

the policy of his government, stood by the established authority, supporting the native sovereign and Mataafa. The American and German authorities in the island were thus brought into conflict, and serious difficulties occurred between the ships of the two nations in the harbor.

When the news of this state of affairs reached Germany, in April, 1889, several additional men-of-war were sent out to the island to uphold the German cause. Mataafa and the Germans were thus brought to war. Meanwhile the American government took up the cause of its consul and of King Malietoa as against the insurrection. A section of the American navy was dispatched to the distant island, and the ships of war of two of the greatest nations of Christendom were thus set face to face in a harbor of the South Pacific Ocean.

In this condition of affairs, on the 22d of March, 1889, one of the most violent hurricanes ever known in the islands blew up from the north, and the American and German war-vessels were driven upon the great reef which constitutes the only break-water outside of the harbor of Apia. Here they were wrecked. The American war-ships *Nipsic*, *Trenton*, and *Vandalia* were dashed into ruins. The German vessels *Adler*, *Olga*, and *Eber* were also lost. The English vessel *Calliope*, which was caught in the storm, was the only war-ship which escaped by steaming out to sea. Serious loss of life accompanied the disaster: 4 American officers and 46 men, 9 German officers and 87 men sank to rise no more.

Meanwhile England had become interested in the dispute, and had taken a stand with the United States as against the decision of Germany. The matter became of so great importance that President Harrison, who had in the meantime acceded to office as chief magistrate, appointed, with the advice of the Senate, an Embassy Extraordinary, to go to Berlin and meet Prince Bismarck in a conference with a view to a peaceful solution of the difficulty. The ambassadors appointed for this purpose were J. A. Kasson, of Iowa; William W. Phelps, of New Jersey; and G. H. Bates, of Delaware. The commissioners set out on the 13th of April, and on their arrival at the capital of the German Empire opened negotiations with the Chancellor Bismarck and his son. The attitude and demand of the American government was that the independence of Samoa, under its native sovereign, should be acknowledged and guaranteed by the great nations concerned in the controversy. The conference closed in May, 1889, with the restoration of King Malietoa and the recognition of his sovereignty over the island.

The closing week of May, 1889, was made forever memorable in the history of the United States by the destruction of Johnstown,

Pennsylvania. The calamity was caused by the bursting of a reservoir and the pouring out of the deluge in the valley below. A large artificial lake had been constructed in the ravine of the South Fork River, a tributary of the Conemaugh. It was a fishing lake, the property of a company of wealthy sportsmen, and was about five miles in length, varying in depth from fifty to one hundred feet. An immense volume of water was thus accumulated in a gorge at the foot of the mountains, and was, as it were, suspended over the valley of Conemaugh. The country below the lake was thickly peopled. The city of Johnstown, with a population of more than ten thousand, lay at the junction of the South Fork with the Conemaugh. In the last days of May unusually heavy rains fell in all that region, swelling every stream to a torrent. The South Fork Lake became full to overflowing. The dam had been imperfectly constructed. On the afternoon of May 31 the dam of the reservoir burst wide open in the center and a solid wall of water from twenty to fifty feet in height rushed down the valley with terrific violence. The country was already inundated, and on top of the swollen streams was poured a veritable flood.

The destruction which ensued was among the greatest which the modern world has witnessed. In the path of the deluge every thing was swept away. The manufacturing city of Johnstown was totally wrecked, and was thrown in an indescribable heap of horror against the aqueduct of the Pennsylvania railway, which spanned the river below the town. Here the ruins caught fire, and the wild shrieks of hundreds of miserable victims were drowned in the holocaust. According to the best estimates more than 2,000 people perished in the flood or were burned to death in the ruins. The heart of the nation responded quickly to the sufferings of the survivors, and millions of dollars in money and supplies were poured out to relieve the despair of those who survived the calamity.

