

Cleveland's financial friends were perfectly willing to risk disturbing the country with premature legislation upon a subject which had not been discussed before the people, and regarding which neither Mr. Cleveland nor Congress had received any popular mandate. So Mr. Cleveland called a special session for this purpose.

When that session closed Mr. Cleveland's party, united upon the tariff question and resistless in its power, had been wrenched asunder by a new and unrelated issue—the coinage question. The needed opening for tariff beneficiaries was thus effected. Mr. Cleveland's fine message on the tariff question was then incontinently thrown into the waste-paper basket of the sugar trust. Months were spent by Congress at the regular session, upon a tariff bill which, when it finally passed, was a wretched caricature of what the Cleveland administration was under bonds to the people to produce.

Is it any wonder if the privileged classes have confidence in Mr. Cleveland, no matter how much he menaces them with the glittering generalities of democracy?

On the other hand, is it any wonder that the unprivileged have learned to distrust his noblest utterances?

How could the people have done otherwise than bury his administration under an avalanche of adverse votes, as they did at the first opportunity? Popular revulsion was as sudden and pronounced as it was richly deserved. At the Congressional elections of 1894, the majority in the House was shifted from Democratic 41 to Republican 66. The complexion of the Senate also was changed for the worse. The popular vote against the Cleveland administration was enormous. In Ohio it ran up to a Republican majority of 137,000—a phenomenal figure.

With Mr. Cleveland's significant record on the tariff issue before them, the financiers at the Chicago banquet might well have listened with complacency and even approval to democratic generalities which, from other lips, would have excited their anger to the highest pitch and evoked from

the billingsgate vocabulary of their subsidized newspapers its most stinging epithets.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Oct. 22.

The Alaskan boundary commission in session at London (p. 361) has come to a decision, which was made public on the 20th. It is regarded as being almost if not wholly in favor of the United States and against the Canadian claims.

This controversy grew out of an interpretation of the treaty of 1825 between Great Britain and Russia. As that treaty defines the boundary between the Hudson's Bay Company and Russian America it governs the boundary between the Dominion of Canada, subsequently established by Great Britain over the Hudson's Bay Company's territory, and Alaska, which was purchased from Russia by the United States in 1867. The controversy consequently was more distinctly one of Canadian-American than of British-American interest; and the British outside of Canada have been notably indifferent.

The question at issue, which has long been pending (vol. i, No. 47, p. 9; vol. v, p. 680), relates to so much of the boundary as extends from the 56th parallel near the 130th meridian, northwesterly to the 141st meridian near the 60th parallel. As described by the British-Russian treaty of 1825, this boundary line begins at the southernmost point of Prince of Wales Island, which is defined as being "in the parallel of 54 degrees 40 minutes north latitude, and between the 131st and 133rd degree of west longitude (meridian of Greenwich)." The line is then described as ascending "to the north along the channel as far as the point of the continent where it strikes the 56th degree of north latitude." Over that part of the line there has been no controversy. It is the geographical vagueness of what follows that has caused the dispute. Having thus fixed a point where the channel known as "Dixon Entrance," which extends to the natural inlet called "Portland

Canal," strikes the 56th degree of north latitude, the treaty proceeds:

From this last mentioned point the line of demarcation shall follow the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast, as far as the point of intersection of the 141st degree of west longitude (of the same meridian), and finally from the said point of intersection the said meridian line of the 141st degree in its prolongation as far as the frozen ocean.

The latter clause also has been free from dispute, the whole controversy turning upon so much of the boundary as runs from Portland Canal to the 141st meridian, the latter point being the summit of Mt. St. Elias. As to this part of the line, the issue hinged upon the interpretation of the following provision of the treaty:

Article 4.—With reference to the line of demarcation laid down in the previous article, it is understood:

1st. That the island called Prince of Wales Island shall belong wholly to Russia.

