

# The Democratic Sentinel

RENSSELAER, INDIANA.

J. W. McEWEEN, PUBLISHER.

FARMS in the Mississippi bottoms are liable to have a hop crop, judging from the frog croaking.

ONE Michael Flanagan has entered the fiftieth year of his service as City Clerk of Kingston, Ont., and he knows what he is there for.

THE skin of a boiled egg is an excellent remedy for a boil. Carefully peel it, wet and apply to the boil; it draws out the matter and will relieve soreness.

A LEADING actress says that "a kiss to be artistic must be impersonal." There is entirely too much in artistic realism in shadowy halls and cozy back parlors.

THE summer girl has taken to wearing suspenders, but the acme of feminine imagination will not be reached until she is able to scold her husband for not sewing on the buttons for them.

A NEW YORK preacher proposes that the churches should open some strictly moral saloons in which nothing but mildly alcoholic drinks shall be sold. This seems to be a movement for a union between church and state—namely, the state of intoxication.

"WESTERN farmers who expect to raise a crop of corn this year," observes the Bangor News, "will have to use diving-bells in planting it." This has been done already, dear friend, and arrangements have been made to procure oyster-tongs later in the season for gathering the corn.

ANOTHER murderer was electrocuted in New York the other day, and one of the attendant physicians declared "there was nothing horrible about it." Judging from the expert testimony in these cases, science will some time make these entertainments quite amusing to all but a single interested person. And they now say that even he no longer kicks.

Ir the road-making experiences of modern Europe teach us in America one lesson more than another, it is that our common roads should be taken as much as possible out of the hands of the merely local authorities, and administered by either the national or the State governments after some plan in accordance with scientific knowledge and the needs of the people who use the roads.

BON FORD wore an opal pin in his neck-scarf at the time he was shot. Friends had frequently reminded him of the unlucky qualities of the opal, but he failed to heed their warnings. By his violent death the baleful influences of this ill-omened stone are again illustrated. It is especially dangerous when worn on the persons of people who have committed murders or who have otherwise incurred deadly enmities.

THE new Boston Public Library seems to be suffering under a variety of afflictions. There was placed recently upon its facade an array of names of eminent lights in the book world, ancient and modern, which an acute observer noted one day was an acrostic, spelling the names of the firm of architects engaged in its construction. When taxed with this presumptuous offense the architects charged the responsibility upon the boys in the office. Perhaps it was the boys in the office who drew the plans of the whole building. But whether done by the office boys or the office employers the trustees have ordered the names to be removed, and a new set will be made which will not be acrostical in its arrangement.

DR. BACON, of Chicago, has introduced a word to public notice which bids fair to be a godsend to the medical fraternity. Mrs. Ford died from the effects of chloroform administered to facilitate a surgical operation, and her husband claims that she was given too much of the drug. The doctor explains that her death can only be attributed to the fact that her constitution bore an idiosyncrasy to the drug administered. Idiosyncrasy, as Polonius would say, is good. There have been many instances in the past of patients dying while under the influence of chloroform. We now know that the accusations of carelessness and ignorance usually preferred against the doctors were unjust. The unfortunate patients were victims of idiosyncrasy.

THERE are 10,123 teachers instructing the public school children of Massachusetts, and just 901 are men. What is the inference? That Massachusetts is overpopulated on the female side; that she should be bled, so to speak, and that this congestion of one sex in one vocation should be sought to be avoided in our other commonwealths. But there is a point not to be overlooked and that is that in the intellectual State that Massachusetts certainly is, woman, seeking an independent vocation, first took to teaching; whereas in our newer States, where distribution of brain work among the sexes is becoming more equalized, both impulse and demand are multiplying the pursuits in which woman is inevitably to become a masterful competitor with father, husband, and brother.

It's English, you know, for women in "high society" to accuse each other of theft. A suit for slander arising from accusation of this nature has been begun in the Chicago courts, and a like one is compromised at Mil-

waukee by the payment of \$3,000 to the accused person. At a reception given by fashionable people in the latter city a set of silver teaspoons was missed, and one of the ladies invited to assist the host was charged by the latter with stealing them. Mrs. Chandler caused the arrest of Miss Laurence for the theft, but subsequently lacked courage to continue the prosecution. The spoons were found to have been accidentally taken to a caterer's, and Mrs. Chandler, being sued by Miss Laurence for \$5,000, has compromised for three-fifths of it. There is comfort in the reflection that if fashionable American women must imitate fashionable English women in some respects there is no evidence yet that the imitation can be carried to the pitch of stealing.

