

\$4.85 and foreign plates (in bond) for \$3.70 per box.

Figures are somewhat dry, but it pays to study these, for the lesson will be learned never to accept even government statistics without verification. Senator Washburn was right and his critics have put themselves in a very undesirable position.

President Hadley, of Yale University, writes in *Scribner's Magazine* for November, as Cockran spoke at Chicago, about that theoretical trust, without any privileges. Such a trust never existed. But in regard to the tariff he is plain enough:

"It is safe to say that in those industries which are at all thoroughly monopolized public safety will generally demand that duties be placed on a revenue rather than a protective basis. The fact that an industry can thus organize itself shows that it has outgrown the period of infancy. If it continues to demand a prohibitory tariff on its products, the presumption is that it is trying to make an arbitrary profit at the expense of the consumer."

## More Republican Opinions.

If President Hadley is not thought a good enough protectionist to call as a witness, there is no lack of orthodox protectionist witnesses. Read what *The Philadelphia Ledger* says:

"But, as a matter of fact, congress has a weapon which readily can be used to checkmate most of the oppressive combinations against whose exactions protests go up from the people. The majority of the trusts deal in products protected by the tariff, in whole or in part, from foreign competition."

And the good republican *Commercial Advertiser* of New York:

"The time will soon come when public opinion will no more tolerate protective duties on trust products, for protection should logically promote home competition, while trust organization destroys it."

In the state of former President Harrison, the republican *Blairsville Courier* sounds no uncertain note:

"We are firmly of the opinion that it is a high tariff, and only a high tariff, that is responsible for the multiplication of trusts, and it is our decided opinion that the only manner in which these combinations can be wounded in a vital spot is by modification of the tariff laws which has made them possible and to which they owe their existence."

A trade paper ought to know what it is talking about when it discusses its own trade; so the remarks of *The American Wool and Cotton Reporter*, a protectionist journal, are worthy of attention:

"The situation, it seems to us, has been made a very complicated one by the trusts—a very dangerous one, we may add. The democratic party, by boldly arraying itself against trusts and

by calling upon the people to support it in its fight, would possess an opportunity such as has seldom come to it. We believe, as matters have now developed, that it would have a rallying cry that would insure its success at the polls. It would come into power pledged to repeal all tariff schedules favorable to trusts, and this would mean the rescinding of a very large part of the existing law. In the matter, for instance, of schedule K, we must confess to feeling a little startled at hearing prominent merchants previously good protectionists, openly advocating a repeal on both wool fabrics and raw wool.

"It is quite a common thing to hear men of standing in the various callings, who have in the past been wedded to protection views, declare that they believe that the trust movement will result in a very general repeal of tariff duties; and it is quite obvious that this is a remedy which would meet with their approval."

Many other similar quotations from high republican and protectionist authorities might be cited. Senator John Sherman said ten years ago that:

"Whenever free competition is evaded or avoided by combination of individuals or corporations, the duty should be reduced and foreign competition promptly invited."

Many trust officers do not hesitate to say that trusts depend upon tariff duties. Those of the tin plate trust told the Industrial Commission only a few days ago that the removal of the tariff would hurt their trust, and in fact, might kill their industry.

Can any intelligent man hesitate to urge the repeal of tariff privilege, or can any one doubt that success awaits the party that will fight the peoples' fight by demanding the repeal of privilege?

Trusts can evade and nullify any statutes passed to restrain them, but against repeal of privilege every monopolist cries out.

New York, October 31, 1899.

Farmers' Leagues are being organized in many counties in Maine, on a platform which demands a revision of the tax laws, a tax on franchises, a horizontal reduction of salaries of state officers, a cessation of appropriations for private educational institutions, home rule for the towns, and the abolition of free railroad passes.

"American shipping needs no subsidy except it be a small one for mail and passenger steamers, which may be used in naval service during war," the *Portland Oregonian* (rep.) says, "but it does need the right to meet the other nations of the earth on an equal footing, by having the world for a market on which to draw when wishing to buy as well as when wishing to sell."

## POLITICAL.

One rule, of many, adopted by the democratic executive committee in Reading, Pa., provides that city candidates must not treat voters to beer or other liquors either directly or indirectly, and that if this rule is violated by a successful candidate he shall be put off the ticket. The advocates of the no-beer campaign are encouraged by its success in the recent congressional contest.

The gold democratic organization in Maryland, in a declaration of its reasons for urging support this year of the republican state ticket, assigns the fear of the democratic state convention to state its opinion on the financial question, construing its silence as an approval of the democratic position elsewhere on silver, and also the silence of the democratic platform on important measures for the promotion of the best interests of the state, in sharp contrast to which is the promise of additional reforms by the republicans, coupled with the carrying out by that party of the promises and pledges in its platform of 1895.

One hundred "leading" republicans of Alabama met in conference in Birmingham on Saturday, "and adopted resolutions endorsing the administration of President McKinley and his foreign policy in particular, and demanding his renomination and reelection." A correspondent of the *Washington Post*, who reported the meeting, adds the illuminating fact that "among those in attendance was National Committeeman William Youngblood, who is Third Auditor of the Federal Treasury."

Both the republicans and democrats in Haverhill, Mass., according to a correspondent of the *Boston Advertiser*, are much exercised over the strength in that city of the socialists. The latter won in the city election last year, and with this encouragement they are trying now to get a majority in the city for their state ticket and their candidates for the legislature. The republicans see the need of making a hard fight to win in the city, and they are asking, and in many cases receiving, the support of democrats.

The *Philadelphia Bulletin* (rep.) warns the president not to attempt to retain exclusive executive control of "our new possessions." "Such a policy," it says, "would not commend itself to the American people. It would arm the democratic minority in the house and senate with a weapon which they could use effectively in assailing the dominant party. It would not be in accordance with the president's own repeated assertions that the future disposition and government of these territories is a question which should be decided by both houses of congress, acting in their capacity as the representatives of the voters of the United States."