2d. That whenever the summit of the mountains, which extend in a direction parallel to the coast from the 56th degree of north latitude to the point of intersection of the 141st degree of west longitude, shall prove to be at a distance of more than 10 marine leagues from the ocean, the limit between the British possession and the line of coast which is to belong to Russia, as above mentioned, shall be formed by a line parallel to the windings of the coast, and which shall never exceed the distance of 10 marine leagues therefrom.

Until the discovery of gold in the Alaskan region this boundary question gave no trouble. But following upon that discovery difficulties constantly arose between American and Canadian prospectors and settlers, and these difficulties soon involved the two countries in the controversy which has just been decided by the boundary commission. The Canadians claimed that the 10-league clause must be interpreted to mean 10 leagues inland from the ocean line, whence the three-mile limit to the high seas is commonly measured; but the Americans insisted that it must be interpreted to mean 10 leagues inland from the actual shore line, following its sinuosities around inlets. Upon the Canadian contention but little of the mainland would have been left to the Americans. Lynn Canal and the American settlements at the head of that inlet—Dyea, Skagway and

the rest—would have been on Canadian territory. Upon the American contention the whole of Lynn Canal would be within American territory, and Canada would have no outlet to the ocean anywhere north of the 56th parallel. In support of their claims, the Canadians relied upon the general principles regarding ocean limits—urging that the boundary must cross inlets of more than 10-leagues penetration inland by jumping from headland to headland. They also referred to the specific reservation to Russia in the 4th clause of the treaty, of the whole of Prince of Wales Island. This reservation clearly shows, they argued, that the 10-league line had reference not to the sinuosities of inlets, but to the main line of the ocean coast, since it would have been unnecessary had the 10-league limit been regarded as extending 10 leagues inland at all points. The American theory, which the boundary commission appears to have adopted, is stated and approved by E. W. Thompson, a Canadian journalist, of Toronto, in an interview appearing in the *Chicago Record-Herald* of the 19th. Referring to the indefiniteness of the second clause of the fourth article of the British-Russian treaty he says:

Because of this indefiniteness it was necessary to interpret the words of the treaty by investigating the notes exchanged between the negotiators, and the circumstances precedent to and surrounding the negotiations. These showed clearly that the purpose of the treaty was to give Russia a coast strip which would serve as an effectual barrier against the Hudson's Bay Company's wish to encroach on the Russian Fur Company's fur trade along the coast north of latitude 54 degrees 40 minutes. Such a barrier could not have been created except by giving Russia possession of the fords, inlets or 'canals' up to their heads. If these heads had been left to the British the Hudson's Bay Company could have placed trading posts on the shore, in full view of many coast Indians, and easily accessible by canoe at all within the distance of a week's paddling or more. Thus the Russian coast fur trade monopoly, which was precisely what the Russian negotiators wished to protect, and precisely what the British negotiators first tried to break and afterward recognized, would have been destroyed. Because all this was obvious to any impartial student of the docu-

ments, it was clear long ago that the Russian or American strip must include all the shore of all the inlets north of the Portland Canal, and must have a width extending at least to the tops of the hills or mountains along the shore.

When this boundary controversy had reached the point of involving the governments immediately concerned—the Dominion of Canada and the United States—a joint Canadian-American commission was agreed upon, its function being to frame a treaty between Great Britain and the United States adjusting all disputes including that over the Alaskan boundary line. This commission, agreed upon in May, 1897, adjourned in February, 1899, to the following August, without having accomplished anything final in character. The Canadian commissioners desired to submit the boundary question to the arbitration of a tribunal consisting of one distinguished jurist chosen by Great Britain, another chosen by the United States, and a third, an umpire, chosen by the other two. But that was not satisfactory to the Americans. They demanded a commission of six jurists, three to be selected by each country. They also insisted that existing American settlements on tide waters should remain within the jurisdiction of the United States even if the Canadian theory of the boundary line were in other respects to prevail; and to that the Canadians refused assent. No progress was made by the commission after the interim between its adjournment in February, 1899, and the adjourned day in August of the same year (vol. ii, No. 70, pp. 1, 2.) Upon its reassembling, the United States offered to accept the proposition of an umpire provided Canada would agree to take the umpire from a South American republic; but Canada refused this, insisting upon a European umpire. So the matter was left until January 24, 1903, when it was settled by an arbitration treaty (vol. v, p. 680) signed at Washington between the United States and Great Britain. Under this treaty the boundary question was to be submitted to an arbitration tribunal consisting of six commissioners, three to be selected by each side to the controversy. The issue was to be determined by a

