

LIKE KILKENNY CATS.

TRUSTS AND COMBINATIONS DEVOUR EACH OTHER.

The Oilcloth Men Want to Renew Their "Agreement"—Ground Down by Other Trusts They Turn Upon the Consumer—Trusts as the Outcome of Protection.

Protected manufacturers make common cause with each other, and stand shoulder to shoulder before the Ways and Means Committee at Washington, fighting for their common welfare. This is not the case in their business relations, in their daily course of trade. In the business world one trust feeds upon another, just as the big fishes in the sea feed upon the small fish.

An example of this is seen in the Linseed Oil Trust and the combination of oil-cloth manufacturers. During the hearings before the McKinley committee last winter, Mr. G. W. Blabon, of Philadelphia, a representative of the oil-cloth and linoleum manufacturers, made this statement: "Linseed oil has advanced largely within the last eighteen months, and white lead also. That is the result of combinations and trusts." Also: "We got along very nicely, however, and made a fair return in profits until this late advance in the prices of oil and white lead."

Here Mr. McMillin, of Tennessee, asked: "Was that advance caused by trusts?" to which Mr. Blabon answered, "Yes; trusts that have come to stay."

This looked very bad; it looked as if the linseed oil trust and the white lead trust were preying upon a number of firms which were struggling each separately with its hard conditions. It now turns out that this was not the case at all. Those who were being preyed upon were also in a combination to prey upon their consumers.

Not long ago a prominent Philadelphia paper printed the following piece of news: "Since the agreement among the oil-cloth manufacturers for the regulation of trade and prices came to an end some time ago, it is said that there has been very active fighting for business on all hands, with heavy cutting of rates. To stop this practice prominent manufacturers have recently been considering numerous expedients, and it has been suggested that an oil-cloth clearing-house be formed. The idea is that this body should be controlled by a board of directors, appointed by the manufacturers, who would receive and concentrate information on the state of trade and fix prices with the consent of a majority of manufacturers." This paper went on to state that prominent manufacturers, among whom was this same G. W. Blabon, were "anxious to adopt some plan of harmony." Their old agreement for the "regulation of trade and prices," which was in force at the very time when Blabon was before the committee, had evidently proved more profitable to them than the cutting of rates; and hence the determination to have some more "harmony."

Mr. Blabon's tale before the McKinley committee was calculated to excite pity.

Between the upper and the nether millstones of two grinding monopolies like the Linseed Oil Trust and the White Lead Trust he had a claim upon the sympathies of all those who take the side of the weak and oppressed against the strong ones who would ride rough-shod over them. But now that it is seen that Mr. Blabon himself was adopting the same trust methods to get higher prices out of the consumers, who can waste sympathy on him?

But it is not alone in trusts that this system of greed reigns in trade. Trusts protect themselves; and in order to do this the individual members of a trust are loyal to one another, to some extent at least, and they stick together so far as pressure can be brought to bear to enforce their regulations. We have seen how trusts treat each other, and if we are to believe the protectionist papers, the same system of general hoggishness prevails as between individuals in trade.

On this subject the New York *Journal of Commerce* says: "In this country, above all others, the greed that is envious of another's success will insist upon sharing in the spoils." And from this fact it draws the conclusion that American manufacturers have suffered more from home than from foreign competition. The difference between American and foreign manufacturers is thus stated: "In some foreign lands a man may discover a good thing, out of which he is reaping a very large profit, and if he is quiet and unobtrusive may keep the business to himself for a long time until he has acquired an ample fortune. But in this country the people are like the greedy birds, and if one picks up more than can be swallowed at once the rest of the flock seek to force a division of the mouthful."

Commenting upon this the New York *Dry Goods Economist*, another protectionist paper, says: "We have more than once commented upon this same melancholy fact. Where ideas are not protected by patents and sometimes where they are, outside rivals invade a neighbor's territory without compunction, and the result very often is a cut-throat competition which is fatal to both. If a man develops a bright idea he should have the benefit of it. There should be a courtesy in the trade that supplemented statutory limitations."