SINCE it is becoming more and more the fashion that the account between husband and wife in cases of marital infidelity shall be settled with the pistol, it would, perhaps, be well to insist upon an accurate knowledge of the use of fire-arms as an essential condition of marriage. It is certainly needlessly cruel to do the thing up bunglingly when called upon to shoot the betrayer of one's honor. Take, for instance, the case in Paris, where a lady of the first social rank disposed of the woman with whom the husband had been guilty. The outraged wife fired five shots from a revolver into the victim, and even then did not succeed in killing her on the spot. The wretched creature lingered in agony for some hours. Since society seems inclined to regard the shooting as perfectly proper under the circumstances, and indeed as in "very good form," it certainly should encourage the instruction necessary to the taking of better aim in the first place. It may be right to kill, but it is not contended, so far as we have heard, that it is right to torture.

AN accident occurred to a cabman in Chicago which seems so reasonable and logical in its nature one wonders that he does not read of such mishaps every day. Some portion of the harness gave way and the shafts shot into a perpendicular position. The Jehu, as a natural consequence, found himself precipitated upon the hard pavement with painful emphasis. This accident calls fresh attention to a well-known fact—namely, that the harness cab is the most uncouth, uncomfortable, unreliable and ridiculous nightmare of a vehicle ever devised by a depraved inventive genius. It is a sort of balancing machine with the horse at one end and the driver at the other. When the driver is a heavy man, one can imagine the difficulty with which the poor animal catches his hoofs into the cobblestones as he pulls his load along. As for the upending feature, there is no reason why a passenger should not consider such a diversion possible at any moment. That cabs have not hitherto turned upside down with frequency can be attributed to no other reason than public good luck.

FROM Montreal comes the information that a number of Canadian capitalists have seriously taken in hand the project of connecting the Georgian Bay and Lake Ontario by means of a ship railway. There was talk of this before the Tehuantepec scheme received its quietus by the death of Captain Eads, but never until now as anything more than a possibility. It is now stated that E. L. Cortbell, a Chicago civil engineer who was associated with Captain Eads in the Tehuantepec business, has just made a thorough inspection of the proposed route from a point near Collingwood to another near Toronto, a distance of about sixty-six miles, and pronounced it entirely and easily practicable. The plan is for a roadbed of fifty feet with six steel tracks, and the estimated cost is not more than \$15,500,000 for a road capable of carrying vessels up to 5,000 tons burden. A corporation called the Hurontario Ship Railway Company has been organized to carry this project through. When that is done and some improvements in navigation of channels connecting the lakes and of the St. Lawrence River are made the traveler can take ship in the port of Chicago and sail to any seaport on the globe, sixty-six miles of the distance overland, without leaving his vessel. This may be done before the century is out. Then look for the Tehuantepec ship railway, unless in the meantime the Nicaragua canal comes in to meet all the requirements of commerce in that quarter. Truly this is a century of wonders, and those who shall be octogenarians at its close will have seen greater things than have been seen in any other country since the earliest record of history.

Devoured the Elephant and Rhinoceros. This pleasant story told of Thackeray by a woman at whose house he visited: After having told a lot of delightful stories, Mr. Thackeray remarked that he must leave, he was so terribly hungry. We told him that we could give him a very good dinner. "There is nothing, my dears, you can give me," he answered with a funny sigh, "for I could only eat the croup of a rhinoceros or a slice from an elephant." "Yes, I can," exclaimed Dot, the 3-year-old daughter of the house. She disappeared into a big cupboard, and soon emerged with a look of triumph on her fat little face, holding in her hands a wooden rhinoceros and an elephant from her toy Noah's ark. Putting the two animals on a plate, she handed them with great gravity to Mr. Thackeray. The great man laughed and rubbed his hands with glee, and then, taking the child in his arms, kissed her, remarking: "Ah, little rogue, you already know the value of a kiss!" Then he asked for a knife and fork, snatched his lips, and pretended to devour the elephant and rhinoceros.

