

fore have seemed to rejoice in broils is indicative of a new era in that part of the world. The close association of the republics named and the bringing in of others means not only the formation of a national power that will resist European aggression, but portends what is far more important, viz: the opening up of that section of the country to political and religious freedom in fact as well as in name, and making susceptible to enlightened, Christianizing influences that part of the American continent which once was the center of its highest civilization.

SECRETARY GRESHAM.

With the death of Secretary of State Walter Quinton Gresham, early this morning, May 28, another vacancy has occurred in the ranks of the distinguished statesmen of this country, and the important duty of shaping the foreign policy of the United States will be entrusted to the care of others. Mr. Gresham has held his high office during a period of turmoil in the world and war, consequently, been called upon to guide the ship through straits where much vigilance and skill were required in order to avoid the rocky Scylla on the one hand and the whirlpool of Charybdis on the other; how he succeeded is for impartial history to tell.

Walter Q. Gresham was born near Laneville, Harrison county, Indiana March 17, 1832. He was educated in the common schools and spent one year in the state university without graduating, however. In 1853 he was admitted to the bar and entered the career of a very successful lawyer. In 1861 he became lieutenant colonel of the Fifty-third Indiana and two years later, after the fall of Vicksburg, he was made brigadier general of volunteers. In the engagement before Atlanta he exhibited much valor and received a severe wound that disabled him and the effects of which he carried with him to his death. After the war he resumed law practice at New Albany, Indiana, and was made a judge by President Grant. In President Arthur's cabinet he held the place of postmaster general and later the portfolio of the treasury. The position of secretary of state he has held since March, 1893.

A great many important questions have been brought up during this time. One of them was the Hawaiian difficulty. His policy on this subject has been severely criticised by his political opponents. It was on his suggestion that the annexation treaty negotiated by Secretary Foster was withdrawn from the Senate, followed by a recommendation that the ex-queen of Hawaii be restored. His views were not accepted by Congress, and the island republic was allowed to remain undisturbed. The Bering sea fisheries was another source of much diplomatic trouble, but Great Britain was finally induced to remain by the arbitration treaty previously arranged. Secretary Gresham's friendly interference in the dispute between Japan and China caused most unfavorable comments at various times and his ability as a diplomat was sometimes questioned. The port

assigned to the United States' representatives during the war and particularly in the peace negotiations will prove, however, that whatever technical objections there might have been at an early stage of the proceedings, the general course adopted was one to inspire confidence in the disinterestedness of this government more than in any of the European powers, and a foundation has thus been laid for the building up of future friendly and profitable relations with the Asiatic countries, of growing importance as these are gradually opened up for intercourse with foreign nations.

Further, to his friendly offices was due the peaceful termination of the negotiations between Mexico and Guatemala at a time when but a spark was needed to kindle the flames of war to the south of the United States; also the withdrawal of a French warship sent to San Domingo to collect a private claim and the withdrawal of the British marines from Bluefields territory. How Spain was called to account for an attempt to stop an American steamer in Cuban waters is recent history, as is the Weller case in Madagascar, about which negotiations with the French government are now pending. Altogether, Gresham's career indicates a man intent on doing what he conceived to be right whether he had to deal with the small states in Central America, the mighty powers of Europe or the nations of Asia just emerging from obscurity. It speaks volumes for the character of the man that his last hours on earth were spent in contemplation of the divine word—his light as he entered the narrow valley where the shadow is deep.

THE DEBS DECISION.

The decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Debs case must be recognized as one of the most important that has been handed down by that august tribunal. It is but demagogism to rail at it as being in the interest of corporations, syndicates and trusts, and adverse to the welfare of the workingmen. The decision goes to the root of national power in preserving the peace and maintaining harmonious relations in the lawful interests of the state; it is a declaration on behalf of the individual rights of freemen such as every man in this country needs and should have a thorough understanding of. There is in it no suggestion of upholding the power of any corporation or combination to coerce the workingman in the least degree as to how he shall dispose of his labor; but there is the plain enunciation of the principle that it is the duty of government to see that one man or a combination of men, whether as corporations or as labor unions, shall not obstruct other men in the exercise of lawful powers. In other words, dealing with the question at issue, the rule is laid down that strikers can quit work if they want to, but that they have no right to prevent others from doing that work; and when the attempt to perform the latter act interferes with interstate commerce, that it is within the scope of the national government to use all its power in suppressing such attempt.

The ground on which the habeas corpus proceedings sought to set aside Judge Wooda's ruling chiefly rested was that the court had no jurisdiction to interfere by injunction with the alleged obstruction of the mails and commerce at Chicago. This is the second of the two divisions in which the decision deals with the case, and it holds that such jurisdiction is undoubted, and is not ousted by the fact that the obstructions consist of acts in themselves violations of the criminal laws. It also holds that the court had power to punish a contempt for its order, and that punishment can be also inflicted in due course for the criminal act accompanying and exhibiting the contempt. As to the government's right to follow the civil process of courts at the same time that it was using the military power in enforcement of its commands, the court says:

In the case before us, the right to use force does not exclude the right of appeal to the courts for a judicial determination, and for the exercise of all their powers of prevention. Indeed, it is more to the praise than to the blame of the government that instead of determining for itself questions of right and wrong on the part of these petitioners and their associates, and enforcing that determination by the club of the policeman and the bayonet of the soldier, it submitted all those questions to the determination of judicial tribunals, and invoked their consideration and judgment as to the measure of its rights and powers, and the correlative obligations of those against whom it made complaint.

The court has words of commendation for those of the strikers who served the mandate of the lower court. Reverting to the claim on behalf of Debs and his associates that the law in the ordinary course of criminal procedure should have been followed by government if it was being broken by the strikers, the court holds that the government is not tied up to such process, but may act with such promptitude and force as the discretion of the chief executive may determine. The national powers in this respect are set forth in the following emphatic language, on the suggestion that the general government had no authority to use force:

There is no such impotency in the national government. The entire strength of the nation may be used to enforce in any part of the land the full and free exercise of all national powers, and the security of all rights entrusted by the Constitution to its care. The strong administration of the national government may be put forth to brush away all obstructions to the freedom of interstate commerce or the transportation of the mails. If the emergency arises, the army of the nation and all its militia are at the service of the nation to compel obedience to the laws.

The Supreme Court decision cannot be properly regarded as adverse to the workingmen, either in labor unions or otherwise. When a man exercises powers wrongfully, it is to his interest to define the limits within which he may rightfully proceed. The decision does this with respect to the actions of those who engage in strikes. They may quit work when the terms of employment are not agreeable. But when they prevent others taking up that employment they are lawless, and the strong arms of the government,