All will conceive the point made here, that manufacturers have a right to their inventions and improvements. A habit of infringing on the rights of others is, however, only a natural outgrowth of our protective tariff system. Our manufacturers have been thoroughly schooled in the protectionist notion that they have a right to prey upon people in other forms of industry. What wonder, then, that they turn around and prey upon each other? What wonder, too, that this system of preying upon each other should go on until they call a halt and "pool their issues?" In other words, they form a trust, agreeing to prey upon each other no more, but to unite in a common scheme for preying upon the consumer alone.

Is not this the natural outcome of protection? The Government gives some men the right to sell to others at an artificially increased price. This increased price becomes like swill in the trough—the hungry pigs crowd around it and the biggest and strongest fight the weakest ones away, then fight among themselves till peace becomes a necessity again in order to satisfy their hunger.

That sharp rivalry of trade which we call competition is necessary; competition is the life of trade. Protection, however, tends directly to defeat competition. True, it may stimulate competition for a time; but the false notion that it engenders, that the protected individuals have a moral right to the home market with exemption from competition, and have a moral right thus to charge the community increased prices for their products, leads to the end to

the defeat of the very ends that the protectionists claim to have in view. Protection ends logically in trusts, for self-interest is the law which rules in trade and must rule. The function of government is simply to keep this self-interest within the bounds of justice—that is, to prevent one man from pushing the pursuit of his self-interest to the point where the next man's just and lawful interest is infringed upon. But if the Government itself takes a hand for the very opposite purpose of giving some men the right to do just that thing, it is the most natural thing in the world that such men should combine and stifle competition when competition has rendered himself to the enlarged expense. In reply to this the Buffalo man writes as follows to the merchant:

"You were somewhat surprised that we could afford to pay the additional nine cents a yard for cloth, but I prepared our work people for it, and to-day, by making a cut equal to ten per cent. on their wages all around, I have covered the amount and turned them all into good, sound Democrats. That, I take it, is as good as a Yankee could do."

That is where the McKinley bill draws its first blood from labor.

140 per cent. to protect American labor. Now note the swift result. The New York commission merchant informed the Buffalo manufacturer that he would have to add nine cents a yard to the price of the fabric in order to cover the increased duty, expecting and fearing that he would thereby lose a customer. But the Buffalo manufacturer promptly accepted the situation. The New York merchant expressed surprise that the manufacturer could so soon accommodate himself to the enlarged expense. In reply to this the Buffalo man writes as follows to the merchant:

"You were somewhat surprised that we could afford to pay the additional nine cents a yard for cloth, but I prepared our work people for it, and to-day, by making a cut equal to ten per cent. on their wages all around, I have covered the amount and turned them all into good, sound Democrats. That, I take it, is as good as a Yankee could do."

That is where the McKinley bill draws its first blood from labor.

ATTENTION, FARMERS.

The Narrowing of the Farmers' Foreign Markets.

The London correspondent of the New York Times has sent to that paper a piece of information of the utmost importance to our farmers. He says:

"For one thing, it has already made it certain that Europe will take no interest in the Chicago exhibition and will practically be unrepresented there. Even more important is the impulse it has given here to consolidate capital in an energetic effort to immediately push railroads throughout the Indian and Russian wheat belts and thus render the European market independent of American grain supplies."

"It" is what is "it?" Why, the McKinley bill.

It is not necessary for European governments to pass retaliatory laws in order to show us how "McKinleyism" operates toward restricting the foreign markets of our farmers. The natural play of the laws of trade will of itself teach us that lesson. Many of those laws are as plain as A B C. Here is one that governs the farmer in all his buying and selling: The farmer who sells his grain or live stock in Smithville is not likely to go to Jonesville to get his clothing and family supplies, and if he goes there at all, it will only be because Jonesville offers him these articles at lower prices.

