

## FULFILMENT OF TREATY OBLIGATIONS

THE question of the ability of the Republic of the United States to carry out its treaty obligations with foreign powers is one of inestimable importance. The magnitude of the subject has been made clear by the unfortunate tragedy at New Orleans.

In a general treaty between foreign governments, protection of the citizens of each of the contracting nations within the domain of the other is necessarily one of the most common conditions of the compact. Hence a remedy for the present dilemma does not and cannot lie in the future omission of such a stipulation. Neither can the situation be improved by a modification of such a needful clause. The glorious institutions of this Republic admit of no distinction between the people of any nation so far as relates to the protection afforded by its laws, and no intimation that any such a difference exists should appear in any of its international transactions.

In considering a nice question like the one in point, it is worse than folly to indulge in bluster, boastfulness and alleged irony. True statesmanship suggests the necessity for an adjustment of the subject on the basis of right. The situation can be best illustrated by a process of reversal. Suppose that citizens of the United States should be slain in some other nation with whom the Republic had treaty relations, in the same manner as were the Sicilians in New Orleans, and a similar answer be given to demands for redress as that tendered by this country to Italy, what would be the result? Doubtless this nation would rise in its wrath, and the popular demand would be that the Secretary of State should do something desperate, in retaliation. The fact that it might be a country whose institutions could not admit of a different reply would hardly suffice to satisfy this nation. Our answer would in all likelihood be that the offending government ought not to enter into international obligations it has not the ability to fulfil. Yet it was proper enough that our Republic should enter into treaties involving a mutual obligation of protection to citizens of the contracting countries, under the idea that the obligation of the several States to sustain the Federal government in maintaining its dignity and fulfilling its international contracts would be strictly honored.

It is evident that Secretary Blaine could not give any stronger assurance regarding the demands of the Italian government than he did. The action of the State and municipal

authorities of Louisiana and New Orleans must be awaited. As the punishment or otherwise of the actors in the tragedy that caused the trouble was a matter for purely local treatment, how could the Secretary answer otherwise than he did? But the offended government could have no relations with a local division of the Republic, and it was exasperated at the manner in which the subject was treated by Governor Nichols. The expressions of the latter regarding the tragedy probably led Italy to believe that it had little prospect of justice being accorded to its subjects in Louisiana. This possibly led that country to exhibit less patience than it otherwise would. But even that source of irritation affords no justification to Italy for acting with the precipitation it has shown in this unfortunate affair.

This is no time for either nation to fling defiance in the face of the other. This country is brought face to face with this question, How shall the general government be placed in a position to fulfil its treaty obligations, independently, under certain conditions, of the several States of the Union, considered singly? The subject becomes all the more important because of the complications that are liable to ensue if the question remains unsolved. In these days of alleged judicial corruption and consequent popular lynchings, which are becoming so frequent as to take on the appearance of an institution, the scenes of New Orleans are liable to be repeated and to involve the citizens of other countries with whom the Republic is united by treaty. With the repetition of such a scene as that presented a short time ago in the Crescent City, there is likely to come a complication with some other power, similar to that existing between us and Italy. It is against the genius of statesmanship to allow a condition to exist that has a tendency to create international bitterness, even if it does not lead to open hostilities. An additional reason for a prudential course is the fact that some of the monarchies of the old world look upon the American Republic as a menace to their own existence. They understand that the tendency of all peoples is toward popularization of government. It cannot be denied that our free system of rule has been the grand object lesson which has caused the spirit of human liberty to be diffused throughout the nations. Self-preservation causes the old effete political and social structures to desire the demolition of this Republic. From the way in which things are drifting it looks as

though the wisest statesmanship on the part of the rulers and a dignified and prudent deportment on the part of the people of America will be required to avoid giving an occasion, at some future time, for a concerted attack upon this country.

The great barrier in the way of a remedy for the unpleasant position in which the Federal government is liable to be placed in connection with the question of its ability to fulfil international treaty obligations is that the cure would necessarily be of a centralizing character, which involves a new danger—the concentration of an excess of power in the chief rulers of the country. It will be claimed that any diminution of the power of the several States to regulate their own affairs is an invasion of American institutions. A broad discussion of the subject may, however, evolve some solution of the question that will fully cover all reasonable objections.

## THE PENNSYLVANIA RIOTS.

THE labor troubles in the Pennsylvania coke regions have at last reached a bloody climax. At 2 o'clock, on the early morning of the 2nd inst., seven men were instantly killed and several others wounded. The works at Mt. Pleasant have been in operation for several days, manned with Italian labor from Ward's Island, New York.

The men who went out on strike last winter are also Italians, Poles and Huns. They were brought there a few years ago to take the place of American, English, Scotch and Irish miners. The English language in those days was spoken everywhere in the mining regions. Now, not a word is to be heard, except an occasional swear, which sounds like English. The situation, in truth, is peculiar.

The cry of the capitalists a few years ago was that Huns, Italians and Poles were better laborers, more tractable, more obedient than others. It was said the English speaking races knew too much, and were too arrogant in demanding protection for labor. A general strike was inaugurated, and a force of coal and iron police organized. The places of the strikers were filled by laborers brought direct from Europe, through Castle Garden. Not an English speaking person would be employed. Pinkerton, of Chicago, had charge of the police arrangements.

In time these foreigners became more or less Americanized, and organized into labor unions. Last December they made some demands which were ignored, and the labor leaders declared a strike. There was an immense supply of coal and other mining products on hand. The strike was just what the capitalists wanted, and it is thought that they were really the originators of the movement.

Last week, when work was resumed, the Italians engaged a few years ago were locked out, and others imported