Oksharui on the 2d, and lasted more than three hours. The Hereros were at last driven off, leaving 92 dead behind them. The German losses were 33 killed and 16 wounded.

The British expedition into Thibet (p. 9) was virtually approved by Parliament on the 13th. After a debate, the use of Indian troops in connection with the "political mission into Thibet" was sanctioned by a vote of 270 to 61. Mr. Balfour, the premier, explained in the course of the debate that the mission has no ulterior objects and that the last thing the Ministry desires is to add to its Indian frontier responsibilities. A dispatch from Col. Younghusband, the leader of the expedition, was read on the floor by Mr. Broderick. It was to the effect that Col. MacDonald, in command of the escort, reached

his goal, Gyantse, Thibet, on April 11, without the loss of a man, and that the Thibetans, highly demoralized, were fleeing from the Gyantse valley.

An incident of the Mexican war with the Yaqui Indians (vol. v, p. 171) recalls the fact that this conflict of generations still drags its bloody length along. The chief of the Yaquis, Manuel Guavesi, who was identified among prisoners captured early this month by the Mexicans in an engagement near Bolomote, was shot off-hand by his captors under orders from the captain in command.

The war in Colorado (vol. vi, p. 822) has reached the stage of a conflict between the judicial and the military authorities of the State. Upon the arbitrary arrest and deportation of Charles H. Moyer, president of the Western Federation of Miners, by the militia at Telluride, Judge Theron Stevens, of the district court at Ouray, issued a writ of habeas corpus for Moyer, directing it to Gen. Bell and Capt. Wells, in whose custody Moyer was alleged to be. They refused to obey the writ; whereupon, on the 11th, Judge Stevens imposed a fine upon them for contempt and issued an attachment for their arrest. In taking this action Judge Stevens spoke from the bench, saying—

A grave question is presented as to whether it is the striking miners or the Governor of Colorado and the national guard that are engaged in insurrection and rebellion against the laws of the State. If there is to be a reign of military despotism in this State and civil authority is to have no jurisdiction, the latter might as well go out of business.

Referring to Judge Stevens's action, Gov. Peabody is reported from Denver as saying:

We shall not recognize the attachment writ, neither shall we obey it, and Adj. Gen. Bell and Capt. Bulkeley Wells will not report in court. The military is not subject to writs of attachment or injunctions. If we recognized the action of Judge Stevens there would be no reason why any justice of the peace could not exercise equal authority and issue writs controlling movements of the military, and thus rendering martial law absolutely impotent and inoperative.

Gen. Bell's reported comment was as follows:

If Sheriff Corbett takes us to Ouray it will have to be over the dead bodies

of all the soldiers under my command in this county. He has not got men enough to do that. The situation demands that we stay in Telluride. Mr. Moyer will never be produced in court until Gov. Peabody orders me to do so unless he escapes and goes over the range on snow shoes.

The sheriff essayed to serve the attachments on the 13th, but after conferring with Gen. Bell and Capt. Wells at a dinner, he decided to abandon that purpose.

In the Presidential politics of the United States (p. 8), news of the most important State convention of the Republicans is at hand. It was held at New York city on the 13th, and Senators Platt and Depew, Gov. Odell and ex-Gov. Black were named as delegates at large from the State of New York. There was no discord in any particular, the action of the convention being absolutely harmonious. The convention endorsed Roosevelt for the party's Presidential candidate, and instructed the delegates at large to support him; but it did not instruct the district delegates, its omission to do so being explained by Gov. Odell as follows:

Since 1880, when we abandoned the plan of selecting the district delegates, the State convention has not, and, indeed, cannot, instruct the district delegates. This direction of the convention to the delegates at large to secure Mr. Roosevelt's nomination is the strongest possible way in which the matter could be put.

The only Democratic State convention of the week was that of Kansas, which met at Wichita on the 7th. It endorsed—

the Chicago platform of 1896 and the Kansas City platform of 1900,—

expressed—

appreciation of and admiration for the candidate of our choice in two great campaigns, the Hon. W. J. Bryan.—

avored—

the nomination by the next Democratic convention of men for President and Vice-President who are in sympathy with these principles and who supported the candidates who represented them.—

and declared that—

In William R. Hearst we recognize one of the foremost Democrats of the nation. He uses his great opportunities and

power in all cases in behalf of the common people without counting the cost to himself. His single-handed contest with the coal trust, just successfully concluded in the Supreme Court, is the most signal triumph of Democratic principles since the trusts seized the business of the country. We indorse the work he is doing in the interest of his party and his country, and commend his example to good Democrats everywhere.