The same law rules in international trade. If we refuse to buy what the English offer us in the line of manufactured products, the only thing left for England to do is to find another market in which to sell. Very good. She finds that market and her ships go there laden with what we have refused. What then? Are those ships going to sail empty to us in order to take away our farm products and manufactures? By no means, unless we offer an extra inducement for them to do so.

What inducement? There can be only one—lower prices.

It is as clear as day that only by underbidding the "pauper labor of the world" can our farmers hold their foreign market, provided McKinleyism is to hold sway.

This is by no means an idle dream. It is a well-known fact that our farmers under the existing tariff laws are losing their foreign markets. Mr. Blaine himself has performed a valuable service to the country in pointing out how the market for agricultural products is growing narrower.

The official figures of the Treasury Department are conclusive proof of the fact. On page 55 of the Report on Commerce and Navigation for 1889 is a table which ought to be seen and studied by every farmer. This table gives the relative quantity of wheat and flour bought by England from each country for a series of years. Comparing 1880 and 1878 we get very striking results. The total consumption of England in 1880 and 1878 was supplied principally by Russia, British India, and the United States in the following proportions:

1880. 1888.
Per ct. Per ct.

Russia..... 4.32 1.52
British India..... 52 11.01
United States..... 65.42 36.98

These figures show what is going on now. It is certain that the McKinley bill will make them still more unfavorable to us.

Black List of Tariff Trusts.

An excellent little book on the tariff question, by N. H. Chamberlain, has recently been published by De Wolfe, Fiske & Co., of Boston. It is written in the form of a story, in which a manufacturer, who has been ruined by the tariff, argues with his protectionist workmen and others against our existing revenue laws: It deals in hard facts rather than in theories.

The author prints the following interesting table of tariff trusts:

NAME OF TRUST.	Protected by duties, av. averaging, per cent.	Protected to guarantees in amount to \$100 of product in amount to \$100 of product, per cent.	Whole expense for labor, in \$100 worth of product, per cent.
Salt trust.....	50	\$33	25
Wheat-wheat trust.....	56	38	40
Flax-waste trust.....	54	45	9
Flax-steel trust.....	45	33	22
Nail trust.....	45	33	22
General iron trust.....	45	33	22
Copper trust.....	24	22	22
Lead trust.....	24	22	22
Tin trust.....	24	21	8
Lead trust.....	74	43	65
Glass trust.....	55	36	45
Sugar trust.....	23	19	8
Linen-cotton trust.....	54	35	5
Rubber-shoe trust.....	20	20	11
Envelope trust.....	23	20	11
Paper-bag trust.....	35	25	15
Cordage trust.....	25	20	12
Average.....		\$30	24

Acknowledging the Corn.

The plea made for the McKinley high-tariff bill is that it is necessary to help labor. The wages of labor must be made higher, although thirty years of protection have failed to yield satisfactory results in the direction of increasing wages. So we now have the McKinley bill for the benefit of labor.

The first effect of the bill has already been reported. In the city of Buffalo, N. Y., there is a manufacturer who uses a certain fabric in the manufacture of his goods. This fabric is bought in New York from a commission merchant who imports it from England. The Buffalo manufacturer got this cloth heretofore at 68 cents a yard. This cost was made up as follows: English manufacturer's price, 30 cents per yard; duty (equivalent to 110 per cent.) 33 cents; profits and expenses for handling, 5 cents.

This was a high duty, but not high enough to satisfy Maj. McKinley; hence he makes the duty in his "domestic bill"

140 per cent. to protect American labor.

Now note the swift result. The New York commission merchant informed the Buffalo manufacturer that he would have to add nine cents a yard to the price of the fabric in order to cover the increased duty, expecting and fearing that he would thereby lose a customer. But the Buffalo manufacturer promptly accepted the situation. The New York merchant expressed surprise that the manufacturer could so soon accommodate himself to the enlarged expense. In reply to this the Buffalo man writes as follows to the merchant:

"You were somewhat surprised that we could afford to pay the additional nine cents a yard for cloth, but I prepared our work people for it, and to-day, by making a cut equal to ten per cent. on their wages all around, I have covered the amount and turned them all into good, sound Democrats. That, I take it, is as good as a Yankee could do."