The year 1889 witnessed the assembling at Washington City of an International Congress. The body was composed of delegates from the Central and South American States, from Mexico, and the United States of America. Popularly the assembly was known as the "Pan-American Congress." The event was the culmination of a policy adopted by the United States some years previously. General Grant, during his presidency and in the subsequent parts of his life, had endeavored to promote more intimate relations with the Spanish-American peoples. James G. Blaine, Secretary of State under Garfield, entertained a similar ambition. The publicist and author, Hinton Rowan Helper, had also by his writings and ad-



vocacy, greatly promoted the cause of overland intercourse through the Three Americas. Mr. Blaine in this cause was accused of a purpose to create in the United States a policy similar to Disraeli's "high-jingoism" in Great Britain. The United States were to become the arbiter of the Western nations. To this end the Central American and South American States must be brought, first into intimacy with our Republic, and afterwards to be made to follow her lead in warding off all Europeanism.

The death of Garfield prevented the institution of some such policy as that here vaguely defined. Nevertheless, in 1884, an Act was passed by Congress authorizing the President to appoint a commission "to ascertain and report upon the best modes of securing more intimate international commercial relations between the United States and the several countries of Central and South America." Commissioners were sent out to the countries referred to, and the movement for the Congress was started. Not until May of 1888, however, was the Act passed providing for the Congress. The Spanish-American nations responded to the overtures and took the necessary steps to meet the United States in the conference. The objects contemplated were, first, to promote measures pertaining to the peace and prosperity of the peoples concerned; to establish customs-unions among them; to improve the means of communication between the ports of the States represented, and to advance the commercial interests and political harmony of the nations of the New World.

The Spanish-American and Portuguese-American States, to the number of nine, appointed their delegates, and the latter arrived in the United States in the autumn of 1889. President Harrison on his part named ten members of the Congress as follows: John F. Hanson, of Georgia; Morris M. Estee, of California; Henry G. Davis, of West Virginia; Andrew Carnegie, of Pennsylvania; T. Jefferson Coolidge, of Massachusetts; Clement Studebaker, of Indiana; Charles R. Flint, of New York; William H. Trescot, of South Carolina; Cornelius N. Bliss, of New York; and John B. Henderson, of Missouri. Mexico sent two representatives, namely: Matias Romero and Enrique A. Maxia. Brazil, still an Empire, also sent two delegates: J. G. de Amaral Valente and Salvador de Mendonca. The representative of Honduras was Jeronimo Zelaya; Fernando Cruz, the delegate of Guatemala, and Jacinto Castellanos of San Salvador. Costa Rica sent as her representative Manuel Aragon. Horatio Guzman, Minister of Nicaragua, represented his

Government in the Congress. The Argentine Republic had two delegates: Roque Saenz Pena and Manuel Quintana. Chili sent two delegates: Emilio C. Varas and José Alfonso. The representatives of the United States of Colombia were José M. Hurtado, Carlos Martinez Silva, and Climaco Calderon. The delegates of Venezuela were Nicanor Bolet Peraza, José Andrade, and Francisco Antonia Silva; that of Peru was F. C. C. Zegarra; that of Ecuador, José Maria Placido Caamano; that of Uruguay, Alberto Nin; that of Bolivia, Juan F. Velarde; that of Hayti, Arthur Laforestrie; and that of Paraguay, José S. Decoud.

The representatives met in Washington City, in October. Committees were formed to report to the body suitable action on the subjects which might properly come before it for discussion. From the first the proceedings took a peculiarly practical direction. The great questions of commerce were at the bottom of the reports, the debates and the actions which followed. Nor can it be doubted that the movement as a whole conducted in the highest degree to the friendship, prosperity and mutual interests of the nations concerned.

At the same time an International Maritime Conference, for which provisions had been made in the legislation of several nations, convened at Washington. In this case the States of Europe were concerned in common with those of the New World. All the maritime nations were invited by the act of Congress to send representatives to the National Capital in the following year, to consider the possibility of establishing uniform rules and regulations for the government of vessels at sea, and for the adoption of a common system of marine signals. Twenty-six nations accepted the call of the American Government, and appointed delegates to the Congress. They, too, as well as the representatives of the Pan-American Conference, held their sittings in November and December of 1889. The same practical ability and good sense as related to the subjects under consideration were shown by the members of the Maritime Conference as by those of the sister body, and the results reached were equally encouraging and equally gratifying, not only to the Government of the United States, but to all the countries whose interests were involved in the discussions.

