



(73)

HF(7)

B20

The Tariff As a Tax on Women

1972

*What Women Pay
the Profiteers*

Edited by

MARION BANISTER

"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 enterprise and build up private fortunes is none the less robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation."

—SUPREME COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES.
The Marshall Case.

Issued by

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
WASHINGTON, D. C.



[1923?]

ORIGIN OF THE WORD "TARIFF"

By Representative Marvin Jones, of Texas, in a speech delivered in the United States House of Representatives.

In the early part of the eighth century a band of marauders under a leader by the name of *Tarif* crossed the straits of Africa and landed on the southern shores of Spain. His band was held together by the spoils of conquest. The horde consisted of Moors, Berbers, Syrians, Africans and a few Arabs, all bent on plunder. They were Mohammedans, and were in a sense the vanguard of the followers of Islam in their westward swing, but cared less for their religion than for booty. *Tarif* plundered the country and established a little seaport town, *Tarifa*, which, with its old Moorish walls, to this day perpetuates the name and memory of the leader of this motley aggregation of robbers and conquerors. *Tarif*, later reinforced by his superior, *Tarik*, and his chief, *Musa*, overran a great deal of Spain. This baron lived in a chateau that was feudal in its magnificence, and in plundering fashion levied certain duties on all commerce that came through or approached the town of *Tarifa*. He made all the people who toiled pay tribute to him as a sort of robber ruler. The gleaming sword was his collecting agency, and he would hold up ship and caravan in piratical fashion and make them pay tribute to sustain his conquest and luxury.

From that town *Tarifa*, which was named after the princely *Tarif*, the English word "tariff" is taken. The name arose in heathenism. It meant forced contribution of the many to the few. How fitting that a policy which finds its consummation in this bill (Fordney-McCumber tariff) should have had such an origin.

For centuries the Moor remained in charge of the Provinces of Cadiz and Andalusia and the seaport town of *Tarifa* and levied their toll upon commerce. Much was the wealth and many the trophies they sent to the Caliph. Their chiefs increased in wealth, in insolent power. They lived in regal splendor, but they were riding to their fall. In 1292 the Christians, under *Guademus*, reclaimed these Provinces, and although the Moors tried repeatedly to recapture *Tarifa* and these rich Provinces and to regain their power to live from the fruits of other men's toil, they could not succeed. Two centuries later they were driven out of Spain.

The privileged classes in this country have grown rich behind the tariff wall. They have overrun the country and levied tribute from all to enrich the few. They have built their "castles in Spain" and their summer homes in Florida. Emboldened by their success, they are endeavoring to get behind the highest protective rates in all history. But, like the Moors of the centuries that are gone, they are riding to their fall. The great heart of America is just and the people will again assert their rights and reclaim their land and Democratic equality shall again flourish in this great free country.

The Tariff as a Tax on Women

What Women Pay the Profiteers

WOMEN are the purchasing agents for all of the 25,000,000 families in the United States. They buy or influence the buying of practically all that the 100,000,000 individual members of these families require in the way of food, clothing, furnishings, and the scores of other items of necessity, culture, comfort, and health.

What American women buy, directly or indirectly, as the purchasing agents of twenty-odd million homes is a very large proportion of all the commodities manufactured and sold in this country. It is estimated that the retail value of the commodities purchased by women every year is \$40,000,000,000—about \$1,600 a family.

There is a tariff tax on nearly every article and commodity in common use in the American home. The aggregate of these tariff taxes on the food, clothing, and other needs and conveniences which women buy is not less than \$3,000,000,000 a year. *That is to say, these tariff taxes increase the expense of every American home by at least \$125 a year.*

As the purchasers of forty billion dollars' worth of commodities upon which private interests collect a tax of about \$8 for themselves for each \$1 paid to the Government as revenues, the women of the United States are profoundly affected, and ought to be equally concerned, by a tariff law that puts them and their families at the mercy of a horde of greedy exploiters.

What follows is designed to be a brief but graphic account of what the Republican Tariff means to American women as the keepers of 25,000,000 American homes. The facts presented are eloquent proofs of the extent to which the Republican Administration has abused the Government in the service of special interests and profiteers.

How the Family Budget is Dissipated

Irving Fisher, the Economist of Yale University, said recently that a salary of \$20 per week goes no further than a \$12 per week salary before the World War.

Professor Fisher's statement is based on exhaustive calculations of living costs. All other authorities substantially agree with him.

An income of \$20 today is no better than \$12 before the war!

The tariff accounts for so much of the difference, that the need of making the tariff honest and fair is clearly one of the nation's first duties.

There are many other things to do. Tariff revision is not a "cure-all," of course. But it is a financial burden that women cannot righteously continue to endure. It is for women above all others to demand and to secure a just and honest tariff revision.

Democratic Tariff Policy vs. Republican Tariff Policy

Democrats and Republicans differ fundamentally and irreconcilably on the question of tariffs. It is necessary to know and understand the nature and extent of this vital difference between the two parties to fully understand the weakness and vices of the Fordney-McCumber tariff law and of preceding Republican tariff measures.

Both Democrats and Republicans recognize the tariff as nothing but a tax; both hold that duties should be collected at the custom house on certain imports from foreign countries, and both regard these imports as one legitimate and necessary means of raising some of the revenues required for the conduct of the Federal Government. The crucial point upon which the two parties differ and disagree is the *purpose for which a tariff is levied*.

