

Catholic claims was not only begun at an early age but was continued till the last year of his life. He was a man of strong individuality, not always perfectly balanced in judgment, but highly respected and greatly beloved by a host of people.

✽

The publication of the correspondence between Lord Salisbury and Mr. Olney looking toward an agreement for a permanent tribunal of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain is in itself a significant sign of the friendly spirit now existing between the two nations, and of the sincerity of the efforts to reach a mutual understanding. So far as the correspondence in itself shows, this understanding is still in the future, though semi-official reports from Washington state that considerable advance has been made since the letters now published were written. It is to be noted as another sign of amicable feeling that with regard to the Venezuelan question (which is inevitably, though we think unfortunately, under consideration simultaneously with the broader question of international arbitration) the English diplomats show no disposition to resent the action of our Government in interfering between the two original disputants. On the contrary, Lord Salisbury has frankly admitted in Parliament that Great Britain has more than once acted in the same way, and he even expresses a preference for dealing with the United States rather than with Venezuela directly. He still maintains, however, that it is unfair to submit to arbitration British claims to territory upon which bona-fide British colonists have settled under the assurance that the land was part of the British Empire. To this Mr. Olney rejoins with acuteness and apparent reason that the fact that some settlers may have occupied certain lands in this way does not in the least affect the question of national title, and if the British claim is particularly strong with regard to this special territory, all the more readily should it consent to place those claims before a fair board of arbitrators. Thus the Venezuelan question is still apparently much where it was; but there are indications—notably Lord Salisbury's complimentary allusion to our own Commission—which lead to the belief that an agreement may soon be reached. At all events, it is clear that both parties desire such an agreement, and will zealously try to attain it.

✽

With regard to the general scheme of arbitration between the two countries, Lord Salisbury proposed a convention providing that each country should name two permanent judicial officers; that in case of a dispute each country should name one of these as an arbitrator, and the two named should select an umpire with final power of decision; that claims to be subject to final decision should be those for less than £100,000, and not involving sovereignty or territorial jurisdiction; that claims of this latter kind might be arbitrated, the decision to be subject to formal protest from either party, and appeal to a court composed of three of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Great Britain and three of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States; that a majority of not less than five to one in this court should be necessary to sustain a finding; that differences which in the judgment of either nation affected its national honor need not be submitted to arbitration except by special agreement. Mr. Olney's efforts were at once directed toward changing the provisions as to appeal from the original Court of Arbitration. He would allow the six members to add three to their number, and would make a bare majority vote of the Court decisive. He also strenuously argues that no question shall be excluded from consideration by the proposed

Court unless Congress or Parliament shall, by act or resolution, decide that the honor of the nation or the integrity of its territory or sovereignty is involved. Certainly, Mr. Olney's proposals give a more practical and workable scheme for arbitration, and (as we believe is right) tend to commit the nations beyond recall to an arbitration once agreed upon, while Lord Salisbury's views make arbitration easy in comparatively unimportant matters, but hedge it about with cautions as regards important matters. There is nothing whatever in the correspondence to indicate the presence of insuperable difficulties. On the contrary, there is everything to make us hope for a final reasonable, fair, and practical agreement. The object in giving the letters to the public has been to elicit the general feeling of the peoples of the two countries—a course as commendable as it is unusual in diplomacy. The public, through the press and by individual expressions, has warmly approved the progress made, and urges that the negotiations be carried on to a successful issue.

✽

The intensity of the political struggle in Belgium, reported from time to time in these columns, has been followed by something like a calm, and the recent elections for the Chamber of Deputies did not appear to arouse very great interest. The members of the Chamber are elected for four years, and half their number retire every two years. The body is made up of 152 members, and in the former Chamber these delegates were divided into 104 Clericals, 33 Socialists, and 15 Liberals, the Liberal party in Belgium having been almost destroyed at the previous election. The term Liberal, as it has been used in Belgium, represented the old-time individualism rather than the new-time Socialistic tendency. At the recent election the interest centered mainly in Antwerp and Brussels, where the size of the constituencies and the number of representatives who were voted for on a general list gave the election a general significance. The Liberals made their chief fight in Brussels, where they have practically taken the same ground as the Progressionists, who may be described as Radical Liberals with Socialistic leanings. The Liberals do not seem, however, to have succeeded in rehabilitating themselves, the latest reports indicating that the Ultra-Clerical group of the Catholic party will have a representation of 70 as against the representation of 58 in the former Chamber. The polling figures have not been telegraphed. At the last election 915,000 votes were cast for the various Catholic candidates, and 871,000 votes divided between the various groups of Liberals and Socialists. Apparently there has not been any marked change of opinion.

✽

As we go to press, the People's Party and Silver Conventions are assembled in St. Louis. The Silver Convention is certain to indorse the nominations made at Chicago, Senator Teller and his associates urging this policy in an open letter. The action of the People's Party Convention is still in doubt—the Southern wing being unwilling to fuse with the Democrats whom they have fought so long, and by whom they have been so obviously defrauded in many elections. If this Southern element stood alone in its opposition to fusion, the result would not be doubtful; but it is supported by Chairman Taubeneck, of the National Committee, and several other party managers, who insist that the party organization must be maintained at all hazards. Whatever the result at St. Louis, however, the bulk of the Populist party will doubtless fuse with the other silver forces. The anti-silver forces are likely to show an equally united front in the approaching campaign. The movement