majority vote, thus making it necessary, in order to prevent a deadlock, for one of the two countries to win over at least one commissioner selected by the other. Moreover, whatever might be the decision of the arbitrators on the general question of boundary, all existing American settlements on tide waters were to remain within the jurisdiction of the United States. This treaty was ratified February 11, 1903, by the Senate of the United States (vol. v, p. 713), and President Roosevelt immediately appointed (vol. v, p. 730) Elihu Root, Senator Lodge and Senator Turner as the American arbitrators. The British arbitrators were Chief Justice Alverstone, of England, and Sir Louis Jette and Allen Aylesworth, of Canada. The commission met at London on the 3d of September (p. 361). They chose Chief Justice Alverstone as president of the commission, and on the 19th they came to their decision by a vote of 4 to 2, the English chief justice voting with the Americans and against the Canadians.

The decision gives Portland Canal to Canada, but the American contention as to the 10-league line inland is sustained. Some islands at the mouth of Portland Canal are also given to the United States. The contention regarding the 10-league line was expressed in the 5th and crucial question submitted to the arbitrators as follows:

Was it the intention and meaning of said convention of 1825 that there should remain in the exclusive possession of Russia a continuous fringe or strip of coast on the mainland, not exceeding ten marine leagues in width, separating the British possession from the bays, ports, inlets, havens and waters of the ocean, and extending from the said point on the 56th degree of latitude north to a point where such line of demarkation should intersect the 141st degree of longitude western meridian of Greenwich?

To that question the commission answers in the affirmative by the casting vote of Chief Justice Alverstone. The Canadian commissioners not only voted against this award, but have refused to sign it. Their objection to signing is that the award is not a judicial one, whereby they are understood to imply that in voting with the American commission-

ers the English chief justice was governed by diplomatic or political rather than judicial considerations.

Great Britain has concluded a treaty with France, signed at Paris on the 14th, which constitutes another step towards arbitration in avoidance of war. It provides generally for the submission to The Hague tribunal of all disputes over treaties between the two countries, which do not involve national honor or independence or affect the interests of a third nation. The terms of this treaty are as follows:

Article 1. Differences of a judicial order, of such as relate to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties, which may arise between them and which may not be possible to settle by means of diplomacy, shall be submitted to the permanent court of arbitration established at The Hague by the convention of July 29, 1899, on condition, however, that they do not involve either vital interests or the independence or honor of the two contracting states, and that they do not affect the interests of a third Power.

Article 2. In each particular case the high contracting parties, before addressing themselves to the permanent court of arbitration, shall sign a special arbitration bond setting forth clearly the subject under dispute, the extent of the powers of the arbitrators, and the details to be observed as regards the constitution of the arbitral tribunal and the procedure.

Article 3. The present arrangement is concluded for a term of five years from the date of the signature.

In British politics (p. 441) Chamberlain is still prosecuting his anti-free trade campaign. He spoke on this subject at Newcastle on the 20th to an audience of 4,000 people, who are reported as enthusiastic. John Morley entered the campaign on the 19th with a free trade speech at Manchester. In opposition to Chamberlain's policy a Free Food League has been formed, with the Duke of Devonshire, who recently resigned from Balfour's cabinet (p. 423), as president. The duke accented conditionally in a letter in which he said:

I understand the principal object of the league is to oppose the new departure in the fiscal policy, which now has been definitely announced and which includes the taxation of food imports from foreign countries and preferential treat-

ment for the colonies, as well as a general tariff on imported manufactured goods. I understand these objects do not involve opposition to the policy of the government in so far as that policy is limited to reserving to the government the right of proposing to parliament tariff legislation for the purpose of negotiating commercial treaties and the mitigation of hostile tariffs.

