

payment of the European claims, for the collection of which the war was begun. A joint meeting of the British, Italian and German representatives, with Mr. Bowen, was held on the 27th, at which, as reported, the latter explained the details of his proposals; and on the 28th, after another joint meeting, Mr. Bowen gave out the following statement:

We have been discussing to-night certain points which needed to be clearly understood. They have been referred to us for our consideration and our views will now be communicated at once to Rome, London and Berlin.

Although Mr. Bowen declines to discuss the details of his proposals, until the blockade shall have been raised, the Associated Press gathered from him that—

The proposals contemplate the administration of the guarantee customs collections by officials to be appointed by Belgium, that country being the creditor (not a naval power) having the greatest pecuniary aggregate of claims. No preference in liquidation is to be given to Germany, Great Britain and Italy, the 30 per cent. being set apart not only for the indemnities demanded by them but also claims of the United States, France, Belgium, Spain, Norway, Sweden and Holland, which have been preferred since the arrangement for paying prior claims in annual installments amounting to 30 per cent. of the Venezuelan customs revenue.

The Alaskan boundary question is believed in some quarters, though without much apparent reason, to have served as the means of bringing the European powers to Mr. Bowen's terms. This question has long been pending (vol. i, No. 47, p. 9). It rises out of a treaty between Great Britain and Russia, made in 1825, when Russia owned Alaska. Under that treaty the boundary line between Canada and Alaska, from the 130th to the 141st meridian was fixed to follow the coast 30 miles inland. This adjustment had little or no importance until the discovery of gold in the Alaskan region. But thereupon, the United States having meanwhile acquired Alaska from Russia, difficulties arose between American and Canadian prospectors and settlers as to the proper location of the boundary. Canadians claimed that the strip of American land 30 miles wide along the coast must be measured from the ocean coast, whence the three-mile limit to the high seas is measured. On the other hand Americans claimed that it must be meas-

ured from the literal coast line, following the course of its indentations. A joint Canadian-American commission was consequently agreed upon in May, 1897, its function being to frame a treaty between Great Britain and the United States adjusting all disputes including that over the Canadian boundary line. This commission adjourned in February, 1899, to the following August, without having accomplished anything final in character. The Canadian commissioners desired to submit the boundary question to the arbitration of a tribunal consisting of one distinguished jurist chosen by Great Britain, another chosen by the United States, and a third, an umpire, chosen by the other two. But that was not satisfactory to the Americans. They demanded a commission of six jurists, three to be selected by each country. They also insisted that existing American settlements on tide waters should remain within the jurisdiction of the United States even if the Canadian theory of the boundary line were in other respects to prevail; and to that the Canadians refused assent. No progress was made by the commission after the interim between its adjournment in February, 1899, and the adjourned day in August of the same year (vol. ii, No. 70, pp. 1, 2.) Upon its reassembling, the United States offered to accept the proposition of an umpire provided Canada would agree to take the umpire from a South American republic; but Canada refused this, insisting upon a European umpire. So the matter was left.

It has now been settled by a treaty signed at Washington on the 24th, and wholly in accordance with the views of the United States. Under this treaty the boundary question is to be submitted to an arbitration tribunal consisting of six commissioners, three to be selected by each side to the controversy. The issue is to be determined by a majority vote, thus making it necessary, in order to prevent a deadlock, for one of the two countries to win over at least one commissioner selected by the other. Moreover, whatever may be the decision of the arbitrators on the general question of boundary, all existing American settlements on tide waters are to remain within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Another important American treaty just signed relates to the Isthmian canal (p. 472), the representa-

tives of the United States of America and of the United States of Colombia having come to terms and signed the treaty at Washington on the 22d. The text of this treaty was made public by authority of the Senate on the 24th. It contains 28 articles. Article 1 authorizes the transfer by the Panama Canal company of all its rights, etc., to the United States. Article 2 makes a concession of right of way for 100 years, with privileges of perpetual renewal. Article 3 concedes a strip six miles wide to be policed, etc., by a joint commission of the two governments. Article 4 reserves to Colombia all general rights of sovereignty over the area ceded. Article 5 relates to the construction, maintenance, etc., of convenient terminals at each end of the canal. Articles 6 and 7 relate to details of construction, security, etc. Article 8 declares Panama and Colon free ports for goods destined for transmission through the canal, but reserves the right to Colombia to collect duties on imports. Articles 9 to 15 relate to details. Article 16 declares the canal and its entrance to be neutral territory in perpetuity. Article 17 gives to Colombia free right of way for military purposes. Articles 18 to 22 relate to details. Article 23 provides for protection against hostile attacks. Colombia is to provide military protection permanently, but—

if the government of Colombia cannot effectively comply with this obligation, then, with the consent of or at the request of Colombia, or of her minister at Washington, or of the local authorities, civil or military, the United States shall employ such force as may be necessary for that sole purpose, and as soon as the necessity shall have ceased will withdraw the forces so employed. Under exceptional circumstances, however, on account of unforeseen or imminent danger to said canal, railways or other works, or to the lives and property of the persons employed upon the canal, railways and other works, the government of the United States is authorized to act in the interest of their protection, without the necessity of obtaining the consent beforehand of the government of Colombia, and it shall give immediate advice of the measures adopted for the purpose stated; and as soon as sufficient Colombian forces shall arrive to attend to the indicated purposes those of the United States shall retire.