## WHAT WOMEN WEAR.

SOME HANDSOME MIDSUMMER GOWNS.

The Fashionables at the Summer Resorts Making Frantic Efforts to Outdo Each Other in Becoming Costumes for the Street and House.

Seasonable Styles. AS the summer resorts unfold their short-lived glory, there will be a scramble on the part of the ultra-fashionables to outdo each other in the quaintness of their costumes and in the novel effects of their watering-place make-up, and midsommer will be sure to bring its mania, writes our New York correspondent. It is a little too early to predict exactly what that mania will be, but it now looks as if it might run in the line of hats, crowns, and that we shall, one many moons, see the summer girl ducking her head to get her towering sugar-loaf safely through the doorway. Another novelty to which I should call the attention of the men folks is the perfume undershirt. It really seems to me as if the young men are all destined this summer, if not to die of a rose in aromatic pain, at least to be stifled with the sweet odors which the summer girl will leave in her wake. The perfume, or sachet, undershirt is easily made. All you have to do is to run bands of silk under the lace flounces and stuff them full of perfume powders—orris, verbenas, lavender, lilac—and the thing is done; and you'll leave behind you a trail of savory odors. But imagine the effect of several hundred of these sachet undershirts in a crowded ball room, in which the swaying of these garments will cause them to distribute their perfumes in greater abundance? It does look as though that delicate creature, the dancing duce, were really in danger of being suffocated with sweetness.

At this season of the year a woman's thoughts are concentrated upon outdoor effects. The sunshade is such an effect. When it harmonizes thoroughly with a costume, the result is most pleasing. In my initial illustration the sunshade is in harmony with the undershirt and sleeves. In this costume the undershirt and tight sleeves are of a rich fawn color, and the bodice, overskirt, and puffed sleeves of striped wood crepe. The collar, tab, and belt are of fine gold gimp. You may make this gown up in dark and light heliotrope. Nothing can be prettier than a stamped foulard for a young person, and nothing more appropriate for summer wear. My second illustration pictures such a gown. The skirt has three ruffles made of bias stripes. The charming little gimp figure is outlined with ribbon set off with a double bow, as indicated. It is exactly the same at the back. There is also a ribbon belt, the sleeves carrying out the same scheme of garniture. The Eton jacket has developed into one of the rages of the moment, but very few of these garments are Eton except in name. The true Eton has small close sleeves, and should invariably be worn with a sleeveless vest, for if you make its sleeves large enough to go over an ordinary gown, you have no longer an Eton coat. The true Eton has tailor-made turn-down collar and lapels. Nor should it ever be made use of as a wrap for muffling up purposes. This is ridiculous. The correct summer girl never makes such a mistake. Her Eton coat is merely a separate bodice which she wears over different vests and matches her skirts, while the vests run in different materials. The coat must fit the figure snugly. To do this, the vests should have long openings for the straps to pass through.

My third illustration presents another very prettily designed figure foulard, with a deep lace flounce and lace basque, ribbon corselet and puffed sleeves, also banded with ribbon. This gown may be made up very stylishly in taffeta lace. I see some very tastefully designed sunshades, and there will, no doubt, be a goodly array of them at the summer resorts. They are inexpensive and dainty. Pale-blue is a favorite color, with very short basques, and either a belt of the same material or one of the fancy belts now so modish. The turn-down collar and deep epaulettes are in vogue. Such a blouse should button in front with gold studs.

popular summer gown, the muslin de laine. The bodice simulates a jacket, and appears to open on a pleated front. At the waist there is a large bow with long ends. The bottom of the skirt is set off with pleated flounces. There is no doubt a vast difference between the gown which the summer girl wears and the woman who merely dresses with an object in view, namely, to render herself attractive to the looker-on. No woman is so handsome that she can afford to scorn the aid of modiste and milliner, and no skirt is so witty that she can shine when negligently or unbecomingly dressed. Her puns may be good, but look at her puns; her epigrams may be brilliant, but look at her ruminations and pleatings; her learning may be astounding, but look at the fit of her bodice, look at the hang of her skirt. She certainly must have been thinking out the plot of a play while she was dressing. There is art in dress, and while it may be to a degree like the lay of Shelley's "Skylark," "unpremeditated art," it is only so in a very slight measure, but like all art it must be acquired by study, observation and reflection.

