

broken mirrors, furniture, torn clothing, and down and feathers clotted with blood. Twenty-five thousand people are beggars, a few of whom were wealthy; but for the most part artisans and factory hands, not the rich bankers against whose tyranny an outraged people had risen, as the ambassador at Washington would have you believe. Many women and children have become crazy from the nervous strain, and as for the number of the dead and wounded no one can as yet tell with exactitude. In the first day fifty were murdered, three hundred dangerously and a thousand slightly wounded, and in the following dreadful two days when the mob had gained in ferocity and cruelty one can well picture how these figures were added to. The entire district thickly settled with Jews is in a state of panic, and, although smaller riots have taken place in several of the neighboring cities, notably the holy town of Kief, the railroads are not able to carry the numbers of terror-stricken people who desire to flee to any place except the vicinity of Kishineff.

The foregoing facts relating to the massacre at Kishineff are derived from dozens of eye witnesses through unimpeachable but necessarily confidential channels of information.

EDWARD RUMELY.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, June 11.

The Conservative party of Great Britain has barely escaped a ministerial crisis over the free trade issue (p. 134) which Secretary Chamberlain has raised. Following the parliamentary interpellation on the 28th (p. 135), the Commons entered into a debate upon the subject on the 9th, in the course of the consideration of the fiscal budget, the second reading of which was at that time moved by Charles T. Ritchie, the chancellor of the exchequer.

Just before the parliamentary session of the 9th a special meeting of the cabinet was held, upon the call of the Premier, to consider the new situation which had probably so divided the Conservatives as to place the ministry at the mercy of the Liberal and Irish members. All the ministers, except Gerald Balfour, president of the board of trade (who was ill), attended this cabinet meeting; and it

was rumored that a split in the ministry itself had there developed. This split was understood to have been immediately caused by the publication two days before of a letter from Mr. Chamberlain to a workingman, in which Mr. Chamberlain committed himself to the policy of protection. The workingman whom he addressed had called his attention to denunciations of his proposals by trade union leaders, and in his reply Mr. Chamberlain said:

I do not attach excessive importance to the opinion of the trades union leaders, because they are, almost without exception, strong radical partisans. Their opinions are not necessarily shared by working people generally, nor even by trades unionists, who appoint officers independently of political considerations. For instance, I may mention that in Birmingham the members of the trades council almost to a man opposed me politically, notwithstanding which my majority at the election, in a purely working class district, was 4,500. I feel confident that in the matter of preferential tariffs and commercial fair play the workingmen will think for themselves and will not be dictated to by even the most trusted trades unionist leaders. . . . It will be impossible to secure preferential treatment from the colonies without some duty on wheat as well as on other articles of food, because these are the chief articles of colonial produce. Whether this will raise the cost of living is a matter of opinion. There is no doubt that in many cases duty of this kind is paid by the exporter and really depends on the extent of competition among the exporting countries. For instance, I think it is established that the shilling duty recently imposed was met by a reduction in price and freight in the United States, and the tax did not, therefore, fall in any way on the consumer here. But even if the price of food is raised, the rate of wages certainly will be raised in greater proportion. This has been the case both in the United States and Germany. In the former country the available balance left to the workingman, after he has paid for necessities, is much larger than it is here. These facts we have to bring to the notice of workingmen generally. Another side of the question requires discussion. At present we enter into negotiations with foreign countries empty handed. We have nothing to give and have to take what they are good enough to leave for us. If we were able to bargain on equal terms I believe the duties now imposed on our produce would be generally reduced. There would be competition among foreign nations for our markets which would bring us nearer to real free trade than we ever have been. As regards old age

pensions, I would not look at the matter unless I felt able to promise that a large sum for the provision of such pensions to all who have been thrifty and well conducted would be assured by the revision of our system of import duties. The grain and other food already supplied from the British possessions are important and are capable of rapid increase. Returns show that this has taken place in the past, even without preference, while our exports of finished goods to foreign countries have gradually given place to exports of raw materials, which are returned to us with the advantage to the foreigner of increased employment of labor and of trade profits on business thus secured. . . . You are told by opponents of all change that such reform as I contemplate would involve the country in ruin, bring starvation into the homes of the working people, and destroy our export trade. If these predictions have any foundation, how are we to account for the fact that the increase in exports and wages and general prosperity during the last 20 years in the United States and Germany has been greater than in the United Kingdom, which is the only civilized country in the world to enjoy the blessings of unrestricted free imports.

