

DISCUSS BELMONT GIFT

Suffragists Both for and Against Its Acceptance.

DAY DEVOTED TO CAUCUSES

Miss Forbes-Robertson, of England, Addresses Meeting—Other Speeches.

[From The Tribune Bureau.] Washington, April 17.—The delegates to the convention of the National American Woman Suffrage Association devoted today to caucuses and board meetings, the main subject of discussion being the proposal of Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont to contribute \$5000 a month to the work of the association on condition that it shall be used for specified purposes. This matter will not be finally settled until a legal contract has been drawn up and signed by the executive board, and therefore the way is still open for the refusal of the gift. As the administration is supporting the Belmont alliance, and the opposition is against it, the matter is closely bound up with the election which takes place to-morrow, and with the future policy of the organization. Mrs. John B. Henderson, member of ex-Speaker Henderson, entertained the officers of the association at luncheon, and Senator and Mrs. La Follette entertained Miss Beatrice Forbes-Robertson, of England. Miss Forbes-Robertson addressed a mass meeting at the Belasco Theatre in the afternoon, and said that arguments against woman suffrage were mostly cloaks to hide the one real objection, which is a sentimental opinion of what the position of woman should be. "The world," she said, "has got an ancient idea of woman which is embodied in the lines: Golden Locks, Golden Locks, will thou be mine? But thou wilt wash dishes, nor yet feed the swine. But sit on a cushion and sew up a seam. And take nice strawberries, water and cream. You cannot kill this idea with facts or logic. You can only drive it out by putting something more beautiful in its place." Elizabeth Abrahm Simon offered prayer at the beginning of the meeting, which was presided over by the Rev. Anna Howard Shaw, of Chicago. Mrs. Anna Howard Shaw, of Kentucky, told the delegates that what they needed was a new element of character, courage. Harriet May Mills, of New York, spoke of the troubles of the suffragists in the New York Legislature. Miss Forbes-Robertson and Ella Sears Stewart, of Chicago, gave a classification of the opponents of woman suffrage. Charlotte Perkins Gilman wrote some poetry in behalf of the cause on the stage, while the others spoke, and then read it with the explanation, not that she meant to reflect on those who had preceded her, but that none might go away and say they had nothing to do with the subject. The British and American classification of opponents was radically different. According to the British speaker they were really divided into two classes—those who are prejudiced against the movement, and those who believe it inexpedient to give suffrage to women. While touching on the subject of expediency, the speaker said it was neither necessary nor expedient for American women to go to jail in behalf of the cause. The American classification puts the opponents into three classes, designated as the ghosts, the owls or hooters, and the complacent standers. Among those of the ghosts feared, according to the speaker, were the ghost "only had women voted," the one that the women would deprive the men of their darling vices; that the women would do nothing else but vote; that they would not vote at all. Another figure in the meeting was Harriet Taylor Upton, of Ohio. As treasurer of the association she took up a collection, protesting, however, that her puritanical training led her to object to working on Sunday.

Gold Locks, Golden Locks, will thou be mine? But thou wilt wash dishes, nor yet feed the swine. But sit on a cushion and sew up a seam. And take nice strawberries, water and cream.

You cannot kill this idea with facts or logic. You can only drive it out by putting something more beautiful in its place.

Elizabeth Abrahm Simon offered prayer at the beginning of the meeting, which was presided over by the Rev. Anna Howard Shaw, of Chicago.

Charlotte Perkins Gilman wrote some poetry in behalf of the cause on the stage, while the others spoke, and then read it with the explanation, not that she meant to reflect on those who had preceded her, but that none might go away and say they had nothing to do with the subject.

The British and American classification of opponents was radically different. According to the British speaker they were really divided into two classes—those who are prejudiced against the movement, and those who believe it inexpedient to give suffrage to women.

While touching on the subject of expediency, the speaker said it was neither necessary nor expedient for American women to go to jail in behalf of the cause.

The American classification puts the opponents into three classes, designated as the ghosts, the owls or hooters, and the complacent standers.

Among those of the ghosts feared, according to the speaker, were the ghost "only had women voted," the one that the women would deprive the men of their darling vices; that the women would do nothing else but vote; that they would not vote at all.