initiated by the anti-silver Democrats of Illinois in favor of a third ticket does not seem to have grown. In New York State, where such a movement would naturally have the most strength, it is kept back by the unwillingness of Senator Hill and Tammany Hall to lose control of the "regular" Democratic organization. Neither the Senator nor the New York City machine seems to be able to decide what course to pursue. The State Committee has been called to meet after the Populist Convention, in the hope that definite action can then be taken. Meanwhile, more and more Democrats are daily deciding to vote for either Mr. McKinley or Mr. Bryan. In Massachusetts there seems no doubt that Mr. George. Fred Williams will be able to carry his party with him to the support of the Chicago ticket and platform. Two members of President Cleveland's Cabinet—Secretaries Herbert and Olney—have announced their determination not to support their party ticket, and it is reported that nearly every member of the Cabinet will vote for Mr. McKinley in November, unless an anti-silver Democrat is nominated. The confusion of old party lines could hardly be carried further.

The Republican Executive Committee has decided to maintain two campaign headquarters—one at New York, the customary place, and the other at Chicago, this year the center of the battle-field. The Democratic Executive Committee has practically decided to establish its headquarters at Washington, instead of New York, partly because it hopes for few campaign contributions from the latter city, but chiefly because campaign literature in the form of Congressional speeches can be mailed from Washington free of charge. The amount of work to be done by the campaign committees is enormous. The New York "Times" recently published a description of what it has amounted to in previous years. One committee of which the "Times's" contributor had some personal knowledge "printed and tried to put out 100,000,000 of documents." The man who had the contract to get out this work had only ten weeks in which to do it, and was "driven crazy" by the complications that arose. He was unable to secure presses enough of his own to turn out the work, and before the close of the campaign had to hire one man for the exclusive purpose of visiting the twenty or thirty other establishments to which he had been forced to turn for help. "The printers' bills aggregated dangerously near the two-hundred-thousand-dollar mark." The Committee on Printing has perhaps the principal work to perform, as it must select and edit the documents sent out—especially the campaign text-book for which the party is held so directly responsible. Another important committee is the "Bureau of Oratory," which arranges for the speeches of the campaign. Nearly all the speakers expect pay for their services as well as their traveling expenses, and their bills reach a high aggregate. Not a little work devolves upon the National Committee in the matter of looking after the press—especially the newspapers published in foreign languages, "nearly every one of whose editors is ready to espouse either side of the question for a consideration." As a rule, their support is secured by giving them standing orders for from 3,000 to 10,000 copies of each issue. These are the main avenues for the open expenditure of money. Besides these there are narrower but not straighter ways by which money is made effective. "Nearly every Committee establishes several secret bureaus which are located away from the headquarters themselves. There are bureaus for the workingmen, bureaus for the Swedes and voters of other nationalities, and even bureaus for the liquor-dealers, whose favor is generally courted by both parties.

Curiously enough, more than one Committee has maintained a temperance bureau contemporaneously with a liquor-dealers' bureau." "One Committee a few years ago is said to have used up \$1,900,000 in its existence of less than three months, but \$1,500,000 is probably nearer the average."

The Bimetallic League of Great Britain held its annual meeting last week. The report presented declared that the cause of international bimetallism had made substantial progress during the past year, and mentioned the resolutions adopted in the French, Belgian, and Prussian legislatures. "In the United States," it continued, "all parties and classes would welcome international bimetallism." The report concluded as follows: "The responsibility for the present and growing dangers to the industrial life of the nation rests upon those who oppose that monetary system under which our prosperity advanced by leaps and bounds." A letter was read from Lord Aldenham (Mr. Henry Huck Gibbs), ex-Governor of the Bank of England and President of the League, congratulating the members upon the great progress which had been made in the United States. "Whatever may be the result of the Presidential election," he said, "we may be sure that our cause generally is prospering." General Francis Walker, however, who differs with Lord Aldenham regarding the ability of any one nation to maintain a bimetallic system, took a more sober view of the situation here. "It is deeply to be regretted," he said, "that millions of our best citizens, as represented at the Chicago Convention last week, declared for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the action of other countries. This was done passionately, but the effect will be to maintain the gold standard unimpaired." Mr. McKinley, he assured the conference, was never a gold monometallist, and could not be if he tried. General Walker read the St. Louis currency resolution, which received hearty applause.

Another important strike in this city has been settled by arbitration, President Low, of Columbia, being this time the arbitrator. The strike was in the single establishment of J. J. Little & Co., but the parties to the dispute were the Typotheta—the organization of the employing printers—and Typographical Union No. 6, the principal organization of printing employees. These two organizations had through conference committees reached an agreement upon four of the seven demands made by the strikers. The remaining three, submitted to President Low, were as follows: (1) that the text of all publications be done entirely on piece or entirely on time; (2) that certain cuts be paid for at space rates; (3) that book and job rooms shall be recognized as "card" offices. President Low decided the first point in favor of the Typographical Union. He decided the second point in favor of a compromise suggested by the Typotheta. The third point was the most important one, and upon this President Low's decision was substantially as follows: To declare the office of J. J. Little & Co. to be a "card office," he said, was to declare that no one could be employed in it except members of the trade-union. As an arbitrator, he could not thus limit the right of an employer to select his employees. "No one," he said, "can compel union men, without their own consent, to work with non-union men. But it is a different thing to demand that an employer shall not be free to employ any but union men. It is no more reasonable for the union to demand that J. J. Little & Co. shall not be free to employ non-union men than it would be for J. J. Little & Co. to demand that the union should be deprived of the freedom to take in new members at its discretion."