We may here revert briefly to the work of the Fifty-first Congress. The proceedings of that branch of the Government were marked with much partisan bitterness and excitement. The first question which occupied the attention of the body was the revision of the tariff. In the preceding pages we have developed with suffi-



cient amplitude the history and various phases of this question. The Civil War brought in a condition of affairs which must, in the nature of the case, entail the tariff issue on the rest of the century. More than two decades elapsed after the close of the conflict before the attention of the American people was sufficiently aroused to the nature of the laws bearing on their industrial condition. Then it was that they first became aware of the fact that a schedule of customs-duties, which had been brought forth under the exigency of war, still existed, and that under the operation of this schedule a vast array of protected industries had grown great and strong. Around them consolidated corporations had been formed, having millions of money at their command and vast ramifications into political society. As a consequence, the revenues of the United States were swollen to mountainous proportions. The treasury at Washington became engorged, and at length the necessity was developed of doing something in the nature of reform.

The condition of affairs in the treasury — depending as it did upon the tariff system — entailed two prodigious evils: the surplus served as a motive in Congress for all manner of jobbery and extravagant expenditure. In the second place, it enabled the combined monopolies of the country to uphold themselves by affecting national legislation in favor of the protected industries and against the common interest of the people as a whole. The situation was really a danger and constant menace. It was for this reason that President Cleveland, as already noted, sent his celebrated annual message to Congress, touching upon the single question of the evils of the existing system and asking that body to take such steps as should lead to a general reform.

We have already seen how this question was uppermost in the presidential contest of 1888. The Democratic platform boldly espoused the doctrine of tariff reform, but stopped short — out of an expedient deference to the manufacturing interests — of absolute free trade. The Republican platform declared for a revision of the tariff system — such a revision as might preserve the manufacturing interests, but favor those industries which seemed to be disparaged. This clause of the platform proved to be wonderfully effective in the political campaign. The event showed, however, that it was a shuffle. A very large part of the Republicans understood by “revision of the tariff” such legislation as should *reduce and reform* the existing system, not merely change it and adapt it to the interests of the protected classes.

With the opening of the Fifty-first Congress it soon became apparent that “revision of the tariff” was not to mean a reform by reduction and curtailments of the schedule, but that the actual movement was in the other direction! Representative William McKinley, of Ohio, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, brought in a measure which passed into history under the name of the McKinley Bill, and which, finally adopted by the Republican majority, was incorporated as a part of the governmental system. The policy of the bill was to abolish the existing duties on a few great articles of production, particularly raw sugar and the lower grades of refined sugar. By this means a vast reduction was secured in the aggregate revenues, notwithstanding the fact that the average rates of import duties on manufactured articles in general was raised from about forty-seven per cent. to more than fifty-three per cent.! The McKinley Bill became, therefore, efficient by adroitly drawing to its principles the sympathies of the protected classes, and at the same time, by throwing free — and therefore cheap — sugar to the people, attracted not a little popular support. The contest over the measure was extreme in animosity, and the bill was adopted only after great delay.

The sequel showed unusual results. The tariff legislation of the Fifty-first Congress was immediately attacked by the Democratic and Independent press of the country. Opinion was overwhelmingly against it. The general elections of 1890 brought an astonishing verdict of the people against the late enactments. There was a complete political revulsion by which the Republican majority in the House of Representatives was replaced by a Democratic majority of nearly three to one. At a later period a second reaction ensued somewhat favorable to the McKinley legislation, and the author of the measures referred to succeeded in being chosen, in 1891, governor of Ohio, attaining his position by a popular majority of over twenty thousand.