Another figure in the meeting was Harriet Taylor Upton, of Ohio. As treasurer of the association she took up a collection, protesting, however, that her puritanical training led her to object to working on Sunday.

PRISONERS FIGHT FLAMES

Many Buildings, Including Jail, Burned at Hyde Park, N. Y.

Hyde Park, N. Y., April 17.—Driven by a strong wind, a fire which started in the county jail here to-day spread into the jail, courthouse, town hall, the Congregational Church, one store and thirteen houses of tenements had been laid in ashes. Twenty families are homeless. The damage is estimated at \$100,000.

Originating presumably from a defective stovepipe between the first and second stories of the county jail, the fire gained headway so rapidly that efforts to save the building were soon seen to be useless and attempts were directed to endangered neighboring structures. The two prisoners, both minor offenders, whom the jail held were released, and turned to with a will to fight the flames.

Help was summoned from Morristown, Johnson and Stone, all of which towns sent their entire fire fighting forces to the aid of Hyde Park, which is the county seat of Lamoille County. Their combined efforts, however, could not prevent the spread of the flames for several hours. When finally under control an area half a mile long on the main street had been swept by the fire.

The records of the county and of the Probate Court are in a vault in the courthouse and their condition is unknown. It is believed, however, that they will be found unharmed. The town records were not damaged, as they were not in the town hall, but at the home of the Town Clerk, some distance away.

BANKER'S AUTO INJURES BOY

Arthur Ostrow, sixteen years old, of No. 22 West 84th street, was knocked down and received a broken jaw and other injuries by the automobile of Edward J. Laidlaw, a banker, of No. 22 Riverside Drive, at 22d street and Fifth avenue, last night. Besides Mr. Laidlaw, there were in the machine the chauffeur and Randall H. Macdonald, of No. 22 Riverside Drive. With the assistance of Patrick and other neighbors, the injured boy was placed in the ambulance and hurried to the New York Hospital, where it was expected he would recover. The chauffeur, Blinkey Prunty, of No. 219 East 22d street, was arrested and his employer hurried to the night court to give bail for him.

TWO DEAD IN FEUD

Father and Son Killed and Several Others Wounded.

Louis, Ga., April 17.—Two dead, one dying and probably one or two others slightly wounded are the results of a Sunday afternoon battle in a family feud of long standing which took place late to-day in Emanuel County. The dead are A. S. Collins, a well-to-do farmer, and his son, Wilson Collins. Marion Lewis is so badly wounded that he is expected to die at any moment.

The battle was between the families of Collins and Lewis, and was the outcome of a dispute over a public road crossing. The two families reside less than a mile apart, and the county line runs between their homes. They met in a lane this afternoon near the Lewis home. The members of the Collins family were armed with pistols, while two shotguns were used on the other side.

Joseph Lewis, father of Marion Lewis, is alleged to have fired the shot that ended the life of the elder Collins. To-night, however, he would make no statement. The sheriffs of both Towns and Emanuel counties have gone to the scene of the trouble, accompanied by physicians.

It was learned that a dozen or more shots were fired. Except Marion Lewis, the others who were wounded are not seriously hurt.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS BLESSED

Washington, April 17.—For the first time in the history of the Knights of Columbus in this country public recognition by the Vatican was given to the order when Archbishop Falconio, Papal delegate to the United States, to-day transmitted the Papal blessing to the Knights. The Archbishop celebrated mass for the members of the order at St. Paul's Church.

WARM FIGHT IN D. A. R.

Trouble Over Dismissal of Headquarters' Clerk.

SUIT FOR REINSTATEMENT

Women to Have Recourse to the Courts to Settle Their Differences.

[From The Tribune Bureau.] Washington, April 17.—If any of the Daughters of the American Revolution came to Washington for the annual continental congress, which opens to-morrow in Continental Hall, their national headquarters, with the idea that peace was still possible between its warring factions, they have now abandoned it. Having found it impossible to settle their own difficulties, the Daughters are now going into court. Lawyers are being engaged on both sides, and as soon as the continental congress adjourns, Miss Agnes Gerald, the headquarters clerk whose case has been made a party issue, will bring suit to compel her reinstatement. Meanwhile, by advice of counsel, she will continue to report for duty every day, as she has been doing ever since her dismissal.

