

course, in the mind of the general public, that terminates the matter and leaves no room for discussion; but yet, are there not events that point rather to a different working out of the problem, if we look up the history of the past few days, or weeks?

The Chinese situation first had something definite to work from in the chaos of counter claims when Great Britain calmly declared that certain Chinese ports must be kept open for commercial purposes. The world's eyes were turned upon the Lion as they wondered at the nation that thus coolly threw down the gauntlet. And even while they watched for the next move of the powers of Europe they heard the declaration of the United States in favor of the policy of Great Britain in China. Yet the students of international amity appear to have completely overlooked this. Perhaps their eyes may be opened when they read to-day that the American fleet which left for the Philippines has put in an appearance in Chinese waters, apparently ready to lend Great Britain a helping hand in case need of it should arise. So much in earnest of the United States' desire to assist Great Britain to keep China open to the trade of the world.

From the other standpoint there is also something to be said. We are told that the North Atlantic squadron of the British navy is lying at Bermuda. Nothing very startling about that. Quite true is it that Great Britain's ships have lain hundreds of times in the same harbor, and hundreds of times again will they be there. But at this particular time they are lying there with steam up ready to move immediately upon the receipt of orders. What important and sudden move does Great Britain expect to make that she is thus holding ready for instant despatch so formidable a fleet of warships? Would it be at all strange if Great Britain should be preparing to protect her own trans Atlantic commerce? Immediately upon the declaration of war Spanish warships would, undoubtedly, blockade American ports and seize upon any and all ships ingoing or outward bound.

In that case New York would, of course, be the greatest sufferer. During the fiscal year 1896-7, exports of domestic merchandise from that port amounted to \$382,610,975, or nearly four times those from any other city in the United States. The total domestic exports of the United States during the same period were but \$1,032,007,603, showing that New York exported over one-third of the total. Of the total of these exports the United Kingdom took \$478,448,592, and other British possessions (exclusive of Canada) took \$46,433,339, a total of \$524,052,237 of supplies which Britain annually requires from the United States. New York exported foreign merchandise during the same time to the value of \$9,068,932. The total foreign exports of the United States were \$18,985,953, so we see New York sent nearly half of the whole amount. Of this total the United Kingdom took \$4,821,806 worth and other British possessions (again excluding Canada), took \$394,481 worth, a grand total of \$5,216,287.

Then take up the exports of the United Kingdom and other British possessions, to the United States during the same year. We find that of the total imports into the United States from all countries of \$764,730,412 New York received goods to the amount of \$480,603,580—over half the total. The United Kingdom sent to the United States goods to the amount of \$167,947,820. Other British possessions (minus

Canada) sent \$45,171,935, which means goods from Great Britain and her colonies to the extent of \$213,019,755.

Now, what do we deduce from all this? Let us make a comparison or two and see what conclusion it forces us to.

New York city exports over one-third of the total domestic merchandise exported by the United States. Then, at the least calculation, she must send \$175,000,000 of goods to British territory (not including Canada). New York sends out over one-half the foreign merchandise exported by the United States. Then it must send at least \$2,500,000 worth to British possessions. New York receives much more than half the total imports of the United States. Then New York must receive about \$110,000,000 of British goods. Thus at a very moderate estimate, and leaving out Canada's immense trade, which is principally conducted by rail, there is at least \$287,000,000 of trade for which Great Britain must keep open the port of New York free from blockade by Spanish warships.

Is it at all beyond the bounds of possibility—rather is it not a probability that a British fleet ready for instant service at Bermuda, is there for no other purpose than to prevent the Spanish from blockading New York? History tells us of the deeds of Spanish buccaneers and privateersmen on the high seas when they sacked and scuttled many treasure ships and merchantmen. Their greatest opportunity to damage the United States would be by the adoption of such methods of attack. They would blockade New York and seize upon every ship that tried to run the blockade. That would mean great loss to British trade, and there is no surer way to rouse the Mistress of the Seas than by infringing, no matter how little, upon her commerce. The protection of New York under these circumstances becomes imperative. It would be unnecessary to protect other Atlantic ports because the whole traffic might be easily conducted through New York. The necessity of such action is still more apparent when we consider that the volume of trade along this particular line would be so immensely increased by reason of New York being the only safe port of entrance and exit. Great Britain's action would be in the interest of many other nations who would take advantage of the privileges her armed forces were offering them, and continue to trade with the United States, via New York. Is it likely that Great Britain would allow her commerce to lose three hundred million dollars a year because Spain undertook to blockade New York? Or is it likely that she would undertake an ocean patrol and invite the Dons to keep away from New York and do their fighting elsewhere? Is it likely that such action would cause opposition from other countries? Or is it likely they will be rather inclined to support Great Britain's stand? Here is food for reflection for the European news gatherers who supply news to the United States public. It may also be in order for such hairbrained publications as the New York Journal to rejoice that their jingo fulminations and vapors at the time of the Venezuela scare did not result in permanently antagonizing Great Britain. Had such been the case where would the United States and its boasted commercial supremacy be with a horde of Spanish privateers destroying every dollar's worth of her foreign trade. Our short-sighted United States friends should visit some international oculist, and, if possible, secure a set of powerful glasses to assist their, at present, very imperfect international vision.