These conditions were accepted by the league. Mr. Ritchie and Lord George Hamilton, who also resigned recently from the Balfour ministry (p. 391), are among the membership of the Free Food league.

At the center of political activity in the United States, Ohio (p. 440), the campaign waxes fiercer as election day draws near. The reunion of the McKisson and the Hanna factions in Cleveland is emphasized by the Republicans as a sure indication of the defeat of Johnson in his own city. According to Raymond, the Chicago Tribune's staff correspondent (who seems, by the way, to have abandoned his high plane of impartial reporting for mere political puffing for Mr. Hanna), in a letter of the 19th from Cleveland—

Uncle Mark Hanna and his Republican associates have only one object in view, which is to kill off Tom Johnson for mayor of Cleveland. They know perfectly well that there is not the ghost of a chance of Mayor Tom being elected governor, and this entire campaign, with its four principal candidates centered in Cuyahoga county, is planned from the Republican side for the express purpose of defeating Johnson so completely that the next time he runs for mayor of Cleveland he will be discredited in advance.

Senator Hanna and Mr. Herrick resumed their touring campaign of the State on the 13th at Mt. Vernon in the Republican county of Knox, and Wooster in the county of Wayne. On the 14th Mr. Hanna appeared again in Cleveland, where he advocated the ship-subsidy bill. The secretary of the treasury, Mr. Shaw, spoke at Delaware in the Republican county of Delaware on the 14th, and Mr. Herrick was at Wellington in the Republican county of Lorain on the 16th. Both he and Senator Hanna left Cleveland on the 20th for a final tour of the State. Another member of the President's cabinet, Mr. Wilson, the secretary of agriculture, has come into the State to make five

speeches for Senator Hanna during the present week.

Having reference to Senator Hanna's defense of ship subsidies, Mr. Clarke, his antagonist for the Senate, has renewed his challenge to debate. He did so in his speech at Sandusky on the 15th, saying:

I want to state that I will meet Mr. Hanna on 48 hours' notice anywhere in the State and talk ship subsidy with him. I will take the position that the ship subsidy in any of the three forms proposed by Mr. Hanna would be not a benefit, but a burden to the people of Ohio.

Mayor Johnson's appointment for the 13th at Ottawa in the Democratic county of Putnam was filled by John J. Lentz, owing to the necessity Johnson was under of resting his voice (p. 441), while Mr. Clarke spoke at Galion in the Democratic county of Crawford. Mr. Lentz spoke for Johnson also at Cary and Sycamore in the county of Crawford on the 14th, and at Bucyrus in the same county on the same day. On the 15th Mayor Johnson again appeared to keep his appointments, addressing five meetings in Erie and Huron counties (both Republican), the principal meeting being at Sandusky, where he was joined by Mr. Clarke, and 4,000 people crowded into his tent. On the 16th he spoke at six meetings in the Democratic county of Seneca, where ex-Congressman Norton (vol. v, p. 517) is fighting the Democratic ticket within the party, and closed with a tent meeting at Fremont in the Democratic county of Sandusky. Here there was an audience of 4,000. At Shelby in the afternoon of the 17th, and Mansfield in the evening (both in the Democratic county of Richland), where Johnson defeated the old Democratic boss, Earhardt, at the primary last Spring (p. 113), both Johnson and Clarke spoke at large tent meetings, that at Mansfield numbering 5,000 people. Johnson's meeting on Monday, the 19th, was at Mt. Vernon in the Republican county of Knox, where 4,500 people gathered in the tent. It was here that Johnson stated his position on the use of campaign funds. After remarking that Senator Hanna has ostentatiously been making charitable donations during the