

plaintiff and defendant will reappear, and there will arise another series of courts of justice with the same powers now exercised by those which we have. The Bryan arbitration by compulsion plan must of course have power to enforce its judgments for why compel an unwilling and unconsenting party to appear unless the finding can be enforced?

It will be noticed that he speaks of corporations and their employees as if no differences ever arise between individual capital and the labor it employs! That is the demagogue way of putting it, and Mr. Bryan cannot change his habits and methods. Let us accept his idea of compulsory arbitration, which is a paradox to juggle with and therefore suits him. When corporate capital and its labor differ labor will have the right to force the corporation to arbitrate, but that right will be valueless unless the despised corporation can be compelled to submit to the judgment. If labor want \$2 a day instead of \$1.50 the corporation must be compelled to take back its employees and pay them \$2. If it cannot be made to do this Mr. Bryan's paradox of compulsory arbitration is to labor a delusion and a snare, and to capital an idle and idiotic threat. But, if labor can compel capital to arbitrate and to submit to judgment, under the same compulsory processes capital can compel labor to arbitrate and submit to judgment. If capital can be forced to take men back into its employ at a wage fixed by arbitration, men can be compelled to work for capital at a wage fixed by arbitration. How will labor look at that side of Mr. Bryan's paradox?

Many laborers, no doubt, cheered him to the echo, but how would they like to be driven to work for a certain employer at a wage fixed by his plan of compulsory arbitration? Do they not see that it takes rights from labor exactly in proportion as it abridges the rights of capital, and that the only arbitration must be by consent and cannot be by compulsion?

Mr. Bryan next took up "government by injunction," opposition to which he declared would "increase until the people of this nation, acting through the constitutions and the laws, will make it impossible to take away from people accused of crime the right of trial by jury to determine the guilt or innocence." There is material at hand for testing this high sounding sentence. The writ of injunction is used to protect the rights of property. The people of the Feather, Yuba, Bear, Sacramento and San Joaquin river valleys have been living under government by injunction since Judge Sawyer's time. Hydraulic mining in the mountains disturbed the equilibrium of their dirt and boulders and washed both into the river beds, causing floods and covering the valley farms with slickens. To protect their

property the valley people applied to Judge Sawyer for a permanent injunction forbidding hydraulic mining anywhere that it imperiled the streams. Judge Sawyer granted the injunction, and the valley farmers of Butte, Sutter, Yuba, Colusa and other counties have since lived under government by injunction. They have enforced their rights under that government. The Anti-Debris association has been watchful, and when the injunction has been violated in contempt of the court that made it perpetual the offender has been taken to San Francisco and the court has punished him by fine or imprisonment for contempt of its judgment. Now, what Mr. Bryan demands is that there shall either be no injunction at all or that the violators of it shall be tried by a jury drawn from the vicinity of the offense, as the constitution requires in the case of juries. Do not the valley farmers see that under such a system they are deprived of all means of protecting their property by law? What chance would the Anti-Debris association of Sutter county stand prosecuting a hydraulic miner before a Nevada county jury? Yet that is the alternative offered by Mr. Bryan for the present protection by injunction and the power to enforce it by punishment for contempt of court.

His position on arbitration and injunction is illustrative of his mental attitude toward all public questions. With no profound foresight into the consequences and results of the plans he advocates, they are used, after the methods of demagoguery, to catch the unwary, and if he had the power to enforce them the disasters that would follow would make the curses of his victims louder than the cheers of his supporters are now.—From the San Francisco Daily Call, Saturday, Sept. 10, 1899.

GOOD AND GREAT.

A recent number of the Kansas City Star pays a merited tribute to the memory of the American ambassador to France who from 1893 to 1897 rendered his country most valuable services at Paris. In that city it was the pleasure of the editor of THE CONSERVATIVE, in 1894, to renew and reinforce a most agreeable friendship with this gifted, genial and chivalrous gentleman:

"James B. Eustis, who died at his home in Newport on Saturday night, was a fine example of the scholar and gentleman in politics. Few of his contemporaries in public life could lay claim to such a complete equipment as was his in the way of liberal accomplishments. He was learned in the law, versed in the chief languages of diplomacy and possessed the polish of an experienced citizen of the world.

"Mr. Eustis filled the post of ambassador to France under the second admin-

istration of Mr. Cleveland with unusual success. He made his ample wealth serviceable in maintaining a hospitality which proved to American visitors to Paris most agreeable and helpful, and the impression made upon the French people by the handsome style of living which Mr. Eustis chose to keep up was highly valuable in a practical way to the government which he represented.

"Mr. Eustis was a strong partisan. This led him to pronounce Mr. Cleveland a failure as a politician. But in the face of this frank criticism Mr. Cleveland, recognizing the high personal character of Mr. Eustis and his ample qualifications as a publicist, conferred upon him one of the most important missions within the gift of the government. That this significant testimonial of confidence was merited was proven by the rare service which Mr. Eustis gave to his government as ambassador to France and by the memory of his fidelity to every trust by which he was honored in life by the people or through presidential appointment."

The silver mine owners have given notice to the democratic national committee that if the free silver issue be dropped or subordinated in the coming campaign they will contribute nothing to the campaign fund, and that probably explains why Bryan feels able to take a holiday for a while.—San Francisco Call.

Commenting on the result of the special election in the Eighth Missouri district, the Boston Advertiser (rep.), says that "it is startling to learn that in a section where the Jingo spirit was supposed to be so strong, and with so many defections from the Bland vote to the populist party, Judge Shackelford has carried the district by even a larger plurality than the late Mr. Bland himself gained last year."

"Admitting, for the sake of argument, that it was our duty to take the Philippine islands for the purpose of establishing settled government," premises the Buffalo Express (rep.), "it was no prompting of duty, but rather of ambition, which prevented the declaration of a policy looking to our withdrawal when settled government had been established."

The Nashville Banner (dem.) finds in the Atlanta Constitution's (dem.) suggestion of democratic unity on anti-expansion and Bryan "a proposition to smother the silver issue," and it thinks that "with such a proposition coming from such a source there is no longer reason to doubt that the 16 to 1 craze is one of the political curios stored away in the museum of past issues."