

TO LYNCH A COMBINE.

THREATENING LYNCH-LAW ON THE BINDING-TWINE TRUST.

Operations of the Trust's Agents in the Philippine Islands—Their Attempt to Force the Holders of Hemp to Sell at a Loss Causes Great Irritation and Calls Out a Threat to Apply Lynch-Law.

"Lynch a trust?" That would be a vast undertaking; but if it could succeed it would at least prove more effective than the Republican effort to break down trusts by talk and threats to take off duties that protect them. A trust after having been lynched would probably never rise from the grave to besiege the Republican Congress for higher duties and get them again.

The Republican talk about squelching trusts means nothing, absolutely nothing, so long as they continue to feed them on high protective duties. The liquor trust gets more protection than ever, and so does the linseed oil trust. The newly formed window-glass trust has been getting an average of 105 per cent protection, and the McKinley bill, as it passed the Republican House of Representatives in May, actually made the protection still higher. To deal out protection with one hand and pass worthless laws against trusts with the other is as absurd as that other scheme of the Republicans, to pass McKinley bills for the purpose of shutting out foreign trade, and then to vote money out of the Treasury to pay people to build ships and sell them upon the seas.

The most practical way to deal with trusts in America is to remove the duties from the article or material of which they create a monopoly.

Senator John Sherman and Hon. J. C. Burrows, one of the makers of the McKinley bill, have both suggested that this is the thing to do, only they forgot all about this remedy when it becomes necessary to vote the subject in Congress. Burrows helped to make the McKinley bill, the most infamous measure in the interest of trusts that the country has ever seen, and there is no evidence that he raised his little finger to put into the bill a paragraph expressing the principle he has publicly championed, that protection should be withdrawn in all cases where it has given occasion to the formation of a trust.

Senator Sherman has advocated the same view; yet when those fifteen Republicans voted with the Democrats to put binding-twine on the free list he did not join them. Senator Sherman has a convenient way to meet such cases. He simply denies that there is any such trust in question, and then he goes right on voting high duties right and left.

While this is the best way to deal with trusts here, another way has been suggested on the Philippine Islands—to apply lynch-law. This law cannot be applied to the case in our land; but the agents of the twine trust have been threatened with it in the country where manila hemp is grown.

The Philippine Islands are a Spanish dependency lying to the southeast of China. Their principal product is manila hemp, which takes its name from Manila, the chief city on the islands. This manila hemp is sent to the United States in large quantities, our imports being in 1889 near six and one-half million dollars' worth.

This trade takes to those islands the representatives of our binding-twine trust for the purpose of buying up the hemp crop. Senator Davis told, in his attack on the trust in the Senate, how the entire business, including the sources from which that commodity was supplied, was governed by a combination of all (or substantially all) the manufacturers of binding twine. In the Philippine Islands they limited and controlled the price of one-half the raw material, and in Yucatan they controlled the other half.

It was in carrying out this plan of controlling the price that the trust's agents in Manila were threatened with lynch-law. Mr. A. R. Webb, the United States Consul at Manila, sends several reports to the State Department at Washington about the contest last winter and spring between the buyers for the trust and the native dealers in hemp. The dealers, Mr. Webb says, had bought the crop at prices ranging from \$8.57 to \$10 per hundred pounds. The American and English syndicates refused to pay the native dealers a price sufficient to cover the cost of their stocks, and the Consul thought that many of the dealers would undoubtedly be ruined.

The trust had vessels chartered, and they were lying in the harbor ready to take away the hemp; but still the trust refused to buy. Two of those vessels had cost the trust over \$30,000, simply for lying in the harbor and waiting till it had forced the dealers to sell at lower prices. A report in this way got into circulation on the islands that the syndicates had "untold millions at their command," and that they would buy no hemp till the price went down to \$5 per hundred pounds.

This state of things produced great irritation among the people, and called forth a chivalrous sentiment of sympathy with the dealers as the weaker party to the fight. The Consul sends two articles from the principal paper of Manila, which show how intense was the irritation which these greedy monopolies had caused in that distant land.

Lynch-law is hinted at by the Manila paper as the remedy for the evils described. "To the force of attack," it says, "the force of resistance opposes itself, and never was it more our duty than now to remind the Americans of their famous lynch-law." A trust has never felt the halter draw with such a good opinion of lynch-law. While the Manila way of dealing with trusts is not to be recommended to our wheat-growers it has at least one striking merit: it would be efficacious to the last degree. The valiant talk of Senator Sherman and Representative Burrows lacks that merit entirely. You can't kill a trust by calling it names. The binding-twine trust will be hurt badly by free twine; it can grin and endure. Senator Davis' denunciation of it as "that all-comprehending, unsatisfied and extortionate monopoly."

