

prior to the enactment of the McKinley law providing for reciprocity treaties, and have remained on the free list to the present time. The McKinley law placed raw sugar such as is imported from Brazil upon the free list, but both the Wilson and the Dingley laws placed a duty on such imports.

Of India rubber, the second in importance of our Brazilian imports, there has been an increase in both quantity and value, the increase in value being most decided. These imports were 26,489,207 pounds, valued at \$13,195,255, in 1895, and 27,464,756 pounds, valued at \$16,999,345, in 1899.

Of cocoa there was an increase from 4,264,701 pounds in 1895 to 4,631,201 pounds in 1899.

The only import in which we find a decrease in quantity is sugar, which decreased from 180,262,039 pounds, valued at \$2,701,287, in 1895, to 41,222,162 pounds, valued at \$810,276, in 1899. As we find the imports of this article for the preceding year to have been 139,426,195 pounds, valued at \$2,317,987, it appears that the principal decrease in imports of sugar from Brazil occurred after the enactment of the Dingley tariff. There being other causes than changes in tariffs for increased or decreased imports, we may not perhaps properly infer that this great decrease in importation of sugar was caused by the Dingley tariff, but such conclusion is certainly more reasonable than that it was the result of the action of President Cleveland and a democratic congress.

Thus we find, instead of a great decrease, a very considerable increase in our imports from Brazil of every article of any importance except the comparatively insignificant import, sugar; and that the principal decrease in imports of this article occurred under a republican tariff.

Looking to our exports to Brazil we find them greatest in the year succeeding the passage of the Wilson tariff.

This law went into effect June 30, 1894, and in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, our domestic exports to Brazil amounted to \$15,135,025, as against exports of \$13,827,914 in the preceding year under the

McKinley tariff and the reciprocity agreement.

It is true that there was an increase in our exports for the year ending June 30, 1891, to \$14,049,273, from exports of the preceding year amounting to \$11,902,496. But as the McKinley law did not go into effect until October 6, 1890, and the reciprocity dickers were not arranged till some months after, they could have had little or no effect to increase our exports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891.

That the increase must be attributed to some other cause is evident from the fact that our exports to Brazil for the year ending June 30, 1893, fell to \$12,339,584, and did not again reach the figures of 1891 and 1892 until after the enactment of the Wilson tariff, when, in 1895, they reached their highest point.

These figures of our trade with Brazil indicate how trivial and inefficient were the measures for extending our foreign trade proposed by Mr. Blaine and advocated yet by his blind followers who failed to comprehend that the real purpose of reciprocity was, as declared by Mr. Blaine, to "safeguard protection." This was accomplished through deluding the public with the idea that something substantial was being done toward freeing commerce, while in fact the fetters were being more closely riveted and trusts and combinations in restraint of trade more strongly entrenched in privilege.

Chicago.

H. L. BLISS.

NEWS

The safety of the foreign ministers in China, as late as the 24th, is now positively assured. This with the exception, of course, of the German minister, whose murder by a mob the Chinese government promptly announced.

At the time of our last report upon this subject (page 248), the only evidence of the safety of the ministers was a cipher message from Mr. Conger, the American minister, received through Chinese channels. This indicated that the ministers were alive but hard pressed on the 18th. It was accepted as genuine by the American government, but the European pow-

ers with one accord denounced it as a clumsy Chinese forgery. They were unanimously of the opinion that all the ministers had been massacred very early in the month.

But on the 26th a message reached Chefoo from Sir Claude Macdonald, the British minister at Peking. Though this message was dated as early as the 4th it indicated that the legations could hold out for a short time, which had the effect of weakening the theory that the ministers had been massacred early in the month. That theory was further weakened by a second dispatch from Macdonald. Its date was the 6th and its tenor as follows:

We are receiving no assistance from the authorities. Three legations are still standing, including the British. The Chinese are shelling us from the city with three-inch guns and some smaller ones which they use for sniping. We may be annihilated any day. Our ammunition and food are short and we would have perished by this time only the Chinese cowards have no organized plan of attack. If not pressed we may be able to hold out for a fortnight longer. Otherwise not more than four days at the utmost. I anticipate only a slight resistance to the relief force, which I advise approaching by the eastern gate or by the river. Our losses until to-day have been 40 killed and 80 wounded.

On the 27th a servant of the murdered German minister reached Tientsin and reported that the legations were safe as late as the 8th. This was confirmed and the period of assured safety extended to the 19th by a cipher dispatch brought by a Japanese runner to the Japanese consul at Tientsin. The consul had sent the runner to Peking on the 15th. On the 19th he left Peking to return with the dispatch, which was as follows:

We are defending ourselves against the Chinese very well, but now the attack has stopped. We will keep up to the last of the month, although it will be no easy task.

A third message from Sir Claude Macdonald brought the date of safety down to the 21st. He said:

British legation, Peking, June 20 to July 16 repeatedly attacked by Chinese troops on all sides. Both rifle and artillery fire. Since July 16 an armistice, but a cordon is strictly drawn on both sides of the position. Chinese barricades close to ours.