In my last illustration I set before you a charming toilet for a Saturday night hop, which may be made up in any flimsy, gauzy material, the cutout being trimmed with lace or shown. The ribbon corselet ends at the side seams; at the back there is a Watteau bow with long ends. If made up in pale blue, a passementerie band of silver crosses the bust and meets at the back under the bow.

The laced Swiss belt is a very pretty novelty in leather of various colors. At the back and front, the two pointed edges are laced with a silk cord. On each side there is a buckle. This belt goes with silk vests and blouses, and is worn at summer resorts. The lacing cord should be tied at the bottom. Crepons are much affected by young girls. They are usually made up of a deep chevron ruff on the bottom of the skirt, and deep cuffs and corselets, the latter being invariably trimmed with three rows of narrow ribbon, broug-

down to a point on the right and fastened with a bow; same scheme of trimming on the cuffs. From what I can hear even young ladies who adore athletics and discuss the merits of the various sports, are a few tips so that you will not take matters so seriously, and jump on reciprocity as if it were intended for a sound economic doctrine, instead of a political scheme. This was the mistake made by most of the leaders of Republicanism here when the scheme was first broached. For instance, Senator Dolph said "The cause of protection is being betrayed;" Senator Hale and Tom Reed ridiculed the plan; Major McKinley called it "Blaine's bid," and objected to having it inserted in his tariff bill; the American Economist, our great organ of protection, ridiculed the idea of "trying to revise this old and obsolete system of discriminations;" and this, too, in order that we make the effort to sell packed meats to meat-packers and breadstuffs to exporters of grain. I could mention dozens of other Republicans who made fools of themselves by not thinking twice before they spoke. They are all sorry now that they were so premature. It is amusing now to hear McKinley talking for "protection and reciprocity," and to read in the American Economist that "reciprocity is the hand-maid of protection." The truth is that they recognize that Senator Hale spoke the truth when he said, "The reciprocity feature is the part of the measure (McKinley tariff) which has floated the whole act," and kept it from being swamped.

Now you understand our predicament. We must make the farmers believe that we really expected that reciprocity would open up new markets for them abroad.

S. A.—But isn't the scheme a sad commentary on your "home market" theory? Doesn't it admit that protection can't make home markets?

U. S.—I don't deny that theories now when we are confronted by conditions. But will you not try to help us out by revising your tariff schedules a

The morning costumes at the fashionable summer places have a great deal of dash about them. In fact, that is the study of the modish maiden. She doesn't care so much for a pretty face as for a fine figure, good carriage, and a certain air of suaveness of self. Everything about her is scrupulously well made. She abhors slouchiness as nature does a vacuum. Take her in her blue serge, for beneath her skirt peep out her dainty ruses, while her Eton fits her like a glove, its left lapel set off with a boutonniere, genuine man-fashions. Her vest, in some perfectly becoming color, is set off with a deep chevron of guipure, and her neat leather belt, fawn color, accentuates the small, round, supple waist, while from the flaring projecting brim of her Hogarth falls her dotted veil, drawn in graceful folds under her chin and tied at the morning breeze. Such is the dashing girl at the Springs, out for a walk on the public promenade. She knows she is perfection, and she has no difficulty in making you think so, too.

My fourth shows a simple but always popular summer gown, the muslin de laine. The bodice simulates a jacket, and appears to open on a pleated front. At the waist there is a large bow with long ends. The bottom of the skirt is set off with pleated flounces. There is no doubt a vast difference between the gown which the summer girl wears and the woman who merely dresses with an object in view, namely, to render herself attractive to the looker-on. No woman is so handsome that she can afford to scorn the aid of modiste and milliner, and no skirt is so witty that she can shine when negligently or unbecomingly dressed. Her puns may be good, but look at her puns; her epigrams may be brilliant, but look at her ruminations and pleatings; her learning may be astounding, but look at the fit of her bodice, look at the hang of her skirt. She certainly must have been thinking out the plot of a play while she was dressing. There is art in dress, and while it may be to a degree like the lay of Shelley's "Skylark," "unpremeditated art," it is only so in a very slight measure, but like all art it must be acquired by study, observation and reflection.