Another incident in the history of the same Congress relates to the serious difficulty which arose in the House of Representatives between the Democratic minority and the Speaker, Thomas B. Reed, of Maine. The Republican majority in the Fifty-first House was not large, and the minority were easily able, in matters of party legislation, to break the quorum by refusing to vote. In order to counteract this policy, a new system of rules was reported, empowering the Speaker to count the minority as present, whether voting or not voting, and thus to compel a quorum. These rules



were violently resisted by the Democrats, and Speaker Reed was denounced by his opponent as an unjust and arbitrary officer. He was nicknamed in the jargon of the times "The Czar," because of his rulings and strong-handed method of making the records of the House show a majority when no majority had actually voted on the pending questions. It was under the provision of the new rule that nearly all of the party measures of the Fifty-first Congress were adopted.

One of the most important of these acts was the attempt to pass through Congress a measure bearing radically upon the election-system of the United States. A bill was reported by which it was proposed virtually to transfer the control of the Congressional elections in the States of the Union from State to National authority. It cannot be doubted that the measure reached down to the fundamental principles of American political society. The "Force Bill," as it was called, brought out the strongest passions of the day. The opposition was intense. The Republican party was by no means unanimous in support of the measure. A large part of the thinking people of the United States, without respect to political affiliation, doubted the expediency of this additional measure of centralization.

Certain it was that serious and great abuses existed in the election-systems of the States. In many parts of the United States elections were not free. In parts of the South the old animosities against the political equality of the Black Men were still sufficiently vital to prevent the freedom of the ballot. Congressmen were many times chosen by a small minority who, from their social and political superiority, were able to baffle or intimidate the ignorant many at the polls. Such an abuse called loudly for a reform; but the measure proposed doubtless contained within itself the potent germs of abuses greater than those which it was sought to remove. The Elections Bill was for a long time debated in Congress, and was then laid over indefinitely in such manner as to prevent final action upon it. Certain Republican Senators who were opposed to the measure, and at the same time strongly wedded to the cause of the free coinage of silver money, joined their votes with the Democrats, and the so-called "Force Bill" failed of adoption.

The third great measure of the Fifty-first Congress was the attempt to restore silver to a perfect equality with gold in the coinage system of the United States. Since 1874 there had been an increasing departure in the market values of gold and silver bullion, though the purchasing power of the two money metals had been kept equal

when the same were coined, under the provisions of legal tender. The purchasing power of gold bullion had in the last fifteen years risen about sixteen per cent., while the purchasing power of silver bullion had fallen about four per cent., in the markets of the world, thus producing a difference of twenty per cent. or more, in the purchasing power of the two metals in bullion. One class of theorists, assuming that gold is the only standard of values, insisted that this difference in the purchasing power of the two raw metals had arisen wholly from a depreciation in the price of silver. This class included the monometalists — those who desire that the monetary system of the United States shall be brought to the single standard of gold, and that silver shall be made wholly subsidiary to the richer metal. To this class belonged the fund-holding syndicates, and indeed all great creditors whose interest it is to have the debts due them discharged in as costly a dollar as possible.

As a matter of course, if a debt be contracted on a basis of two metals, that fact gives to the debtor the valuable option of paying in the cheaper of the two coins. This valuable option the people of the United States have enjoyed, greatly to their advantage and prosperity. The silver dollar has been for precisely a hundred years (with the exception of the quadrennium extending from 1874 to 1878) the dollar of the law and the contract. It has never been altered or abridged to the extent of a fraction of a grain from the establishment of our system of money in 1792. It has therefore been, and continues to be, the lawful and undoubted unit of all money and account in the United States, just as much, and even more, than the gold dollar with which it is associated. If it be true, therefore, that there is a radical and irremediable departure in the value of these two metals — if it be true that we have, as monometalists assert, an 80-cent dollar — it is clearly and demonstrably true that we have also a "long dollar," a dollar worth more than par, a 120-cent dollar, which the creditor classes desire to have substituted for the dollar of the law and the contract.

