

ed and exists by the will of Europe, it is only natural to suppose that the present disturbances on the western slopes of Kjolén is a matter in which the leading powers are interested. It is not likely that the ideas of Björnson will find much sympathy in the court of St. Petersburg, nor, indeed, at any other European court.

Sweden having now taken her position on the question, it remains to be seen what Norway will do. In the latter country the Liberals have an overwhelming majority and can carry any measure they propose; but it is to be hoped, in the interest of Norway, that they will not force the question to a point where no solution is possible except by the sword. The Norwegians are a brave, intelligent and progressive race. They have shown in bygone ages that no enemy can long prosper among their mountain fastnesses. Even Sweden has lost some of her bravest heroes on her barren soil. Yet, she ought not to be anxious to renew the strife of former centuries. Not in war, but in peaceful industry lies the development of Norway towards independence. A war might possibly cost her the liberty she now enjoys.

Neither Sweden nor Norway can singlehanded, resist any of the great powers, should a conflict arise. United, they might offer a resistance not to be entirely despised. By their union the two countries have some significance in the politics of Europe. To dissolve his union seems, therefore, to be equal to committing political suicide.

THE SILVER QUESTION.

In the Democratic caucus held on Friday evening, in the Capitol at Washington, the fact was disclosed that the representatives of the Democratic party are even more irreconcilably divided on the silver question than has been claimed by their opponents. It should, however be remembered that the Republican party is in the self-same condition, except that a greater proportion of Democrats than of Republicans are bi-metallicists, that is, in favor of a double standard for money—the circulating medium to consist of gold and silver at parity. In this respect, though, what the Republicans lack numerically to place them on an exact equality with their antagonists, they fully make up in the zeal and energy of the leading silver advocates on their side.

Look, for instance, at the two Nevada Senators, Jones and Stewart; the two Colorado Senators, Teller and Wolcott, not to mention those of Montana and a number of Congressmen, each a host in himself on that question and radically in favor of the white metal. Who could have the temerity to say with such a showing that silver is or can be made a party question? It is purely and altogether a sectional question, the Far West and the Solid South being for it, as a rule, the remainder of the country being against it except "in spots."

But even this gives very slender ground, or even pretext, if in fact any of either, for the assertion made by Mr. Harter, a Democratic Congressman from Ohio, at the caucus spoken of, that the silver

question would split the Democratic party just as the slavery question had done. If this were to occur from such a cause how could the Republican party hold together with the same influences operating upon it? And does it not thus manifestly appear that if the silver Democrats were to "flock by themselves" because of that issue, and the goldites were to go the other way, at least one new party would spring into existence to receive one or both?

And then it rationally follows that the financial question being made the basis of a political organization, it would attract to itself all who endorse such position in whatever present following, especially if, as seems inevitable, the platform of their present party declared in favor of one standard, one basis, one metal for money, all others to be gauged by it and take the same place as any other merchandise.

It should be considered that the question of what should constitute a measure of values and circulating medium is not properly a political question—that is, political in its partisan, American sense. It pertains, primarily, to the domain of philosophy and its diffusion throughout the body politic is guided and directed by science and controlled measurably by local requirements.

Perhaps the best argument which can be advanced against silver being a party question is the one already presented—that no party in existence is, has been or ever can be unanimous or even harmonious upon the subject. And in saying this, we have due regard for the creation of a "silver party," so to speak, whose adherents and supporters would act together on that question; but it would not be a party in the accepted sense of the term, any more than the "Fire-proof ticket" of Chicago immediately after the great fire was or represented a party.

We are not prepared to concede just now that either of the great parties is going to permit itself to be dragooned, enticed or wheedled into either the open advocacy or denunciation of silver. They never were so near together numerically as now, and the change of a very few votes in but one State—the one that is most sensitive to the money question, New York—might determine the result. The leading spirits, or some of them, on either side, have already shown a disposition to not act very differently to what they have all along been doing on the silver question. They see or claim to see in it the rock on which their party would split and go down; and so we are likely to have the same glittering generalities about "honest money," "a dollar worth 100 cents," "the faith of the nation," "no inflation," and so on, that we have had ever since silver was demonetized by the Sherman act of 1873. Unlike Mr. Harter, we do not think either party will go down because of silver, nor do we think either will win this year because of it.

THE WORLD'S SUGAR CROP.

ACCORDING to the London (England) *Observer* the world's crop of sugar for 1890-91 aggregates about 6,000,000 tons. Of this 2,340,000 tons was pro-

duced from cane, and 3,660,000 tons from beet. England and the United States consume nearly one half of the total product. The figures given for the former are 1,268,000 tons, for the latter 1,500,000 tons.

About thirty years ago beet sugar contributed the smallest proportion to the whole available supply; now it turns out 1,320,000 more than the cane sugar. For the year mentioned Germany produced 1,325,000 tons, Austria 760,000 tons, France 700,000 tons, Russia 530,000 tons, Belgium 200,000 tons, Holland 65,000 tons, and other places 80,000 tons. Germany consumed 510,000 tons, thus giving her for export over 800,000 tons. France also had about 200,000 tons for export, and Austria about 450,000 tons.

For the sugar year ending October 1, 1890, 1,548,631 tons was consumed in the United States. Of this 290,000 tons was imported from Europe, principally from Germany and France. It is estimated that the consumption of sugar for 1891-92 in the United States will average fifty-five pounds per capita, or about 3,120,000,000 pounds. According to the bounties that have been paid, the home production will net about 600,000,000 pounds. This leaves us dependent on foreign countries for about 2,500,000,000 pounds. At 4½ cents a pound this means the sending abroad of over \$100,000,000 in gold annually for sugar.

It is said that Germany and France are seeking to have our sugar bounty law repealed. And well they might, for we consume over 600,000,000 pounds of their sugar annually. This year the beet product in the United States will be largely in excess of last year's. With the preparations going on for extending its cultivation beyond the present four producing States—California, Nebraska, Utah and Virginia, the output for the ensuing year promises to double that of this year. And there is no reason why the United States cannot raise sugar enough in time to supply the home market. Germany but a short time ago imported the article, now it is one of her chief exports. It is the same with France, and Austria. This is all because of a bounty system at the commencement.

TERSELY PUT.

THE Utah position is thus tersely summed up in an editorial paragraph that appears in the *Scranton, Penn., Free Press*:

"There is no valid reason for not admitting Utah to statehood. It is more populous than some of the States in the Union. It has thriving towns of commercial importance; the people are law-abiding, much more so than might be expected in view of the fact that it is ruled by what have been termed the worst kind of carpet baggers; polygamy is no longer practiced. There is no reason for keeping her out. The opposition assails democratic government when it antagonizes Utah's just claims."

ST. LOUIS, March 1.—Jay Gould's private car arrived this evening over the Pennsylvania, and started for Texas at once on a special train over the Iron Mountain. Neither Gould nor his doctor could be seen.