Article 24 requires the United States to begin construction within two years after ratification and to open the canal to inter-oceanic traffic within 12 years thereafter. Article

25 provides for the payment of \$250,000 in gold annually for the lease, beginning nine years after ratification, and \$10,000,000 in gold upon the exchange of ratifications. Articles 26 and 27 relate to details, and article 29 requires ratification within eight months from January 23, 1903. The treaty is signed in behalf of Colombia by Thomas Herran, and in behalf of the United States by John Hay.

The political crisis in Colorado (p. 664) has passed, the Democratic legislature having reelected Senator Teller to the United States Senate, and the Wolcott faction among the Republicans having acquiesced. The second vote on joint ballot was taken on the 22d by the House and the Democratic Senate, but without effect, Teller securing 50 votes—1 short of a majority. On the 23d the third ballot was taken, but with the same result. On the 24th, however, upon the fourth joint ballot, Mr. Teller received 51 votes, and Senator Adams, who presided, declared him elected. Mr. Wolcott stated his position on the following day, publicly announcing his withdrawal as a candidate and urging the people of Colorado to support the election of Teller. Following is his explanation:

There were three joint sessions of the general assembly. At the last one 51 Democrats voted for Teller. No other joint session had been held and no Republican had voted in a joint session. The election of Mr. Teller was tainted with fraud; first, in the trickery of adjournment by the Democrats of the House; second, in the arbitrary and fraudulent expulsion of two legally elected senators. There is, however, now no other legally constituted Senate, as might have been but for this conspiracy [referring to the alleged combination between Democrats and anti-Wolcott Republicans], and it is now too late to undo the wrong and by unseating the fraudulently-elected members from Arapahoe county insure the valid election of a Republican senator. Wicked and unforgivable as is the wrong done the Republican party, yet from the point of view of the highest citizenship there is but one thing to be done, and that is for the people to accept the deplorable situation and the governor of the state to issue a certificate of election to Mr. Teller.

In the American labor field the anthracite arbitration (p. 663) still drags on at Philadelphia. Its proceedings were enlivened on the 28th by an interchange of views between Mr. Darrow, counsel for the miners,

and Judge Gray, chairman of the arbitrators, over the demand of the former that the arbitrators invite the presidents of the coal roads and of the mining companies to appear and testify regarding restricted output. Mr. Darrow explained his demand thus:

There has been evidence offered here on the part of the operators for the purpose of showing that the miners have limited production in the last year. We believe the fact to be that the coal roads have placed a limit on production for many years. So long as they make the charge to this commission for the purpose of influencing its decision, I want them to bring into court for our examination the presidents of the roads so that we may find out the situation.

The demand was taken under advisement.

The miners' convention at Indianapolis (p. 664) adjourned on the 27th. During its sessions two or three political and economic questions of general interest came before it. One of these was raised by a resolution favoring the initiative and referendum. It was defeated on the ground that it would involve the mine workers in politics. Another came up on a resolution favoring government ownership of coal mines and railroads. A motion to table the resolution was defeated, but it was referred back to the committee on resolutions, which subsequently reported adversely. Still another arose upon a resolution indorsing international socialism, which was tabled. It received the support of 200 delegates. On the 26th a strong report of a special committee against "government by injunction" was adopted. The report instructs the committee making it to visit Washington and urge senators to vote for the anti-injunction bill now pending before the Senate. Also to report the record that every senator makes on that measure. The report bases its opposition to "government by injunction" on the ground that those injunctions operate to impair the right of trial by jury. It declares that, while many judges try causes that come before them conscientiously, there are many who do not hesitate to stretch the law in their eagerness to promote the interests of those who are in a position to assist them in securing wealth, power or notoriety; that judges are influenced by their associations, and that they move in social circles into which few workingmen ever enter. It also warns the general public that the

power that can crush the employes of a coal king or a railroad magnate can destroy the business and curtail the liberties of any citizen whenever it suits the purpose of that power to do so. John Mitchell was reelected as president. There was no opposition and he received 55,032 votes.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The death of the sultan of Sulu (p. 664) is now denied.

—Gov. Yates of Illinois has offered John Mitchell a place on the Illinois board of arbitration. Mr. Mitchell declines.

—The trial of Maj. Glenn before a court-martial at Manila, charged with murdering native guides (p. 634), came to an end on the 24th. A verdict was then rendered, but its nature and effect have not yet been divulged.

—Judge William R. Day, of Canton, O., formerly President McKinley's law partner and later secretary of state under President McKinley, who afterwards appointed him United States district judge of Ohio, has been offered by President Roosevelt the place on the supreme bench of the United States which is about to be vacated by Judge Shiras. Judge Day has accepted the offer.

—Col. Arthur Lynch, on trial in London for high treason in having while a British subject become a naturalized citizen of the South African Republic, (p. 665), was convicted on the 23d and sentenced to death. The court held that the oath of allegiance to a British enemy, taken as a condition of naturalization, constituted the treasonable act. Lynch's sentence was commuted on the 27th to penal servitude for life.

—The "get coal" conference (p. 648), called by Mayor Maybury of Detroit, met at Washington on the 27th. It was attended by delegates from 19 states and was presided over by Senator Mason. The resolutions adopted declare that companies in the form of trusts and conspiracies exist in restraint of trade, especially in the production, transportation, distribution and sale of coal; that they tend to create a monopoly of one of the necessities of life, occasioning suffering to millions; that combinations and conspiracies exist between transportation companies whereby special rates, rebates, etc., are allowed some shippers, and exorbitant rates charged others; that these conspiracies are in violation of the interstate commerce and anti-trust acts; and that it is the duty of the Federal district attorneys, under the direction of the attorney general, to institute legal proceedings to secure the punishment of the conspirators.