What the Supreme Court Thinks of Protection.

The "principle of protection" was some years ago passed upon by the United States Supreme Court. The decision was rendered by Justice Miller, who was appointed by Lincoln. It is as follows:

"To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is

called a taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms. Nor is it taxation. A 'tax,' says Webster's Dictionary, 'is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or property of a citizen by the Government for the use of the nation or State. Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.'

"We have established, we think, beyond cavil, that there can be no lawful tax which is not laid for a public purpose."

If it be said that a benefit results to the local public of a town by establishing manufactures, the same may be said of any other business or pursuit which employs capital or labor. The merchant, the mechanic, the innkeeper, the banker, the builder, the steamboat owner, are equally promoters of the public good, and equally deserving the aid of the citizens by forced contributions. No line can be drawn in favor of the manufacturer which would not open the coffers of the public treasury to the importunities of two-thirds of the business men of the city or town."

Lawyers will find this in 20 Wall, 657.

TARIFF LETTERS TO FARMER BROWN.

NO. 3.

How Far the Tariff Increases Prices.

DEAR FARMER BROWN—I think it was sufficiently shown in my last letter that the tariff raises prices. Since writing that letter my attention has been called to an article in the *New York Dry Goods Economist* on the rise in retail prices which has recently taken place in anticipation of the passage of the McKinley bill.

Before entering upon the question how much the tariff adds to prices, I will ask you to read the following extract from the article just referred to:

"Retailers within a few days have marked up goods from 5 to 10 per cent. To give a few examples: Surah and faille Francaise have advanced from 65, 75 and 95 cents to 65, 80, 90 cents and \$1. The \$1.25 and \$1.50 qualities are \$1.35 and \$1.60, or poorer quality is marked up to the former prices of the better sorts. Cashmere and sergo at \$1 were 90 cents a month ago. Striped cheviots of 50 to 90 cents are today 54 cents to \$1. Ladies' cloth selling for \$1.35 was \$1.25 last week, yet the order for this was placed four months ago. Linen goods, such as sheeting, pillow cases, towels, table covers and napkins, have advanced in the last month from five to ten per cent. Towels that are now \$3 a dozen were \$2.75 last month, yet these are standard goods that are often ordered a year ahead of delivery, and certainly are not influenced by the prices of to-day. Buttons and dress trimmings are about ten per cent higher, especially crochet and pearl buttons. Hosiery has advanced in the same ratios. Fifty cents are now asked for 47 cent stockings and 75 cents for the 69 cent quality."

If prices take such a rise in the mere anticipation of the McKinley bill, what will they do when the bill becomes a law? How delighted will be the soul of Wm. McKinley, Jr., with his curious notions about the desirability of high prices!

And now for the subject of this letter, to determine how far the tariff raises prices.

I said in my last letter that Republicans themselves speak of protective duties and revenue duties, by which is meant duties which afford protection to some native industry, and duties which afford no such protection, whether because such industry does not exist at all, or because it only exists but produces more than the home market can consume.

You will see, therefore, that we shall have to make a division of articles into classes. Before we can determine how much the tariff raises prices let us make these classes as follows:

First, commodities which we produce ourselves in such abundance that we must sell the surplus abroad.

Second, commodities which we produce in sufficient quantities to fill, or nearly fill, the home markets, and which we can sell in foreign markets at a profit.

Third, commodities which we either do not produce at all or produce in quantities insufficient for home demands.

Commodities which fall under the first class cannot be made higher in price to the consumer by the imposition of a duty. Under this class fall the great staple products of our farms—our corn, wheat (including flour), cotton, and meat and dairy products. How do duties on these things help anybody? We have so much of them that we are compelled to sell them abroad to an enormous extent. In the year ending June 30, 1890, our exports of agricultural products were considerably more than three-fourths of all our exports. Our exported breadstuffs alone were in excess of all our exports of manufactures, the figures being \$151,000,000 for manufactures and \$154,000,000 for breadstuffs. Cotton exported reached \$250,000,000, nearly \$100,000,000 more than manufactures, while provisions of all kinds, including live hogs and cattle, showed a total of \$168,000,000. Now, in cases where these enormous quantities of commodities are being exported, it is clear that a tariff on the insignificant quantity of similar commodities coming into the country can have no effect whatever in raising the prices of our own products. Stand on the wharves of Liverpool, as I have done, and see the ships discharging vast heaps of our corn and wheat, and how contemptible does Major McKinley become in his attempt to beguile American farmers into the support of protection with increased duties on corn and wheat! Never has a public man acted with greater insincerity and with a more palpable intention to deceive. He did not put a duty on cotton—there are no votes to be made for him in the South by such cheap and transparent jugglery—and for all his duties on wheat and corn and on nearly every article classed as provisions, you need not give the snap of your finger. You can carry in a quart cup all the extra product of your entire county by reason of McKinley's higher duties.

