

genius of Utah, is something which we are trying to crowd down the throats of this convention, that California came here as the physician to medicate this Congress; whereas the fact is that California sat as a patient in the committee on resolutions last night, and without a protest swallowed the pill administered by Dr. Utah. Now, there is the manner in which the question of good faith is raised, and I raise it as a general criticism and not as a personal application; and I say that every gentleman of the Utah delegation will justify me, perhaps not in my phraseology, which is never fortunate nor happy, but in the intention that lay behind it in the sentiment that I expressed.

Mr. Newlands—

"The members of the Congress regard it as a great misfortune that the disagreement should have occurred between the delegations for which they hold so great respect; the entire convention was indebted to the California delegation for the intelligence and zeal which they have shown here, and they are also greatly indebted to the Utah delegation for the generous manner in which they have surrendered the control of the proceedings to the convention, for the modesty which they have exhibited and for the abundant hospitality with which they have greeted them to their city.

As a member of the committee on platform, I wish to say that the chairman of the committee was a little over-zealous in making the charge of bad faith against the Utah delegation. It is true that Mr. Goodwin did dictate the language of this resolution with reference to the public schools, but it seems to me that in doing so he did not express the views of his delegation, and it was the right of his delegation, if they saw fit to modify them, to alter the expressions.

The convention was here for the purpose of deliberation and not for the purpose of establishing technical rules which would stop any delegation from expressing its views upon any plank in the platform. If the Utah delegation had failed to receive the proper expression of its views in the platform made by the committee, it has a right to be heard and ask for the correction.

It had been stated that the State of California had three million dollars in its school fund and the State of Nevada had eight hundred thousand dollars. How was the money obtained? By the sale of land granted by the government to these States.

Utah says that it has not received the benefit of such a grant and that if the entire public domain is granted the arid States and Territories with the sole proviso that the proceeds of the sale of arid lands should be applied only to reclamation purposes, that their school fund would be deprived of the benefit which every other State was enjoying and then claim that the resolution ought to be so shaped as to permit the legislature of Utah to utilize all its grant as it sees fit, either in the reclamation of the lands or in the promotion of education, or of both, according to its wisdom, thus placing the State of Utah, when it assumes statehood, upon an equality with the States of California and Nevada.

There is propriety in the claim, and whatever view the convention may

ultimately take of the question, these delegates who have remembered us with such kindness and courtesy and with such public spirit and modesty should have every opportunity of expressing their views with reference to the interests of Utah.

Mr. Thomas—Now, gentlemen of the convention, I want to say this: that if I have done anything I am sorry for I am willing to be forgiven.

Mr. Stanger (Colorado)—Governor Thomas, before you leave the stand will you permit me to ask you a question? I think it is pertinent to the question under discussion and not for explanation.

Mr. Thomas—With pleasure.

Mr. Stanger—You say that Utah has derived the benefit of the granted lands?

Mr. Thomas—It has derived none, and never can get any.

Mr. Stanger—Why? That is what I asked—excuse my ignorance.

Mr. Thomas—I thought I made it clear in my opening address why Utah has never obtained any benefit from the donation of public lands which is usually made to States and Territories. The reason is this: The arable lands in Utah are found in the valleys which run through the Territory, and the settlers coming into the Territory in 1847, before the land office was opened in March 1869, had taken all the arable land up that could be cultivated without great expense. Consequently the reserved school sections remaining are found on these mountain tops; they are worthless, they are scattered, here and there, and you can realize nothing from them.

Mr. Stanger—Colorado avoided that by having Congress give them those lands.

Mr. Thomas—Colorado is a great State, and Utah is only a Territory.

Mr. Newlands—Colorado has them for school purposes, but suppose Congress makes a grant of all the lands in this Territory to Utah simply for reclamation purposes, then there is an entire dedication of the lands to that purpose, and there is no possibility of securing a school fund.

Mr. Thomas—That is the point.

THE EASTERN QUESTION.

It is now accepted as a well authenticated fact that a British force has not, as reported, taken possession of Sigr harbor, on the Island of Mitylene, as a strategic point to enable England to control the mouth of the Dardanelles. It is evident, however, that the alleged picnic of British officers on the island, was a feint manoeuvre for the purpose of causing the publication of a reported seizure to go abroad. The object in view was evidently two-fold—to ascertain what effect such an act would have upon the powers in case it should be necessary to resort to it; it was also perhaps intended as a deterrent to Russia, who appears to have started upon an active resumption of her traditional policy of aggrandizement.

To our view the eastern question is much more likely to cause a gigantic war in Europe than is the enmity existing between Germany and France. The latter country is reluctant to fight, because if she were successful in a strug-

gle there would doubtless be a revolution. The man who led the French armies to victory would become the idol of the people and they would force him, whether he might will or no, to be their Dictator, virtually changing the Republic to a monarchy. Another danger would be that in case of defeat, the populace of France would demolish their form of government anyway, as it would be pronounced a failure. In addition, in the event of war arising out of the Franco-German question, the Socialists of France would foment revolution while her armies were in the field. It is clear that what there is of wisdom in France will cause that country to avoid war as long as possible. Germany is also in an uncomfortable position on the same subject. Should hostilities break out between herself and France, it would appear from the understanding existing between the last named country and Russia that she would be placed between the upper and nether millstones. While France could throw her forces into Germany from the south, Russia could do the same thing from the north.

The eastern question has been the source of a number of bloody wars already. The latest of these were the Crimea of 1854—in which France was an ally of England—and the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78. Over the latter there was much European diplomacy, which culminated in the Berlin Congress of the powers and the notable treaty which was virtually the work of the late Lord Beaconsfield, who carried nearly every one of the points on which he insisted.

The policy of Russia toward aggrandizement is operated under her claim to be the protector of the Christian populations of the Turkish area. The same power also insists that she is the heir-in-chief of the "Sick Man," as Turkey is usually designated. Since 1854 the area affected by the eastern question has extended and may now be said to include Asia Minor, Persia, Turkestan, Afghanistan, Egypt and India. The movements of Russia affect the interests of Great Britain more than those of any other country. This is the reason why she is at present comparatively isolated on the subject. She has called upon the powers who signed the treaty relating to the non-passage of ships of war through the Dardanelles to aid her in putting a stop to the encroachments of Russia. The reply is not encouraging. The governments to whom the application for aid is made, favor the maintenance of a policy of non-interference.

It is not clear that war will be the immediate result of the situation. That it will sooner or later grow out of the eastern question there is little room for intelligent doubt. It would look like madness on the part of any of the powers to plunge Europe into a bloody struggle just now, even if there were no other preventive cause than the condition of the crops in the Old World. The harvests are practically a failure over the continent. The opening of sanguinary international strife when the masses are in distress for want of bread would be worse than insanity. War is always one of the worst conceivable calamities. When it is associated with famine and conse-