The advocates of the free coinage of silver have argued that the difference in the bullion values of the two money metals has arisen most largely from an increase in the purchasing power of gold, and that equal legislation and equal favor shown to the two money metals would bring them to par the one with the other, and keep them in that relation in the markets of the world. It is claimed, with good reason, that the laws hitherto enacted by Congress discriminating against silver and in favor of gold, were impolitic, un-



just and un-American. It was urged in the debates of 1889-90 that the free coinage of silver would be of vast advantage to the financial interests of the country. This view and argument, however, were strenuously opposed by the money centres and credit-holding classes of the United States, to whom the payment of all debts according to the highest standard of value, that is, in gold only, was a fundamental principle.

The debates, for awhile, seemed likely to disrupt the existing political order. Suddenly the United States Senate, by a combination of a large number of free-silver Republicans, with the great majority of the Democrats, passed a bill for the absolute free coinage of silver, and for the day it seemed that the measure had succeeded. The Administration, however, was strongly opposed to free coinage. The Senate bill was therefore adroitly arrested by the management of Speaker Reed and the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Another bill, in the form of an amendment providing for the *purchase* (but not for the *coinage*) of four million ounces of silver monthly, by the treasury of the United States, and the payment therefor in silver certificates having the form and functions of money, was passed by the House and finally accepted by the Senate. An expansion of the *paper* money of the country was thus effected, while at the same time the control of the silver bullion was retained in the treasury under the management of those who were opposed to free coinage and hopeful ultimately of at least effecting a compromise by which a more valuable silver dollar may be substituted in the interest of the creditor classes in place of the standard silver dollar which has borne the full legal tender quality since the foundation of the Government. By the legislation just referred to, the ultimate decision of the silver question was thrown over to another Congress, to constitute a menace and terror to party discipline for both the Democratic and Republican parties.

In addition to the admission of four new States, the Fifty-first Congress passed the necessary acts for the organization of Idaho and Wyoming. These were destined to make the forty-third and forty-fourth members of the Union. Idaho at the time of organization contained a population of 84,385. Wyoming had a population of 60,705. The acts for Statehood were passed for the two new commonwealths on the 3d and 10th of July, respectively, in the year 1890.

In June of the same year was taken the eleventh decennial census of the United States. Its results, so far as the same have

been compiled, indicate that the aggregate population of the country has increased to 62,622,250, exclusive of Indians not taxed and Whites in Alaska and the Indian Territory. These additions will doubtless increase the grand total to 63,000,000 souls. The centre of population had continued its progress westward, having removed during the ninth decade from the vicinity of Cincinnati to a point near the hamlet of Westport, in Decatur County, Indiana.

The period which is here before us was marked by the death of three of the few remaining great leaders of the Civil War. On the 5th of August, 1885, Lieutenant-General Sheridan, at that time commander-in-chief of the American army, died at his home in Nonquitt, Massachusetts. Few other generals of the Union army had won greater admiration and higher honors. He was in many senses a model soldier, and his death at the comparatively early age of fifty-seven, was the occasion of great grief throughout the country. Still more conspicuous was the fall of General William T. Sherman. Among the Union commanders in the great Civil War, he stood easily next to Grant in greatness and reputation. In vast and varied abilities, particularly in military accomplishments, he was perhaps superior to all. It may well be thought that he was more fortunate than any other—and wiser. After the war, he steadily refused to be other than a great soldier. No enticement, no blandishment, no form of applause or persuasion, could induce him to exchange the laurels which he had won in the immortal contest for the Union for any other form of chaplet or perishable wreath.

Sherman might have been President of the United States. It were not far from the truth to believe that he was the only man in America who ever willingly put aside that glittering prize. To have fallen into the hands of politicians, place-hunters, jobbers and cormorants, would have been intolerable to that brusque, sturdy and truthful nature. With a clearer vision even than the vision of Grant, he perceived that to be the unsullied great soldier of the Union, was to be better than anything made by men in caucus and convention. Born in 1820, he reached the mature age of seventy-one, and died at his home in New York City, on the 14th day of February, 1891. That event produced a profound impression. The General of the Union army who had fought so many great battles and said so many great things, was at last silent in death. Of his sterling patriotism there had never been a doubt. Of his prescience in war, of his learning, of his abilities as an author, there could be as little skepticism. As to his wonderful faculties and achievements,



all men were agreed. His funeral became the man. He had provided for that also, in advance. He had directed that nothing other than a soldier's burial should be reserved for him. His remains were taken under escort from New York to St. Louis, where they were deposited in the family burying grounds, in Mount Calvary Cemetery.

