

TRUSTS AND THE TARIFF.

Repeal of Special Favors the First Step.

The recent Chicago conference upon "trusts" had one result of great value. It brought out clearly and unmistakably that the first step to be taken in the matter must be the abolition of every protective duty that favors a trust.

All shades of opinion were represented, from actual commendation to violent denunciation, and every position had a fair hearing. It only needed such a discussion to reveal at the same time how superficial were all the arguments advanced in support of the "trusts" and yet how impracticable was almost every remedy proposed for the evil. But throughout the discussion, and even because of it, one proposition and one remedy stood out with greater and greater clearness each time they were advanced—the proposition becoming almost an axiom, whose mere statement at once demanded the only logical step as a remedy.

Protection favors trusts.

Then remove the favors.

Other propositions were of doubtful constitutionality; there was no such question as to this one. Some were unjust; this was justice itself. Some proposed constitutional amendments, involving doubt and delay for many years; this could be settled in one congress. Legislation compelling publicity would be admirable in its way; but publicity would serve rather as a means of discovering ultimate remedies than as an effective remedy most needed now.

A Popular Demand.

The demand for a removal of the protective taxes wherever they grant privileges to trusts is not only logical and just but it has arisen spontaneously among members of all political parties and in all sections of the country. The American people abhor privilege. They will not knowingly consent to it, and when they have supported legislation which granted special privileges it has only been through misunderstanding. The prominence of the great combinations called "trusts" has already removed much of the misunderstanding under which protective taxes have hitherto been supported and the people are eager today to listen to the evidence and ready to give the case a fair hearing.

The press can render no greater service than by spreading the facts; and, believing that the statement of them will strengthen the popular conviction that "tariff is the mother of trusts" and render the popular demand for the immediate remedy irresistible, I venture to offer the services of the New England Free Trade League in helping to secure for your columns frequent articles from eminent men well posted upon the subject, explaining in detail the nature of

the connection between the protective taxes and the trusts which they support (such as those in tin plate, window glass, lead, steel rails, paper, etc.) and showing the extent to which they enable the trusts to extort from our people. I am assured already of the assistance of many men whose information and opinions are of the highest value.

Bourke Cockran Answered.

One of the most eloquent men in the country, the Hon. Bourke Cockran, inquired at the recent trust conference "whether a monopoly that oppresses exists, and where it is? Who is hurt, and where? Where has the octopus got possession of somebody? On whom is it acting? Where is its lair?"

The answer is easy and is based on evidence familiar to all. American producers for years have proved their ability, if freed from tariff restrictions, to compete with foreigners. Wherever, then, a trust is producing a protected article and is extorting from our people more than the price at which it could be imported free of the protective tax—there is the lair of a monopoly or octopus which has possession of the whole American people and is acting upon them, but is able to hurt them solely because of the power which it derives from the protective tariff.

Objections Considered.

All trusts are not supported by the tariff; but that is no reason why those which are so supported should be allowed to bleed the people while we are groping for more complete remedies. Removing the taxes which support those trusts, will not, it is true, reach all the trust evils; neither will it remove all the tariff evils. But that is no argument against extending relief where it is possible. We do not give up courts because they cannot do full justice to every one, nor discard medicine and surgery because they cannot cure every ill.

Both our great political parties denounce trusts and the platforms of both will continue to promise a remedy. If there is one thing, however, that this self-governing people should have learned by experience, it is the danger of trusting to such promises unless they are too definite to be safely evaded after election. But if our people concentrate their energies upon the demand for the removal of the power for extortion which the protective taxes give to trusts, immediate relief will be sure; for the trusts will no longer be able to confront the people with the old complacent inquiry: "What are you going to do about it?" And the party that succeeds in the election will not dare to evade such a definite declaration from the people of what they mean to do.

HENRY W. LAMB,

President New England Free Trade League.

THAT CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE PEOPLE.

The voters of Nebraska should now be authoritatively informed as to the alleged attempt on the part of the leaders of the populist party—when they secured a recount of the vote on a constitutional amendment—to debauch the franchise, steal the real majority vote and expand the minority into a fraudulent majority for their own benefit!

Was such an attempt made?

Was it made by House Bill number five which had the approval of Governor Holcomb and all the other leaders of fusion then gathered at the state house in Lincoln?

What did Representative Severe of Otoe county have to do with securing the passage of an act, the avowed purpose of which was to place in power two judges of the supreme court and an amendment to the organic law of the state?

THE CONSERVATIVE seeks the truth in regard to the rumored assault of the ballot by a conspiracy of law-makers known as populists? Where can the truth be found? When found will it show that Governor Holcomb had a guilty knowledge of the attempt to defraud the people of their right to govern themselves? Was House Rent Holcomb knowing to the fact that there was attempt, by conspiracy, to capture the supreme court of the state? Was he one of the conspirators?

Does Senator Prout's report give any light on this dark subject? Why did Governor Poynter refuse to permit the filing of that report at the state house? Does it contain too much truth? Give up the facts. Let the people behold them!

THE TRUST KILLER.

Attorney-General Blarney Smyth of Nebraska is a

modern St. George to the dragon of monopoly, enflamed in trusts. Smyth is the killer of trusts. He has, however, forgotten in his octopuscidal mania, to hurl himself upon the silver combine at Omaha, which is one of the large and long tentacles of the sixteen-to-one octopus.

When Smyth charges upon the argentiferous monopoly which runs a smelter at Omaha there will be a conflict of giants. The small skirmish with The Standard Oil Company which Smyth has inaugurated merely for electioneering purposes is only a sham battle.

But the silver trust will find that when Smyth, aided by Bryan, Allen and Holcomb, storms its works, a battle to extermination has begun! And thus the reformers will prohibit the use of money furnished by silver bullion and mine owners during the present campaign in Nebraska. Down with the silver trust! It is a twin of Standard Oil!