The rumor that this letter had brought discord into the ministry was confirmed on the 9th, when Chancellor Ritchie avowed himself to be an out-and-out free trader, and added that with his present knowledge he could not be a party to the Chamberlain policy, which he believed would be detrimental to the interests of both Great Britain and her colonies. That the ministerial split thus indicated ramifies the Conservative party, was plainly evident as soon as Chancellor Ritchie had formally moved the second reading of the budget bill, which contained a clause repealing the war duties on grain (p. 134); for Henry Chaplin, a Conservative member, who had been president of the local government board in the Salisbury ministry, immediately moved an amendment striking out that clause. He said that the ministry had made an irretrievable mistake in throwing away, by this repealing clause, a weapon which would have helped them to carry out the new fiscal policy to which Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain were committed. While admitting that Chancellor Ritchie had for the moment prevailed with the ministry over Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Chaplin predicted that the triumph would be short lived; and he added significantly that it was an extraordinary position in which the fol-

lowers of the ministry had been placed by the indecision of the ministers—a position that made it useless to seek guidance or leadership from them. Mr. Chaplin is an avowed protectionist. In concluding his speech he formally moved his amendment, saying that he meant to force a division upon it.

Mr. Chaplin's amendment was immediately seconded, and then Sir Michael E. Hick-Beach, Conservative member, and chancellor of the exchequer under Salisbury, proceeded with the debate in a different vein but to the same end. He was repeatedly checked by the Speaker, who ruled that the Chaplin amendment did not open for full discussion the fiscal policy proposed by Mr. Chamberlain, but was irrelevant to the budget bill because the bill does not raise the question of preferential tariff rates between Great Britain and her colonies. Sir Michael succeeded, however, in putting himself on record against Mr. Chamberlain, while supporting Mr. Chaplin's amendment. Among others to speak were Sir Henry Fowler (Liberal), who dwelt on Premier Balfour's duty to the nation to ascertain the opinion of his colleagues on Chamberlain's proposal, and let the House and the people know the ministry's decision regarding a question so vital to the empire. Sir John Gorst (Conservative) bitterly opposed any tampering with the free trade policy, declaring that a great portion of the rising generation in the United Kingdom was already so degenerate and poverty stricken that anything tending to increase the price of food would threaten a national disaster. James Bryce (Liberal) followed, explaining that the references to the United States made by Mr. Chamberlain and others in support of protection were quite erroneous, as American prosperity was due greatly to the cheapness of food under a system by which free trade prevails between all the great States composing the American nation. Then came the Hon. Arthur Elliot, the financial secretary of the treasury. Replying on behalf of the ministry to inquiries as to its attitude, he made a bitter attack on protectionists and preferential tariffs, and insisted that the financial policy of the ministry was clearly exhibited by its decision to revoke the grain tax, which savored of protection. "I ask the House seriously to consider."

he exclaimed, "what this country has to gain by giving up its position as a country of cheap imports. I am sure that the more the people inquire into the subject the more they will find it is essential to the prosperity of the country that it remain a cheap country; and the more they will be convinced that the basis on which our financial and commercial system has been conducted since the days of Sir Robert Peel should not lightly be dismissed as of no account." This direct attack on Mr. Chamberlain by a member of the administration, who, it was believed, must have spoken with authority, elicited loud cheers, and is reported to have been considered even more important than Mr. Ritchie's denunciation, as indicating that the majority in the ministry is overwhelmingly opposed to any system of preferential trade. The debate of the 9th was adjourned at midnight, after an announcement by Chancellor Ritchie that he hoped Mr. Balfour would be able to give the House on the 10th a definite statement on behalf of the entire cabinet, though he could not promise it. It was in his closing speech that Mr. Ritchie avowed himself a free trader, as quoted above. He favored an inquiry, however, into the subject of preferential tariffs; but he said that he would be surprised if such an inquiry showed any practicable means of carrying out a policy of preferential duties, and expressed his belief that it would confirm his present free trade views.