After the death of General Sherman, only two commanders of the first class remained on the stage of action from the great Civil War — both Confederates. These were Generals Joseph E. Johnston and James Longstreet. The former of these two was destined to follow his rival and conqueror at an early day to the land of rest. General Johnston had been an honorary pall-bearer at the funeral of Sherman, and contracted a heavy cold on that occasion, which resulted in his death on the 20th of February, 1891, at his home in Washington City. Strange fatality of human affairs that after twenty-five years, he who surrendered his sword to Sherman at Raleigh, should have come home from the funeral of the victor to die! General Johnston was in his eighty-third year at the time of his decease. Among the Confederate commanders none were his superiors, with the single exception of Lee. After the close of the war, his conduct had been of a kind to win the confidence of Union men, and at the time of his death he was held in almost universal honor.

It was at this time, namely, in February of 1891, that a serious event reaching upward and outward, first, into national and then into international proportions, occurred in the city of New Orleans. There existed in that metropolis a branch of the secret social organization among the Italians known by the European name of the Mafia Society. The principles of the brotherhood involved mutual protection, and even the law of revenge against enemies. Doubtless much of the spirit which had belonged to the Italian order of the Mafia had been transferred to America. At any rate, some of the features of the order were un-American in character, and some of the methods dangerous to the public and private peace. Several breaks occurred between members of the society (not the society itself) and the police authorities of the city; and the latter, by arrest and persecution, incurred the dislike and hatred of the former. The difficulty grew in animosity until at length Captain David C. Hennessey, chief of the police of New Orleans, was assassinated by some secret murderer, or murderers, who for the time escaped detection. It was believed, however, that the Mafia society was at the

bottom of the assassination, and several of the members of the brotherhood were arrested under the charge of murder.

A trial followed, and the circumstances tended to establish — but did *not* establish — the guilt of the prisoners. The proof was not positive — did not preclude a reasonable doubt of the guilt of those on trial, and the first three of the Italian prisoners were acquitted. The sequel was unfortunate in the last degree. A great excitement followed the decision of the court and jury, and charges were made and published that the jury had been bribed or terrorized with threats into making a false verdict. These charges were never substantiated, and were doubtless without authenticity. But on the day following the acquittal of the Italians, a public meeting, having its origin in mobocracy, was called, and a great crowd, irresponsible and angry, gathered around the statue of Henry Clay, in one of the public squares of New Orleans.

Speeches were made. The authorities of the city, instead of attempting to check the movement, stood off and let it take its own course. A mob was at once organized and directed against the jail, where the Italian prisoners were confined. The jail was entered by force. The prisoners were driven from their cells, and nine of them were shot to death in the jail-yard. Two others were dragged forth and hanged. Nor can it be doubted that the innocent as well as the guilty (if indeed any were guilty — as certainly none were guilty according to law) suffered in the slaughter.

The event was followed by the greatest public excitement. Clearly murder and outrage had been done by the mob. It was soon proved that at least two of the murdered Italians had been subjects of the Italian Kingdom; the rest were either naturalized Americans or foreigners bearing papers of intention. The affair at once became of national, and then of international, importance. The President of the United States called upon Governor Nicolls, of Louisiana, to give an account of the thing done in New Orleans, and its justification. The governor replied with a communication in which it were hard to say whether insolence or inconsequential apology for the actions of the mob was uppermost. With this the excitement increased. The Italian Minister, Baron Fava, at Washington, entered his solemn protest against the killing of his countrymen, and the American Secretary of State entered into communication with King Humbert on the subject.

