

spreading starvation over the Czar's dominions. The most impoverishing crop that any country can have is a crop of official loafers, and loafers of the Russian species are the worst that the world produces.

### THE REPORTS FROM CHILE.

THE news from Chile today is about what the people of this country have been wanting to learn. In spite of the contradictory statements concerning the relative strength and merits of the contending parties, there has grown upon the people of the United States a firm conviction that Balmaceda is not only a usurper but a barbarous tyrant, who to maintain his power is not above practicing any sort of savagery that would strengthen his cause and weaken that of his enemy. In a word they have pretty generally believed that the reports of cruelty and persecution said to have been practiced upon the supporters of the Insurgents that have fallen into his power were true.

That Balmaceda's army would be routed at the first genuine engagement, was perfectly natural to expect, notwithstanding the tolerably authentic statement that he had at his command 30,000 troops against the 5000 accredited to his opponents. The Congressional party has given evidence of being a band of patriots whose revolt was for a good cause and whose struggle was thoroughly unselfish. That such a band would hang together and fight hard, was a foregone conclusion.

On the other side there appeared nothing in the way of leadership that was not mercenary. There has been no indication of patriotism or even of a regard for their chief commander, of the quality that inspires men to take desperate personal hazards for the sake of victory. The soldier never finds himself a party in the triumphs of such leaders, and when you put him in a tight place with a chance to brake from the ranks he is pretty certain to avail himself of the first opportunity to get out of bad company.

The conduct of Balmaceda's army as reported today proves conclusively that they went into the fight with a great deal more reliance on their heels than on their guns. If the facts are correctly described, the bulk at least of the army was only wanting a respectable excuse to gain their liberty.

It will not be surprising if the next authentic message brings word that the ranks of the Insurgents, in spite of their losses in battle, have greatly increased in their fighting strength. The soldiers who have behaved so badly under Balmaceda might make a very different exhibit if inspired by a righteous cause and led to the conflict by patriotic generals.

### WOOL AND SILVER IN OHIO.

THE campaign in Ohio is now fairly in progress. On the 22nd ult. Mr. McKinley made the opening speech at Lima. In it he sounded the keynote of the battle so far as his party is concerned. He treated favorably on the currency issue, and left no room for dispute as to his attitude in relation to

free coinage of silver. In his speech he said:

"I am in favor of the double standard, but I am not in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver in the United States, until the nations of the world shall join us in guaranteeing to silver a status which their laws now accord to gold. The double standard implies equality at a ratio and that equality can only be established by the concurrent laws of nations. It was the concurrent law of nations that made the double standard; it will require the concurrent law of nations to reinstate and sustain it. Until then for us to decree the free and unlimited coinage of the world's silver would ordain that our silver dollars would surely depreciate and gold would go to a premium."

The wool question is also figuring largely in the Ohio campaign. And so complicated a phase has it assumed that it is much in the nature of a puzzle. For the consideration of non-partisans, we give extracts from the speeches of party men on both sides. In the speech already quoted from, Mr. McKinley remarks:

"There was much said by Governor Campbell in his speech at Cleveland about the low price of wool. He stated correctly, and I have no doubt by inadvertence, that the farmer of Ohio was only getting 20 cents a pound for his wool. At the time he made this statement the farmer was receiving for his choice clips 28 and 29 cents. The inference from his speech would be that the increased duty on wool is the cause of depressed prices. If this be so, then the tariff is not a tax. This was not the Democratic doctrine in Ohio in 1883 and 1884. They then believed that the tariff did help the wool-grower, and that a great outrage had been committed upon him when the duty was reduced 11 per cent. by the tariff law of 1883. They so declared in a document issued by the Democratic State committee of that year and demanded of the wool-growers or the State that the party that committed that great outrage should be defeated at the polls. And I may say in passing that they were defeated. Their statement was that the Ohio wool-growers had been fleeced of \$6,000,000 by the reduction of 11 per cent. of the duty. The Governor was one of those who believed it then.

"The wrong of 1883 was righted at the first moment that the Republican party secured control of Congress and was not righted in all the years the Democrats were in control. The new law gives the wool-grower better protection than he ever had before. The wool of the world has fallen in price. American tariffs do not fix the price of foreign wool, but they do stand as a wall of defense to the American wool-grower against the wool produced on cheaper lands and by cheaper labor in other countries."

As to the effects of the tariff on wools the quotations in Bradstreet are given by some Democratic papers showing that the price of foreign wools used for carpets and cheap woollens has increased under the McKinley bill, while the price of American wools has decreased, and that the increase in the former corresponds with the decrease in the latter. Other Democratic papers shift the issue to the question of subsidy. Among these are the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which thus replies to Mr. McKinley:

"We do not see how any supporter of the McKinley bill in its entirety can object to this proposition of a bounty on American grown wool. Every argument used in support of the sugar bounty ap-

plies with equal force to a wool bounty. Sugar was protected by a tariff tax; so with wool. The tariff protection failed to develop domestic sugar production in proportion to the needs of the country; so with wool. The policy of protection by tariff tax was abandoned in the case of sugar and stimulation by bounties substituted; if that policy is right as to sugar, as claimed by the McKinleyites, why would it not be equally right in the case of wool? Can any McKinleyite tell? Why should the sugar cane planters of Louisiana and the sugar beet growers of Kansas and California be subsidized by the United States treasury and the sheep raisers of Ohio be refused similar encouragement to continue otherwise an unprofitable industry? Why should the Ohio farmer get two or four cents less for his wool than the treasury may give the Louisiana or Kansas farmer a gratuity of two cents a pound on his sugar? The Ohio wool-grower might ask Major McKinley that question."

### CORRUPTION IN CANADA.

FRIENDS of honest administration in government are not by any means pleased with the news which comes from Canada. The conservative or Tory party in the Dominion is badly demoralized. Since the death of Sir John MacDonald it seems as if the fates decreed the death of his party also. It is fast dividing into factions, and very soon it will be in a minority. But it is reported that Sir Charles Tupper is coming back from England to reorganize it and take the lead in governmental matters.

In addition to the disintegration going on in the Tory party from heterogeneous and inharmonious elements, it is also threatened with annihilation because of the dishonesty of its principal chieftains. At present there are only three or four of the ministers who have not been implicated in dishonest practices, or, as it is commonly termed, "boodling." And the aggressiveness of the "boodling" surpasses anything ever done in New York or Chicago.

In view of the fact that Canada is passing through an important crisis in her affairs, a sketch of her political growth may not be out of place. The Dominion was constituted by an act of the Imperial Parliament passed in 1867. At first only the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were embraced in the union. Rupert's Land was added in 1870, after its purchase from the Hudson Bay Company. In 1871, British Columbia with Vancouver Island was added, and in 1873 Prince Edward Island came into the Dominion. In 1880 all British possessions in North America were annexed, except Newfoundland.

The Parliament of Canada consists of a Senate and a House of Commons, the Queen's signature of course being essential to every enactment. It must meet at least once every year. All money bills must originate in the Commons, but any bills providing for appropriations, taxation, or in any way affecting the public revenue must be recommended in a message from the Governor-General.

The electorate includes all male adult subjects, who own or occupy wealth or property, the minimum value of which is \$150, or of the year-