In my last illustration I set before you a charming toilet for a Saturday night hop, which may be made up in any flimsy, gauzy material, the cutout being trimmed with lace or shown. The ribbon corselet ends at the side seams; at the back there is a Watteau bow with long ends. If made up in pale blue, a passementerie band of silver crosses the bust and meets at the back under the bow.

The laced Swiss belt is a very pretty novelty in leather of various colors. At the back and front, the two pointed edges are laced with a silk cord. On each side there is a buckle. This belt goes with silk vests and blouses, and is worn at summer resorts. The lacing cord should be tied at the bottom. Crepons are much affected by young girls. They are usually made up of a deep chevron ruff on the bottom of the skirt, and deep cuffs and corselets, the latter being invariably trimmed with three rows of narrow ribbon, broug-

down to a point on the right and fastened with a bow; same scheme of trimming on the cuffs. From what I can hear even young ladies who adore athletics and discuss the merits of the various sports, are a few tips so that you will not take matters so seriously, and jump on reciprocity as if it were intended for a sound economic doctrine, instead of a political scheme. This was the mistake made by most of the leaders of Republicanism here when the scheme was first broached. For instance, Senator Dolph said "The cause of protection is being betrayed;" Senator Hale and Tom Reed ridiculed the plan; Major McKinley called it "Blaine's bid," and objected to having it inserted in his tariff bill; the American Economist, our great organ of protection, ridiculed the idea of "trying to revise this old and obsolete system of discriminations;" and this, too, in order that we make the effort to sell packed meats to meat-packers and breadstuffs to exporters of grain. I could mention dozens of other Republicans who made fools of themselves by not thinking twice before they spoke. They are all sorry now that they were so premature. It is amusing now to hear McKinley talking for "protection and reciprocity," and to read in the American Economist that "reciprocity is the hand-maid of protection." The truth is that they recognize that Senator Hale spoke the truth when he said, "The reciprocity feature is the part of the measure (McKinley tariff) which has floated the whole act," and kept it from being swamped.

Now you understand our predicament. We must make the farmers believe that we really expected that reciprocity would open up new markets for them abroad.

S. A.—But isn't the scheme a sad commentary on your "home market" theory? Doesn't it admit that protection can't make home markets?

U. S.—I don't deny that theories now when we are confronted by conditions. But will you not try to help us out by revising your tariff schedules a

U. S.—Well, that clause authorizes the President to put duties on tea, coffee, sugar, molasses and hides.

S. A.—Am I not mistaken? I thought your constitution gave your Congress full and exclusive power to lay and collect taxes, duties, etc.

U. S.—Yes, so it does, but I haven't time now to discuss a constitution more than a hundred years old and made to suit different times. As I was going to say, the President put a duty of 3 cents per pound on your coffee, 15 cents per pound on your hides, and 2 cents per pound on your sugar; if, in his opinion, you unduly tax the goods imported into your country from the United States, he is to learn what you intend to do in regard to this matter that I called you up.

U. S.—Well now, I'll tell you frankly, Jim Blaine.

## A TALK BY TELEPHONE.

MOTIVES OF THIS NEW BUNKO GAME EXPOSED.

Wholesale Cut in Wages in the Protected Iron and Steel Industries—Tariffs and Duties—Upward Changes Go Down—Monopolies and Millionaires.

The Reciprocity Fable. United States—Hello! Hello! South America—Hello! U. S.—Is that you, South America? S. A.—What do you want? U. S.—This is United States. You know, we put a reciprocity clause into what we call the McKinley bill, that we passed here last fall.

S. A.—Yes, I heard you did. U. S.—Well, that clause authorizes the President to put duties on tea, coffee, sugar, molasses and hides. S. A.—Am I not mistaken? I thought your constitution gave your Congress full and exclusive power to lay and collect taxes, duties, etc.

U. S.—Yes, so it does, but I haven't time now to discuss a constitution more than a hundred years old and made to suit different times. As I was going to say, the President put a duty of 3 cents per pound on your coffee, 15 cents per pound on your hides, and 2 cents per pound on your sugar; if, in his opinion, you unduly tax the goods imported into your country from the United States, he is to learn what you intend to do in regard to this matter that I called you up.