That is where the McKinley bill draws its first blood from labor.

HUSTLING HOOSIERS.

WHAT THEY'VE BEEN DOING FOR A WHOLE WEEK.

A BIG LIBEL SUIT—SENT TO THE PEN—BY THE MORPHINE ROUTE—ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION—A BIG BOND—NOT TO GET HOODER GAS—DIED OF LOCK-JAW—STOOD ON THE DEADLY PLATEAU—KILLED IN A RUNAWAY—BUNCOED A BUSINESS MAN—DISAPPEARANCE OF A SWEET SIXTEEN—HIGHWAYMEN JAILED—CRUSHED TO DEATH, ETC.

—Simon Yandes has given \$30,000 to Wabash College.

—Thomas Saberton, of Evansville, was found dead in bed.

—German anniversary attracted big crowds at Evansville.

—Soldiers' reunions are prevalent throughout the State.

—O. E. Lawrence was mysteriously drowned at Michigan City.

—Mrs. Mary Bailey, of Attica, fell into a cellar and was fatally injured.

—Fred Poschen, an inmate of the poor house at Valparaiso, hanged himself.

—A passenger train on the Monon ran into an open switch and was derailed.

—Mrs. Ed. Doody publicly whipped Mrs. Kidney in Indianapolis. Jealousy.

—Alexander Lane, the slayer of Al Hoover, has been arrested at Lebanon.

—Carelessness and fog caused a serious collision on the C. W. & B. near Linwood.

—Fred Sachen, Valparaiso, preferred death to the poor-house and hanged himself.

—Mixed schools after a week's trial are to be done away with at Crawfordsville.

—E. & T. H. excursion train jumped the track near Hazleton. Narrow escape.

—John Hancock Craig, Danville, is the biggest man in the world. Weighs 600 pounds.

—Real estate agent, Al Brown, was acquitted at Laporte of a charge of embezzlement.

—Edward Colvin, a child of 3 years, swallowed concentrated lye at Attica, with fatal effect.

—President Wright, of the Cambridge City Council, was struck by a train and seriously injured.

—The funeral of ex-State Senator Carpenter was one of the largest ever held in Shelby County.

—Five horses at Annapolis, afflicted with glanders, have been killed by the State Veterinarian.

—W. H. Schrieber, who robbed the Columbus Bank, was arrested in Detroit and made to disgorge.

—Robert Burton stood on the platform of a fast mail train while going through Washington. He'll die.

—John Cunningham, of Harrison County, sold the apples on his orchard of 900 trees for \$1,600.

—Mrs. Michael Ronan was instantly killed at Ronan by the collision of a runaway team with her buggy.

—The dry-kiln of the Eagle Sash and Door Company at Goshen was burned.

—Stephen Sterkey, a teamster of Marshall, was caught under his overturned wagon and crushed to death.

—Quimley King was caught by a falling tree he had chopped down at Bloomington, and fatally crushed.

—White Caps notified Fred L. Weil, of English, to either sober up or leave the county. He left the county.

—The widow of the late Vom Heilman, Evansville, has qualified as executrix of the estate. Bond, \$1,500,000.

—Three smart residents of Danville refused to answer census inquiries. They've been over to the United States Court.

—Harvey H. Weed, of Fayette County, was seized with a hemorrhage of the lungs while at work in a field, and death ensued.

—Grandmother Hawn, one of the oldest and best known pioneer women of Northern Indiana, died near Rochester, aged 94.

—Hon. John V. Bentz was thrown from his horse at English, and the animal stepped on his face and then fell upon him.

—Michael McCarthy, of Muncie, preferred his church to a Protestant sweetheart and at the last moment refused to marry her.

—A grand reunion of ex-soldiers was held at New Albany, and Governor Hovey and General Gresham were the honored guests.

—Large headed postmaster at Brazil bought ten dollars' worth of stamps from two tramps for \$7. The stamps, of course