The same view is taken by the more candid Republicans themselves. Senator Allison, who voted for McKinley's duties on corn and wheat in the Senate the other day, said, in 1879, that the duties on corn and wheat afford no protection to the great grain-producing regions of the country, and that, "therefore the farmer has no protection at all." And yet the Senator goes through with the solemn farce of voting higher duties on wheat, corn, and similar farm products! Verily, it is a "fraud on the farmer!"

The second class of commodities are those in which the domestic manufacturers or producers are able to fill, or nearly fill, the home market and may

export to some extent at a profit. In this class the duty is only partly added to the domestic article; and under some conditions, as for instance a temporary rise in prices on the other side, it may be that no part of the duty is added. This latter condition occurred six months ago in the case of steel rails. The price in England, under conditions of trade partly temporary, rose to a point precisely equal to the price with us. The protectionists were quick to point out this case as a proof that the duty on the foreign article is not added to the price of the competing domestic article. "See," they said, "you 'free-traders' are always saying that the whole duty is added to the price of articles made in our country; here are steel rails selling in London for \$35 a ton, and the price in the United States is the same, but according to your 'free trade' notions the duty of \$17 a ton ought to have made the price of rails \$52 a ton in the United States. Don't you see that your talk is that the tariff is a tax is all humbug?"

No; it is not humbug. In this case the equality of prices was merely temporary, as our own rail makers pointed out to Congress in their efforts to have the present exorbitant duty retained. "The duty," they said, "must be adjusted to meet the lowest English price, which was some \$16 a ton; showing that as soon as a fall of prices should take place on the other side they would begin to add a part of the duty again, and this has since happened."

A very large number of commodities fall in this second class; and, it is always here that the protectionists make their fight. Here they find cases to prove their oft-repeated assertion that the tariff is not a tax. I have shown that in the first class it is never a tax; all I claim for the second class is that there the tariff is partly a tax, still, though a tax.

The third class of commodities, which are either not made here at all or are made in quantities not sufficient for the home demand, the tariff is a tax to the amount of the duty collected.

As, however, my letter has extended beyond its usual length, I shall reserve my remarks upon this class for my next letter. Yours truly, RICHARD KNOX.

Reciprocity at Home.

CHANCEY M. DEPEW advises the New York farmers to take as their motto the three R's—Reciprocity, Retaliation and Revenue.

The farmers are already for revenue; only the trouble is that the tariff makes fearful inroads into their revenue. In order to get revenue they must first get reciprocity at home, a reciprocity which places an equal burden of taxation on every man; and when the farmers get that kind of reciprocity they can very well afford to let retaliation take care of itself—they will, in fact, have all the retaliation they need.

DePew is not half so shrewd as people credit him with being. If the farmers should take his advice and demand retaliation, what would become of the system of protection which DePew upholds, and which places burdens upon the farmers for other people's benefit? Ought not DePew to have told these New York farmers, rather, that the mottoes for them to follow are long suffering toward their Egyptian taskmasters, and the patience which endures all things from trusts and the tariffs which create trusts? He should have taught them to give to him that takes from them—if the coat is taken, to give the cloak also—and to resist not the tariff evil that is daily making them poorer and poorer.

Farmers can very well afford to abstain from retaliation; because they are being robbed, they do not need to retaliate upon their oppressors and rob them of what they have already gained. One thing they can do and ought to do: they should say with emphasis that this thing must stop; that the day has come of equal rights to all and special favors to none. Reciprocity must begin at home, giving back to every man the inborn right which has so long been denied—the right to use his labor and the products of his labor according to his own will, without having to make enforced contributions to others.

Reciprocity in trade is trading on equal conditions, and it is precisely this which the farmers of this country are not now allowed to do. The laws of the country make reciprocity impossible, for the farmers are compelled to sell at a price fixed in the free-trade markets of the world, markets in which the so-called "pauper nations" figure as chief competitors; and they are compelled to buy in an artificially dear market, a market made dear simply and solely and confessedly by protection.

Reciprocity at home! Let that be the watchword for farmers. If they demand it they can have it, for the demands of the farmers of this land are bound to be heeded; and when they get that kind of reciprocity they will get revenue, too, and retaliation can go by the board.

—Frank Andrews and John Lewis, arrested on suspicion at Goshen, prove to be expert thieves wanted in Michigan for burglary.

—Charles Howe has been sent to the penitentiary for two years from Montgomery County for stealing a few articles of jewelry.

—James Maskell, of Shelburn, was killed by being run over by the northbound train on the E. & T. H., being literally cut to pieces.