In verification of the expectations of Mr. Ritchie, the Premier did make a statement on the 10th. His speech, however, was preceded by a continuation of the general debate. Sir Charles Dilke (Radical) argued that it is an exaggeration to say that protection countries are more prosperous than Great Britain; for, while the United States and Germany are large exporters, under protection, Great Britain's exports are equal to the combined exports of the United States, Germany and France. As to the alleged prosperity of the United States, he insisted that prosperity there had been retarded rather than advanced by protection, the real explanation of American prosperity being her natural advantages and internal free trade. Mr. H. H. Asquith (Liberal) followed. His most striking point related to Mr. Chamberlain's assertion that the war tax on grain does not fall upon the consumer but is paid by the for-

eigner. In that case, said Mr. Asquith, the proposal of the ministry to repeal it is "a magnificent display of international affection," since Great Britain would be making a present to the United States of the millions which this tax brings into the British treasury. The next important speaker was the Premier. He began by explaining that the grain tax had been put on because the government needed money, and was now to be repealed because the government does not need money. Without committing the ministry definitely to either side of the Chamberlain proposals, but positively refusing to make a statement of "any finality" upon that question, he declared himself a free trader. Yet he said he did not regard free trade as a fetish, but had an absolutely open mind regarding the necessity for any alterations in a system which was founded to suit the conditions of fifty years ago. Consequently, while admitting that differences of opinion exist upon the subject in the cabinet, he stated that they are not serious enough to cause the resignation of any member. Great Britain is confronted, he proceeded, according to the cable dispatches, by—

three great phenomena: Huge tariff walls against the United Kingdom, the growth of trusts, and the desire of the colonies for closer fiscal union with the mother country. These factors could not be ignored. He maintained that the method of starting a public discussion was the only way to deal with these phenomena, though he did not commit himself to Mr. Chamberlain's more advanced programme. It would be folly and rashness, he said, to interfere with the great system which had been in operation for so many years without the most careful examination and without due regard for history and the traditions of the past, while at the same time they could not ignore those new problems which the ever-changing face of industrial life presented for decision and the action of statesmen.

This non-committal speech, delivered with extraordinary oratorical effect, seems to have distinguished Mr. Balfour as the real leader of his ministry. It was received by the Conservatives and most of the Unionists, with cheer after cheer; and when Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (Liberal leader) replied with an appeal for an opportunity for the House to consider more fully the merits of the whole question raised by Mr. Chamberlain, the ministerial majority remained loyal to the Premier.

The vote upon Mr. Chaplin's amendment striking out from the budget bill the clause repealing the war duties on grain, being now taken, the amendment failed by 424 to 28. Some Conservatives abstained from voting and some Unionists voted for the amendment; but a majority of the Conservatives and also of the Unionists joined the Irish and the Liberals in voting against the protective tariff on grain.

German politics also are affected by the protection question. It is avowedly a landlord question there (vol. v, pp. 585, 600), the agrarian interests and influences constituting the strength of the protection movement, which has advanced so far as to have but little political opposition outside of the Socialist party. The general parliamentary campaigns began about the middle of May and are still proceeding, though but little information regarding them is cabled. At first only slight interest was manifested, but the campaigns are said now to be warming up, the fight being between the Socialists and different varieties of anti-Socialist parties. On the part of the anti-Socialists appeals are made for loyalty to the monarchy, to the church, to the stable institutions, and to the rights of property against the "Godless, lawless, propertyless, greedy disintegrators or dreamers." The Socialists, laying but little stress on doctrinal points, are making an opportunist campaign along anti-protection lines. They demand lower tariffs that there may be cheaper bread and meat. Freedom of speech is also one of the demands they emphasize.