Of the 20 delegates elected by the convention, 10 are pledged to Hearst. No attempt to pass a vote of instructions was made, a compromise agreement having been effected between the Hearst and the anti-Hearst men to make no effort to secure a vote for instructions of any kind. David Overmeyer, chairman of the delegation, though an anti-Hearst man, is also what is known as an "anti-reorganizer," as are most of the delegates.

What is evidently regarded by Democratic leaders as a triumph in tactics which may play an important part in the Presidential campaign is the concession by the Republicans of the Senate of a full investigation into the affairs of the post office department. The Republicans of the lower House had refused to permit such an investigation; but when the post office appropriation bill came before the Senate the Democratic members of that body, taking advantage of its liberal rules of debate, forced a compromise. They refused to permit the appropriation bill to pass until the Republican senators agreed to a complete investigation of the department.

NEWS NOTES.

—Isabella, former Queen of Spain and grandmother of the present king, died at Paris, France, on the 9th.

—The state council of Switzerland unanimously adopted a bill on the 8th making the glorification of anarchist crimes punishable by imprisonment.

—Two thousand pounds of powder exploded in the aft turret of the United States battleship *Missouri* during target practice at Pensacola, Fla., on the 13th, and killed five officers and 25 men.

—On the 8th the committee on labor of the lower House of Congress refused to endorse the long pending 8-hour bill, but recommended referring it to the Department of Commerce and Labor.

—The Supreme Court of the United States decided on the 11th that the or-

der of 1902 of the Postmaster General, excluding from second class mail privileges books published periodically, is valid.

—A referendum system on the granting of street franchises has been adopted, by a majority of 4 to 1, by the city council of Houston, Texas. J. J. Pastoriza led in the agitation for it and it was bitterly opposed by the local street franchise corporations.

—The Supreme Court of Kansas decided on the 9th in the case regarding religious exercises in the public schools (vol. vi, p 804) that the particular exercise complained of in that case, repeating the Lord's Prayer preparatory to regular studies, does not constitute religious worship.

—In Congress on the 9th Bourke Cockran moved a resolution of inquiry into the pension-office order making old age a pensionable disability, for the purpose of determining whether it is a usurpation of legislative powers. After a debate, in which Cockran made a powerful speech, the resolution was tabled by 103 to 100, three Republicans voting with 97 Democrats against tabling.

—Before the United States Supreme Court at Washington on the 6th and 7th, the habeas corpus case of John Turner, ordered to be deported as an anarchist immigrant (vol. vi, p. 826), was argued for Mr. Turner by Edgar L. Masters and Clarence S. Darrow, of Chicago. Decision was reserved and may not be rendered for several weeks or even months. Mr. Turner is announced to speak at 27 N. Clark street, Chicago, on the 17th at eight p. m.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE PRESIDENCY.

Clay's (Denver) Review (Ind.), Apr. 9.—A week ago Judge Alton Parker had a probable chance of being nominated for President and a barely possible chance of being elected. To-day all this is changed. Grover Cleveland has come out for him. The natural consequence is, he is no longer in the running.

New Orleans Harlequin (Ind.), Apr. 7.—Bryan, Hearst, Tom Johnson—these are your Democrats—your genuine article. Grover isn't a Democrat. He is a stomach. Parker isn't a Democrat. He is a ladada. Hill isn't a Democrat—and it grieves me to say so of a man who has often said he is one—he's a self.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Apr. 7.—Mr. Cleveland says Judge Parker is an admirable candidate. There is danger in such testimony and praise, for what is meat to the reorganizers is poison to the anti's. But aside from this, may not "real and intelligent Democrats" ask for a bill of particulars from Judge Parker's friends?

(Pendleton, Ore.), East Oregonian (Dem.), Apr. 5.—Roosevelt not having a million dollars to give for the nomination for President, must seek it from outside sources. Hearst, having it, is willing to pay the price. What is the difference in the tactics? Is it any more reprehensible for Hearst to spend a million dollars of his own for the office, than it is for Roosevelt to spend a million of Carnegie's money for the same