—The damage suit of Burrows vs. the P. C. & St. L. Railway Company, for \$25,000, was decided at Logansport in favor of the plaintiff.

—HENRY SELTER, of Adams Township, Allen County, died at the age of 91. He was a well-known farmer, having settled there forty years ago.

—Wm. Wallace, a painter; of Brazil, fell from a scaffold near Stanton, breaking his right arm and suffering injuries which will probably prove fatal.

—At a charivari party near Burnettsville an old shotgun burst in the hands of Orla Miller, shattering his left arm and carrying away a piece of his nose.

—Willie Crawford, a small boy at Muncie, was accidentally shot in the breast by a rifle in the hands of his cousin, Edward Crawford, while they were engaged in shooting birds. His recovery is doubtful.

—JAMES CARNEY, who was recently jailed at LaPorte for theft, proves to be deserted from the regular army. Although the evidence was clear that he had stolen to a sufficient extent to send him to the penitentiary Judge Noyes decided that it would be best to turn him over to the officers of the regular army to be dealt with by them.

—A strange and fatal disease has attacked the family of George Davidson, a resident of Mentor, Dubois County. Last week a little daughter of Mr. Davidson was attacked with the disease and died at 8 p.m. On the same evening a boy, aged 9 years, was attacked with the disease and died the following morning. Three other children of the family are hopelessly ill with the disease.

—The whereabouts of Joseph Lombard, agent at Fort Wayne of the Provident Savings and Life Insurance Company, is a matter of grave concern to his family and friends. Mr. Lombard left on the 10th of August to attend the G. A. R. encampment at Boston, and no news has been received from him since his departure. He is a man of exemplary habits, and his prolonged absence is causing serious apprehensions as to his well-being.

—Diphtheria has made its appearance in Shoals, and is causing great alarm. The public schools have been closed. There are a number of very serious cases, but no deaths reported as yet.

—ALFRED WILTON, aged 25, was crushed to death by a fall of slate in the Harrison Mine, near Clay City, Clay County. He was bank boss in the mine, of which his father was superintendent. The latter, who resides at Terre Haute, received the news at the depot, and fell fainting.

—LANDLORD.—"Better stay, Mr. Gibbs. All the big bugs'll be here next month." VISITOR.—"There's a good deal here now. That's why I thought I'd go."

IN THE HOOISER STATE.

ITEMS GATHERED FROM VARIOUS SOURCES.

Patents Granted to Indiana Inventors—New Fair Association at Fort Wayne—Railroad Accidents—Political—Criminal News, Etc.

Rewards of Genius.

Patents have been granted Indiana inventors as follows: Charles W. Dixon, Bloomfield, wrench; Henry A. Gore, assignor to Goshen Folding Bed Company, Goshen, folding bed; Roderick G. Gupill, Elgin, Ill., assignor of one-fourth to L. O. Bailey, Indianapolis, plate glass rolling mechanism; Francis Harrington, South Bend, apparatus for polishing paint on yarns; William H. Helenburger, assignor to Ellis Helenburger, Indianapolis, wire fastener for fence posts; Frederick A. Hetherington, assignor of one-half to T. E. Hibben, Indianapolis, photographic camera shutter; Wm. Morris, assignor of one-half to E. Dietz, Indianapolis, corner iron for trucks; Benjamin F. Osborn, Aurora, Aurora, combined vice, punch and drill; Robert D. Smith, Mishawaka, electric controller for power mechanism; Walter P. Snapp, Gorman, gang cultivator; William H. Wright, Elkhart, grooved switch.

Minor State Items.

—Gas has been struck near Monrovia at a depth of 140 feet.

—Frank Bowers shot John Glisse in the hip in a quarrel at Mudsock.

—Noah Reddish was burned to death in a boarding-house at Lafayette.

—A grand reunion of the Eighty-seventh Indiana Volunteers was held at Peru.

—The annual reunion of the Eighty-seventh Regiment occurs at Covington, Oct. 8 and 9.

—Miss Emma Roswell, of Jeffersonville, aged 45, took the wrong medicine with fatal effect.

—A new natural-gas company, with a capital stock of \$100,000, has been formed at Shelbyville.

—The Munice Homestead Company has contracted for fifty laborer's cottages, at a total cost of \$25,000.

—Josiah Cobbs, aged 60, a prominent farmer near Seymour, fell from a tree and was fatally injured.

—The seventh annual reunion of the Thirty-sixth Indiana Volunteers will be held at Knightstown, Oct. 8 and 9.

—A small son of Homer Winters, of Goshen, picked a dynamite cartridge to pieces, and both hands were shattered.

—JERRY MOORE, an 8-year-old boy at