Italy was thoroughly aroused. The Italian societies in various American cities passed angry resolutions against the destruction of



their fellow-citizens by the mob, and the newspapers of the country teemed with discussions of the subject. There was unfortunately a disposition on the part of America to play the bully. At times, threats of war were freely made, and it appeared not impossible that the two countries would become unhappily involved in a conflict. The more thoughtful, however, looked with confidence to the settlement of the question by peaceable means. The Italian Government presently recalled Baron Fava from Washington, and during the remainder of the year, communications between the two governments were made only through the Italian Chargè d'Affaires at Washington. Gradually, however, the excitement subsided. The American Government was fortunate in having as its representative at the Court of Italy the Honorable Albert G. Porter, a man of calm temperament and deeply imbued with the sense of justice and right. By the beginning of 1892 it had become certain that the unpleasant episode would pass without further menace of war, and that the question involved in the difficulty would be justly settled in the course of time by the equitable rules of diplomacy.

The year 1891 was noted for a serious difficulty between the United States and the Republic of Chili. The complication had its origin in the domestic affairs of that Republic, particularly in a revolution which, in the spring of the year named, began to make headway against the existing government. At the head of that government was President Balmaceda, against whom the popular party in the Chilian Congress was violently arrayed. The President was accused of seeking to influence the choice of his own successor in the approaching election, but more especially of retaining in office a Ministry out of harmony with the Congressional majority. The latter point was the more serious, and led at length to the assumption of dictatorial powers by the President. This course seemed necessary in order to maintain himself in power and to uphold the existing Ministry. The popular party receded from Congress only to take up arms. This party was known in the civil conflict that ensued as the Congressionalists, while the upholders of the existing order were called Balmacedists. The latter had possession of the government; but the former, outside of the great cities of Valparaiso and Santiago, were the most powerful.

The insurrection against Balmaceda gathered head. A Congressional Junta was formed, and a provisional government was set up at the town of Iquique. Thus far the movement had in no wise disturbed the relations of Chili with the United States. It is in the

nature of such revolutions that the insurgent party must acquire resources, gather arms and create all the other means of its existence, progress and success. The Chilians of the Congressional faction found themselves in great need of arms, and would fain look to some foreign nation for a supply. In the emergency they managed to get possession of a steamship called the *Itata*, belonging to the South American Steamship Company, and sent her to the western coast of the United States to purchase arms. The steamer came to the harbor of San Diego, California, and by the agency of an intermediate vessel managed to secure a large purchase of arms, and to get the same transferred to her own deck. At this juncture, however, the government, gaining information of the thing done, ordered the detention of the *Itata* until her business and destination could be known. A district attorney of the United States was sent on board the ship, which was ordered not to leave the bay. In defiance of this order, however, the officers of the *Itata* steamed out by night and got to sea. They put the officer of the United States in a boat, sent him ashore, and disappeared over the Pacific horizon.

The announcement of the escape of the *Itata* led to vigorous action on the part of the Government. The United States war-ship *Charleston* was ordered out in pursuit from the bay of San Francisco.

The *Itata*, however, had three days the start, and it could hardly be expected that the *Charleston* would be able to overhaul the fugitive. The former made her way to one of the harbors of Chili, whither she was pursued by the *Charleston*. But the matter had now come to protest, made by the United States to the provisional government of the Revolutionists, and the latter consented to the surrender of the *Itata* to the authorities of our country. This was done, and the incident seemed for the time to have ended without serious consequences.

After the affair of the *Itata*, public opinion in Chili, particularly in the cities of Santiago and Valparaiso, turned strongly against the United States. This is said of the sentiments of the Congressional party. That party saw itself thwarted in its design and put at fault by its failure to secure the wished-for supply of arms, that failure having arisen through the agency of our Government. However correct the course of the United States may have been, the Revolutionists must needs be angered at their disappointment, and it was natural for them to look henceforth with distrust and dislike on the authorities of our country. This dislike centered about the legation of the United States in Santiago. Hon. Patrick Egan, the American