This note was rapidly followed by messages from different directions

containing the same and further assurances, though indicating that the danger was not past. One was from Mr. Conger, who said that by agreement there had been no firing since the 16th. Another was from Lieut. Col. Shiba, Japanese military attache at Peking, who wrote on the 22d that the legations were then impatiently awaiting reinforcements, and explained that they had been blockaded since the 13th of June, and since the 20th of that month had "been attacked continually, night and day, by the Chinese soldiers from more than ten encampments." He added:

By a supreme effort we are still defending. We are daily awaiting with the greatest anxiety arrival of a reinforcing army, and if you can't reach here in less than a week's time it is probable that we will not be able to hold out any longer.

Finally, on the 2d, a fourth message from Sir Claude Macdonald virtually testified to the safety of the ministers down to its date—the 24th. In this note Macdonald said:

We are surrounded by imperial troops, who are firing upon us continuously. The enemy is enterprising but cowardly. We have provisions for about a fortnight and are eating our ponies. The Chinese government, if there be one, has done nothing whatever to help us. If the Chinese don't press the attack we can hold out for say, ten days. So no time is to be lost if a terrible massacre is to be avoided.

Dispatches from Chinese sources are in harmony as to the safety of the foreign ministers with the dispatches quoted above; and they bring the date of safety down to the 27th—five days later than the legation messages. An imperial decree of the 24th stated that "all the foreign representatives, except Baron Von Ketteler," were then "in safety and unharmed," and that "provisions in the shape of food-stuffs, vegetables and fruits" would be "supplied to the legations in order to show" the courtesy of the emperor. And on the 27th Li Hung Chang telegraphed from Shanghai:

Pekin reports ministers alive. Safety assured. Allied forces entrance Peking unnecessary.

As we write (August 2) it is believed that the allied army at Tientsin is advancing upon Peking. It is certain that a movement from Tientsin began on the 1st; and Gen. Sir Alfred Gaselee, commanding the British

forces, had announced his intention on the 31st of making an immediate advance upon Peking, expressing his hope of having the cooperation of the other forces. The report of last week that Gen. Dragiminoff, the Russian, would command the allies was not without foundation, though it is settled that he will not have command. He declines the appointment, said to have been proffered by the czar with the consent of the other powers, pleading advanced age and feeble health.

Italy divides the world's attention for the moment with China because of the assassination on the 29th of King Humbert. The king had attended a gymnastic exhibition at Monza, his summer home, for the purpose of distributing prizes, and was in his carriage about to drive to the palace when he was shot by a bystander named Bressi. He died almost instantly. Bressi, who made no attempt to escape, was immediately arrested. He declared himself an anarchist who had come from Paterson, N. J., especially to commit this murder.

King Humbert was born in Turin March 14, 1814. He was the son of Victor Emmanuel II. of the house of Savoy, and succeeded to the Italian throne on the death of his father, January 9, 1878. He had taken a prominent part, though but a youth, in the events leading up to the unification and consolidation of the Italian states into one kingdom. In 1868 he married his cousin, Margherita of Savoy, and his only son, Victor Emmanuel III., the prince of Naples, succeeds him upon the Italian throne. His reign in general was monotonous, varied by only two great events: the formation of the "triple alliance" with Germany, and Austro-Hungary, which he is supposed to have effected, and the disastrous war with Abyssinia.

Notwithstanding the excitement over the assassination of King Humbert, and the supreme importance of the situation in China, the war in South Africa still demands attention. When we wrote of this subject last week Lord Roberts's enveloping movement reported on page 185 had not yet culminated in success, and he had just begun an advance from Pretoria apparently toward the southwest, the details of which were not yet known. A day or two later he reported a heavy engagement south of

Bethlehem, in the Orange Free State, where his original enveloping plans are supposed to be in operation. The engagement occurred on the 24th and 25th, and in the course of it the British were forced out of some of their positions. New positions, however, were secured, and on the 27th Lord Roberts reported the Boers as closed in upon. On the 30th, after heavy fighting, they surrendered at Fouriesburg unconditionally. The number surrendering was at first reported as 5,000; but a dispatch of the 31st from Lord Roberts made it 986. This number was augmented, however, in a dispatch of the 1st, which told of the surrender of 1,200 more.

Instead of advancing southwesterly from Pretoria, as last week's reports indicated, Lord Roberts appears to have moved eastwardly along the railroad from Pretoria to Lourenzo Marques. On the 25th he reported from Balmoral, one of the stations on the road, that part of his force had fought an engagement the day before six miles south of that point and had routed the Boers by a flank movement. The British pursued, crossing Olifant's river on the 25th and occupying Middleburg on the 29th. But they did not succeed in surrounding the Boer force, and Lord Roberts returned to Pretoria.

In the Philippines also fighting goes on. At Oroquieta, in northern Mindanao, it is reported that in revenge for the murder of an American soldier, who was bolloed while buying food in a native store, a company of the Fortieth infantry killed 89 of the villagers, and that the gunboat Callao afterwards shelled the village. In the general fighting of the week ten Americans were killed and 14 wounded.

An Associated Press dispatch of the 29th from Manila reports the attempted celebration of the amnesty proclamation to have been a complete failure. The natives showed the utmost indifference, and Judge Taft and others of the commission refused to attend the banquet, as they learned that speeches in favor of independence under American protection would be made.

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in