The principal Socialist leader, August Bebel, who has long been a member of the Reichstag and is now a candidate before nine constituencies, predicts an increase in the Socialist membership of the new Reichstag to from 58 to 80, and an increase in the popular vote of 1,000,000, which would carry the aggregate up to 3,000,000. Edward Bernstein, the leader of the opportunist element in the party, makes about the same prediction. But the Socialist organ, the Berlin Vorwärts, expects the party to elect 100 members. Even the opposition concede some gain for the Socialists. There is a Socialist candidate now in every one of the 397 districts.

No matter how successful the Socialists may be at the polls, their victory will be moral rather than political in its influence and effect; for the parliamentary districts are so gerrymandered that even an overwhelming popular majority would still leave the party hopelessly in the minority in the Reichstag. These districts were mapped out in 1869, in accordance with a constitutional provision that there should be one representative for each 100,000 inhabitants (and for any residue of over 50,000 within each State), and that the constituencies should be multiplied and rearranged from time to time so as to preserve this proportion. The first requirement was carried out at the time; but the second has never been carried out. The consequences, in the concrete, are very striking. Thus, to consider only the number of representatives, Prussia has 235 where she should have 345, Hamburg 3 instead of 8, Saxony 23 instead of 42, while in some other States the divergence is slight, and Alsace-Lorraine have even a representative too many. The arrangement of the constituencies is even worse. In Berlin at the last election one constituency had 90,657 inhabitants, another 328,753, another 409,934, and another 586,926. In the Berlin neighborhood an agrarian constituency had 68,118, and a labor constituency 505,395. All the great towns suffered in the same way. In Munich 327,713 people had one representative; in Leipzig, 334,569; in Dortmund, 303,360; in Bochum-Elfenkirchen, 429,903; Elberfeld, Essen, Dusseldorf, Frankfurt, Dresden, Stuttgart, Kiel, Cologne all contained gigantic constituencies. These conditions tell with peculiar force against the Socialist party, and in favor of the agrarian and other aristocratic interests. They are perpetrated for the purpose, doubtless, of keeping the Socialists out of power in the Reichstag. Although the government is ostensibly holding aloof from the campaign now in progress, the emperor's ministers are reported by press dispatches to be using their influence for two distinct purposes—the overthrow of the Socialists and the election of candidates favorable to commercial treaties and preferential tariffs.

The French have made a destructive military raid upon Moorish tribes near the eastern boundary of Morocco. It consisted in an attack upon Figuig, in the French Soudan

region. The French governor-general, Jounart, had recently visited Figuig, which is a fortified oasis where the desert natives find refuge, and was received with rifle shots that killed several of his escort. It was with difficulty that the rest of his party escaped. To teach these natives a lesson in civilization, a punitive expedition of 4,000 troops was consequently sent out. It approached Figuig on the 8th and bombarded it for several hours, destroying a multitude of houses. Part of the French fire was concentrated upon the mosque, which was blown to pieces. This structure is described by the dispatches as "much venerated," and its destruction as "expected to have a great moral effect." The Moors replied to the French bombardment, but there was no loss on the French side. An opportunity was given by the French to the women and children to get out of the town before the bombardment began. After it was over, the French withdrew to Djenaned-Dar, there to await offers of submission, the design being, if offers of submission were not made, to bombard other towns in the Figuig oasis. To avoid misconception in Europe, France has formally notified the European powers that she has no intention of taking Moroccan territory.

As this page goes to press a startling report comes in from Servia. A little before midnight on the 10th a revolution broke out at Belgrade, the capital, under the leadership of Maj. Angikovics, whose troops shot and killed King Alexander, Queen Draga, the queen's sister, her brother Nikodem, Premier Markovitch, the ministers Petrovitch and Tudrovics, Gen. Paslovich (formerly war minister), and some members of the royal guard. Prince Karageorgevitch, a Montenegrin now in Switzerland, has been proclaimed king by the revolutionists, who have formed a new government under Jovan Avakumovics as premier, and revived the constitution of April 6, 1901. The new ministers have summoned parliament to meet at Belgrade on the 15th.

Belated reports of a massacre by Turkish troops at Smerdash were published herein on the 5th. The massacre took place on the 21st of May. It seems that the village of Smerdash was occupied by a band of insurgents, who withdrew to the mountains upon the arrival of the Turks. For this reason the inhabit-