than is ordinarily paid for a glass of sherry or a cigar.

"Let no one call this a Utopian idea; for the idea has been realized already in Germany, where the cheapening of books has had more influence than is generally imagined in making the country what it is now. Thirty-four years ago, Herr Philipp Reclam, of Leipsic, founded his 'Universal Bibliothek.' I do not hesitate to say that this library is today one of the wonders of the world."

Mr. Clowes adds that his plan includes "the bringing up to date of various excellent works of reference and standard books that have ceased to be copyrighted, and the making of arrangements for the collecting, editing, and reprinting of much useful matter which appears from time to time in peroidical literature, general and scientific, and which, in the ordinary course of events, is never published in any other form." In addition, he says, he contemplates "the employment of a small staff of expert translators, and the offering of certain foreign writers of distinction a modest royalty on translations of their works."

Mr. Clowe's plan, to a limited extent as yet, has been followed by a Glasgow publishing house, Messrs. Gowan & Gray. Their first five volumes of their "Complete Library," published this spring, comprised the most complete and useful edition thus far published of the writings of Keats in poetry and prose, with introductions, notes and indexes that in their completeness and accuracy are invaluable to students of this great poet. The editor is the leading living Keats expert, Mr. Buxton Forman, who has devoted a lifetime to the loving investigation and exposition of the poet's life and writings. The binding and typography of these volumes are artistic and in every way excellent, involving the use in several instances of two colors. Yet the price in England is only a shilling per volume (twenty-five cents). The plan is to include all the chief poets and prose writers.

Davitt on Arbitration.

New York, Sept. 2.—The experience of compulsory arbitration in New Zealand may not offer to labor and capital in the United States an inducement to adopt the mediation of a similar law for the settlement of trade disputes.

The governmental, social and economic conditions are widely different. New Zealand has a total population of less than 800,000 people, with a single administration, corresponding with that of one of the states of your federal republic. Conflicting and co-operating interests are, therefore, less diverse and of far less magnitude there than here, while the application of a law of conciliation is rendered far easier and made more direct within the orbit of so small a community.

Still, the principle involved in a dispute between employers and employes is the same. The same interests of capital and labor are involved in a strike or a lockout, and the neutral or innocent interests of other industries and of various sections of the public are compromised and are made to suffer during the continuance of conflict. They are no parties to the original dispute and can gain nothing in a victory won by either side that will offer compensation for the losses sustained in the dislocation of trading or commercial connections resulting from the shutting down of works or of manufactories.

The state is, also, equally concerned in the small as in the great community in an industrial strife which may injure national interests and may provoke a disturbance of the public peace and cause a possible interruption of the sway of law. It was for these various reasons that a compulsory arbitration law was enacted in the New Zealand legislature in 1893.

This law, roughly speaking, operates as follows: If a strike is ordered by a trades union, or a lockout is decreed by employers, a machinery of legal arbitration, of a dual character, stands ready for intervention. A choice is left between a purely voluntary tribunal and one in which the state appoints the umpire and compels the hearing of the case in the interests of the whole community.

In the first place both sides may agree upon an umpire, who presides over a court which consists of an equal representation of the disputants, the law recognizing the right of federated capital and of organized labor to appear in court for their respective sides in the suit. Evidence is tendered on oath, as in ordinary legal proceedings, and the decision of the tribunal is made obligatory in the enforcement of a fine, should either side refuse to accept the verdict recorded.

Public opinion is invariably behind such verdict with its indorsement, with the result that neither side can afford to incur the censure of this "popular court of appeal" by disregarding the judgment given in the arbitral decision.

Where one or both sides in a dispute refuse to have voluntary recourse to an arbitration tribunal the law can command a hearing of the case before a judge of the high court. The side which might refuse to appear would run the risk of inviting an adverse judgment through default, and the fear of this probable penalty acts as an inducement to both sides to accept the intervention of the state as an impartial arbitration.

In almost every instance in which this compulsory arbitration law has been applied to, or set in motion, since its enactment a settlement satisfactory to both sides and approved of by the public has been the result.

The operation of the law so far has not been injurious to capitalistic interests, nor have trades unionists found it detrimental to their rights of combination in the working of such a law. The state has secured almost industrial peace, and public opinion, if not absolutely unanimous in its approval of the law, finds satisfaction in the cessation of active warfare between capital and labor.

A similar compulsory law would have to "grow," as it were, out of public opinion in this vast and complex racial community of 80,000,000 people. An experiment like that of New Zealand could not be so readily applied here, with your gigantic trust interests and your great labor combinations representing a thousandfold more wealth and mightier industrial organizations than all the British and capital of New Zealand combined.

But a similar principle is involved in the present strike. Labor, in its legally organized strength, declares itself injured in some of its interests or legitimate claims. Capital, in the exercise of its legal rights, asserts that the demands made upon it, on the part of its employes' representatives, are unreasonable and unfair, and a strike has ensued.

Is there no way out of this combat except by the barbarious method of a fight to a finish? Such a conflict has the all-round demerit of insuring (1) great loss of capital; (2) great sacrifices on the part of the workers; (3) the depletion of trades union funds; (4) continuous injury to "the innocent interests" of economically associated trades, and (5) the growing public concern for the national loss sustained by trade and commerce while the fight continues.

Surely a country which has already frightened a competitive industrial world by its inroads upon European markets ought to be able to devise some means, rational, fair and just all around, by which a settlement may be arrived at which will be equitable in its terms even should it not put the words "victors" or "vanquished" into the records of the strike.

A somewhat similar strike occurred in Liverpool in 1893. The strikers were the United Dock Laborers of Liverpool and the capitalists concerned represented the vast shipping interests of that great seaport. The fight was a remorseless one for a time. Neither side would give way, while the whole city and kindred interests suffered to the extent of millions by the dislocation of trade and commerce.

Peace was secured in this simple manner: A friend of the trades unionists called upon the active leaders of the shipping combination and asked them this simple question:

"Is it wise in you to see continued the daily loss of enormous wealth by Liverpool capitalists, to embitter the growing exasperation of ten thousand workers and to appear indifferent to the general injury done to the entire community in the conflict, rather than to consent to examine what is equitable in the demands of the dockers' union?"

This advice was followed. Such a rational consideration of the men's case was gone into. Just concessions were made, a compromise was arrived at and the strike was ended. All the union asked for was not conceded, but so reasonable was the agreement mutually consented to and so conciliatory was the attitude of the employers in meeting the workers more than half way that the terms of peace then laid down have prevailed ever since.—Michael Davitt, in Chicago American.

More Than One Way.

"Hello, central! Give me one triple nought, south."

"What?"

"Don't you catch it? One zero, zero, zero, south."

"Wh-a-t?"

"South one double nought nought."

"Can't you speak plainer?"

"One thousand, south—ten hundred, south. Get it now?"

"Oh, you mean south one ought double ought. All right."—Exchange.