U. S.—Well now, I'll tell you frankly, Jim Blaine.

U. S.—I beg your pardon, but this is what I think: If your President wishes to put a tax on your tea, coffee, sugar, which are now on your free list—and your people don't object to paying it, I don't see why we should. As to what kind of duties we should have, I think we can decide for ourselves without any foreign interference.

U. S.—Of course we don't wish to interfere, but don't you understand that if we tax our imports of these articles from your country and not from other countries, you will lose some of your trade up here?

S. A.—Oh, yes, of course we might lose a little with you, but we would gain a great deal with other countries. If you tax our hides and increase their cost to you, your manufacturers will make fewer gloves, shoes, etc., but Europe will make more; so if you tax sugar as you have been doing, business and preservers will do less of it, and Europe will do more in this line. I see clearly that while such a policy might injure us a little it would harm you much more—so much more that I can't think you would be so foolish as to adopt it, but only intend it for a bluff. No, we don't care to swap any tariffs this year.

U. S.—But wait a little; don't talk quite so loudly. After I shall have explained a few things you may take quite a different view.

S. A.—Well, go on. U. S.—I see you have had a high protective tariff here for thirty years. S. A.—Yes, I know that's what you call it. I agree, though, that it's high. U. S.—Well, the Republican party that made this tariff has been telling the farmers and laborers that it was to help them by giving them home markets, high wages, etc.

S. A.—You didn't have to give reasons to your manufacturers, I guess. They didn't object to a policy that would give them exclusive ownership of your "home markets" and "high wages." U. S.—Please wait until I am through. As I was going to say, the farmers, who expected everything of protection, became spendthrifts, and, because nearly half of their farms were mortgaged, and must farms east of the Mississippi River have lost half of their value, during the last fifteen years, they got it into their heads that "protection" was to blame for all their extravagance and foolishness. The same kind of an absurd idea was taking possession of the wage-earners, who, because they have to do more work or see their wages reduced nearly every year, began to think that protection was at fault, though it was explained to them that it was due to over-production, excessive competition, and, anyway, by 1890, when McKinley was revising the tariff, a few of us saw clearly that the protection system could not stand much longer, unless it was again repaired, with a view to helping the farmer.

It was for this reason that I proposed that we should open our markets to your countries for our farm products. S. A.—Yes, I see; but you don't expect to find markets for farm products here? We are in the farming business ourselves, and unless your farmers look well to their laurels they will soon lose some of their markets in Central America and the West Indies, where we are already selling flour and other agricultural products. It is in the interests of agriculture rather than products of agriculture that we want. It is strange you did not think of this before you promised the farmers to find new markets for them down here.

U. S.—It is unnecessary to cast reflections like this upon our intelligence. When politics is running high here, and the tide is going against us, we must devise some expedient to turn it. We can't always do what is best or promise what is likely to be fulfilled.

S. A.—Oh, yes, I understand; your reciprocity was only a piece of "Jingoism" to catch the farmers' votes and keep the Republican party in power. U. S.—No, not exactly that; but I don't care to stop to explain everything now. I desire only to point out a few tips so that you will not take matters so seriously, and jump on reciprocity as if it were intended for a sound economic doctrine, instead of a political scheme. This was the mistake made by most of the leaders of Republicanism here when the scheme was first broached. For instance, Senator Dolph said "The cause of protection is being betrayed;" Senator Hale and Tom Reed ridiculed the plan; Major McKinley called it "Blaine's bid," and objected to having it inserted in his tariff bill; the American Economist, our great organ of protection, ridiculed the idea of "trying to revise this old and obsolete system of discriminations;" and this, too, in order that we make the effort to sell packed meats to meat-packers and breadstuffs to exporters of grain. I could mention dozens of other Republicans who made fools of themselves by not thinking twice before they spoke. They are all sorry now that they were so premature. It is amusing now to hear McKinley talking for "protection and reciprocity," and to read in the American Economist that "reciprocity is the hand-maid of protection." The truth is that they recognize that Senator Hale spoke the truth when he said, "The reciprocity feature is the part of the measure (McKinley tariff) which has floated the whole act," and kept it from being swamped.

Now you understand our predicament. We must make the farmers believe that we really expected that reciprocity would open up new markets for them abroad.

S. A.—But isn't the scheme a sad commentary on your "home market" theory? Doesn't it admit that protection can't make home markets?