Miss Gerald rests her case on the contention that the president general has not the right to dismiss an employe without the sanction of the executive board. Mrs. Scott's supporters say that even if the courts take this view of the matter it will not affect the present case, for, though the president general dismissed Miss Gerald on her own responsibility, the board has now endorsed her action.

This was done at a stormy meeting on Saturday, when Mrs. Scott bitterly arraigned the opposition as "disloyal and obstructive," and at the same time Mrs. Mary Wilcox, recording secretary general, was censured for refusing to remove Miss Gerald's name from the payroll. The vote stood 24 for Mrs. Scott and 14 against, while eight refrained from voting. The Gerald supporters quote legal authority for the contention that not only all those who voted to uphold Mrs. Scott but those who refrained from voting are liable for the action against the dismissed employe. Miss Gerald has placed her case in the hands of L. Cabell Williamson.

The Scott party has been endeavoring to test the strength of the opposition by calling for votes of indorsement at a number of preliminary meetings. The Continental Hall committee as well as the executive board gave the administration a vote of confidence, but the District of Columbia committee failed to do so, because, it is said, of an interruption by Mrs. A. Guss, which caused the adjournment of the meeting before the motion could be made. Mrs. Scott promptly retaliated by dismissing Mrs. Guss from the committee on which she had been serving. Mrs. Guss, who formerly supported the administration party, has now gone over to the insurgents. She had been serving to add to the peace and harmony of the occasion.

The New York State society is also taking legal advice. There is a contest as to the legality of the election of the vice-regent, Mrs. Joseph King, and the regent, Mrs. Joseph Ward, has announced that she will cut off all discussion and insist on another election. Mrs. Nellie Rich was elected vice-regent, but, being led to believe that she could not hold this office and that of a chapter regent at the same time, she retired, and threw her votes to Mrs. King. Finding later that she had acted under a misapprehension, she declared herself legally elected.

Mrs. Theodore Bates, of Massachusetts, gave a dinner this evening for Mrs. Scott. Mrs. Donald McLean being one of the guests.

WHO OWNS EL PASO LAND?

Rio Grande's Shifting Channel Raises Diplomatic Question.

MANY MILLIONS INVOLVED

Controversy Over Whether Eroded Territory Was Acquired by Erosion or Accretion.

Washington, April 17.—The shifting channel of the Rio Grande is responsible for the present diplomatic controversy over the question whether the extreme southern section, valued at several million dollars, of the city of El Paso, Tex., on the Mexican frontier, does not really belong on the Mexican side of the boundary line. The land involved, which is known locally and in the State Department as the Chamizal zone, and over which the United States has always exercised jurisdiction, is about one and one-half miles long and about five blocks wide. It contains a large number of residences, owned and occupied principally by Mexicans.

El Paso never had considered the Mexican claims seriously until the meeting of President Taft and President Diaz in El Paso a year ago, when it was agreed that the disputed territory for that particular occasion should be regarded as a neutral zone. The citizens of El Paso regarded this agreement as of the highest consequence, in that it tended to recognize that Mexico might have a claim to the territory, and steps immediately were taken to obtain a settlement of the whole matter, as real estate values in the section involved were becoming seriously affected.

Citizens of El Paso, including the Mayor of the city, visited the State Department some weeks ago and urged Secretary Knox to dispose of the questions at issue as soon as possible, representing that the delay in fixing this bit of international boundary had already depressed the value of property lying within the zone. Secretary Knox gave assurances that he would take up the matter immediately with Mexico, and it was his hope that a conclusion might be reached within the next few weeks.

The treaty of peace with Mexico, which followed the war of 1846-48, in fixing the boundary along the Texas frontier, provided that the channel of the Rio Grande should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely fickle regarding keeping its original course, and it was agreed that, in the case of a change in the course of the river by accretion, the territory gained by either should be the boundary line, but in supplementary boundary conventions, essentially new courses in the section were recognized, those of 1851 and 1852, the fact was recognized that the Rio Grande River was extremely f