U. S.—I don't deny that theories now when we are confronted by conditions. But will you not try to help us out by revising your tariff schedules a

little—just enough so that we can show our farmers that reciprocity has really opened markets for them, or at least that it has been the means of inducing countries to permit our agricultural products to enter their markets under less duty. It matters but little to us that these same markets want manufactured and not agricultural products. Please make some change so that we can announce that "reciprocity treaties" have been made, and that we can continue to import sugar, coffee, and hides from S. A.—We will consider your case; but another objection occurs to me just now. Isn't such a policy of discrimination contrary to the policy adopted long ago by your own and several other American republics, which is open to "entangling alliances" with countries?

U. S.—Bosh! That's an exploded idea up here, except with a few Democrats who have had but little practical experience in state and foreign affairs for over thirty years.

S. A.—We may be able to accommodate you a little, as you have for years had some of our most important exports on your free list; and, besides, we don't care to be boycotted by your country. We do, however, think that you should have adapted your reciprocity to fit countries that want agricultural products and that have a large commerce. Our people down here don't trade much anywhere. The whole of South America takes less than 2 per cent. of your agricultural products, while Great Britain alone takes 60 per cent. Reciprocity with us may help some of your manufacturers in the same way that "protection" has helped them, but it can't help your farmers and I should think they would soon see through your little game; though if you insist we shall.

Canada—Hello! Hello! Is this the United States? U. S.—Yes, yes, and I am certain I am talking to Canada; she always puts in when she calls and I never miss a cold chille. Please state your business.

C.—I called you up to learn what kind of a reciprocity treaty you intend to make with us.

U. S.—We are not considering any reciprocity treaty with you, and we are not certain that it might be to our game; though if you insist we shall.

Canada—Hello! Hello! Is this the United States? U. S.—Yes, yes, and I am certain I am talking to Canada; she always puts in when she calls and I never miss a cold chille. Please state your business.

C.—I called you up to learn what kind of a reciprocity treaty you intend to make with us.

U. S.—We are not considering any reciprocity treaty with you, and we are not certain that it might be to our game; though if you insist we shall.

Canada—Hello! Hello! Is this the United States? U. S.—Yes, yes, and I am certain I am talking to Canada; she always puts in when she calls and I never miss a cold chille. Please state your business.

C.—I called you up to learn what kind of a reciprocity treaty you intend to make with us.

U. S.—We are not considering any reciprocity treaty with you, and we are not certain that it might be to our game; though if you insist we shall.

Canada—Hello! Hello! Is this the United States? U. S.—Yes, yes, and I am certain I am talking to Canada; she always puts in when she calls and I never miss a cold chille. Please state your business.

C.—I called you up to learn what kind of a reciprocity treaty you intend to make with us.

U. S.—We are not considering any reciprocity treaty with you, and we are not certain that it might be to our game; though if you insist we shall.

Canada—Hello! Hello! Is this the United States? U. S.—Yes, yes, and I am certain I am talking to Canada; she always puts in when she calls and I never miss a cold chille. Please state your business.

must sign the new scale "on or before June 24." There are several gentlemen in Minneapolis who should not overlook this news. One of them is Mr. H. W. Oliver, chairman of the convention's sub-committee on tariff matters. He reported to the iron and steel manufacturers after the passage of the McKinley bill that the rates in the new iron and steel schedule "were those proposed by the manufacturers themselves." Another is ex-Speaker Reed, who declared that the manufacturers had "obtained what they wanted," and who said at Buffalo on Oct. 15, 1890:

"They ask me whether I consider the McKinley bill just to the poor. Well, I should say so. A bill which has for its object the aiding of the poor by raising their wages, it seems to me, is a just one."

Mr. McKinley himself should meditate upon the great reductions now demanded by the iron and steel manufacturers of his own State. Perhaps a convention can be induced to say something in its platform about the impending conflict between the manufacturers and their workmen.

New Sanitary Ware Trust. When McKinley raised the duties on sanitary pottery from 55 to 65 and 70 per cent. by putting duties on packing cases, the seven manufacturers at Trenton, with one at East Liverpool, Ohio, and one in Baltimore, practically had a trust, though each firm owned its own factory. Since duties were increased the manufacturers, some of whom have made millions in a few years, cut wages about 15 per cent. after a long strike against a reduction of 10 to 40 per cent. This method of doing business by "understanding" or "agreements" is not entirely satisfactory to the manufacturers, and on May 23 five of the big manufacturers at Trenton incorporated in one company with a capital of \$300,000. Those in the combine are the Empire Pottery, Trenton Pottery, Delaware Pottery, Equitable Pottery, and Crescent Pottery.

Column advertisements of the stock of this new trust in New York papers, "the companies manufacture and sell about 75 per cent. of the output of the famous sanitary plumbing ware made in this country. The earnings for 1891 will pay the dividends on the preferred stock (8 per cent.), and over 16 per cent. on the common stock, thus providing for the expense of management. The confidence expressed by the public in the conduct of business that can be put in operation by the proposed combination of these companies will still further increase the net earnings."

The men who had their wages reduced in 1891 must relish this kind of talk. Consumers who are acquainted with the "economies of trusts" will expect soon to receive another "revised" price list of sanitary ware, showing the one issued in April, 1891, advancing the price of goods.

These same manufacturers also announced that "the manufacture of these goods requires skilled labor of the highest grade, and that they are not from this declaration that these highly skilled laborers were receiving unusually high wages. In 1883, the Bureau of Labor of New Jersey collected accurate statistics of the earnings of workers in a representative pottery in Trenton. They are as follows:

Workmen. Average weekly earnings. Hollow ware pressers, \$10.00. Dish makers, 16.35. Flat pressers, 12.15. Handlers, 12.35. Jiggers, 11.10. Turners, 10.00.

The commissioner said "many of these workmen are among the most rapid operators in Trenton." Many of the workmen have submitted to several reductions since 1883, making great economies in their daily lives. "The 'economies and improved system' of this new trust may be counted on to close down at least one of these potteries, or in some other way to throw out one-fifth of these men."

The dependent wages upon tariffs is demonstrated with remarkable clearness in this industry. While duties have been going up wages have been going down. It is the object of a protective tariff, as explained in the Minneapolis platform, to levy duties on imported articles equal to the difference in wages at home and abroad. The duties on pottery not only cover this difference, but, in some kinds of ware, they are two or three times the total labor cost of making such ware in Trenton.

Monopolies and Millionaires. The New York Tribune has published a list of 4,095 millionaires in the United States to show that the majority of them have not made their money in protected industries. It, however, finds that 1,175 of these have removed themselves thus far from the poor-house largely by the aid of "protection." After omissions are supplied, which good judges say are numerous, the list shows that there are 5,000 of these tariff beneficiaries, tax-evaders, and land sharks among us.

Supposing that they will average \$4,000,000 apiece, these few men, less than 1-1000 of our population, will, in addition, then own \$20,000,000,000, or 30 per cent. of our total wealth, which according to our last census was \$63,548,000,000. It is entirely reasonable that 100,000 more persons can be found whose total accumulation will add \$20,000,000,000 more, making fully 50 per cent. of our total wealth in the hands of 1-6 of 1 per cent. of our population. It is quite probable that 1 per cent. of our population owns 80 per cent., and perhaps 90 per cent. of all our wealth, and the gap between the rich and the poor is widening wider and more threatening every day.

Read in any part of this list and you will be convinced that the sources of every one of the fortunes have been in monopoly of some kind. The greatest monopoly, if the Tribune's data are correct, is that of land in different forms—lots, farms, mines, etc. This appears to have made more than one-half of our millionaires. The second is undoubtedly that from tariff taxation, giving a few of our manufacturers the monopoly of our markets, a monopoly they have made doubly secure by means of trusts in nearly every protected industry. Other less objectionable monopolies come from patent and copy rights, government contracts, etc. The most striking feature of these millionaire-producing monopolies is that they are nearly all the direct results of tariff taxation, or they can be removed by direct taxation that shall hit the wealthy and the poor to give the rich no leave any person in possession of what he has not earned.

Republican Platform on the Tariff. The New York World, speaking of the Republican party, as portrayed in its recent platform, says: "It reiterates its repudiation of the tariff, the greatest evil which has been done by taxation, which is equivalent to saying that if crops grow in spite of frosts, frost is good for crops."

The argument put forward in defense of the McKinley tariff by Andrew Carnegie, that "it possesses free-trade