Representative James W. Collier (Mississippi), a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, has outlined with clearness and accuracy the fundamental difference between the tariff principles of the two great political parties. He says:

"The differences and the distinctions between a Democratic and a Republican tariff are well defined. Both parties declare that certain import duties should be levied upon the importation of certain articles produced or manufactured in foreign countries. The distinction lies not in the way in which these taxes are collected. Both parties believe that they should be collected at the customhouse. The distinction lies not in the use to which these taxes are to be put after they are collected, because both parties would apply them to the uses of the Federal Treasury. The distinction, then, lies in the purposes, the object, and the intent which governs the levying of the tariff rate on the article which is taxed.

"The purpose, the object, the intent of a Republican in levying a tariff rate is to keep out importations, so that the supply of the article taxed will be limited, which will increase the demand in order that the American manufacturer who makes the same article may receive a high price by this destruction of competition, which is called protection."

"The purpose, the object, the intent of a Democrat in levying a tariff rate is solely to secure funds to meet the expenses of the Federal Government."

"Therefore, the tax must be so fixed that, instead of keeping out importations, it will permit the bringing in of importations, which generally, though not necessarily, means a competitive rate.

"To the framer of a Republican tariff bill *protection* is the object, the purpose, and the intent, and if any revenue should be collected, why, then, this revenue is merely incidental.

"To the framer of a Democratic tariff bill *revenue* is the purpose, the object, and the intent, and if any protection should result to any American industry by reason of this rate, then this protection is merely incidental.

"The Republicans believe that a tariff tax is a subsidy, a benefit, a bounty, to be bestowed upon some favorite; a privilege to be conferred upon some beneficiary.

"The Democrats believe that a tariff tax is an expense, a burden, a price that all the people have to pay, not to increase the profits of private enterprise, but to raise revenues to meet the expenses of the Government.

"The Republicans believe in a system of taxation whereby the people may tax each other, so that certain classes may be the beneficiaries of that tax.

"The Democrats believe that the Government alone should tax the people and that the Government alone should be the beneficiary of that tax.

"Believing that no dollar should be collected by taxation for any purpose other than the legitimate expenses of the Federal Government, all that concerns the framer of a Democratic tariff bill is not the difference in the cost of the production here and abroad, but, *first*, how much revenue is needed and, *second*, how can this revenue be raised by levying a tariff tax in such a way and on such articles as will bring in the greatest amount of revenue, at the same time so fixing the rate that it will fall heaviest on luxuries and nonessentials and prove least burdensome to the people."

The Underwood-Simmons Tariff Law

The difference between a Democratic tariff and a Republican tariff is clearly shown in the following table, published by the Fair Tariff League, a Protectionist organization, consisting largely of Republicans, that seeks to eliminate the element of dishonesty from Republican tariffs.

Two Kinds of Tariffs, Democratic and Republican— How They Serve Labor and Consumers

Product.	Wage Per Dollar of Product.	Underwood Tariff on Each Dollar Imported.	Fordney Tariff on Each Dollar Imported.
Cotton goods.....	\$.1675	\$.34	\$.51
Silk goods.....	.1575	.425	.57
Woolens.....	.1575	.32	.68
Hosiery.....	.1775	.37	.67
Gloves, leather.....	.175	.1375	.50
Shoes.....	.27	Free	Free
Buttons.....	.33	.36	.99
Glassware.....	.305	.35	.385
Chinaware.....	.41	.55	.69
Aluminum.....	.1775	.205	.45
Oilcloth and linoleum.....	.115	.325	.35
Carpets and rugs.....	.195	.48	.49
Cutlery.....	.39	.3933	1.82
Sewing machines.....	.44	Free	.15
Glass Bottles.....	.30	.39	.60
Glucose.....	.06	.15	.50
Stamped ware.....	.235	.20	.40
Paints and varnishes.....	.07	.115	.28

In column 2 of this table is shown the amount paid in wages out of each dollar that the factory gets for its product.

In column 3 is shown the tariff tax of the Democratic party in the Underwood law on each dollar's worth of the article imported. This shows that in cotton goods, silks and woolens, the Democratic tariff was twice as high as the payroll in the industry. In other industries the tariff rates run from a little more than the total wage, as in glassware and buttons, to two and a half times more in glucose.

The Tariff and Wages

A Republican argument, addressed to working people, has been that a high tariff was necessary to keep wages high in America, and to protect the American workingman and workingwoman against "the pauper labor of Europe."

The Republicans have used the wages paid in the factories of the various industries as a basis upon which

they argued for high tariff, claiming that to compete with similar low wages paid in European countries for the manufacture of similar goods, would lower the American wages and thus reduce "American standards of living."

As a matter of fact, the use of machinery in America not only triples and quadruples the output of the factories, as compared with the foreign manufactories of similar articles, but it also assures to the American workman or workingwoman who operates these machines, a larger wage in comparison with the European worker, turning out the same goods by hand, or on machinery of a type inferior to that in use in America.

A clear example of this is given in that part of this booklet dealing with "Hosiery" and "Laces and Embroideries."

As for the comparison of the increases asked by the Tariff Barons on the basis of wages paid, the foregoing table gives concrete illustrations in the manufacture of a number of articles.

Republican Tariff Penalizes Women

The Fordney-McCumber Tariff hits women especially hard. The woman spends the family money, and she it is who has felt keenest the increased cost of sugar, of woolens, of the thousand and one articles which her budget, with the decreased buying power of the dollar, must cover.

As one woman recently said:

"I can speak for myself—when I prepared my two children for school this autumn, I found in buying the necessary clothes for them, everything that went into their trunks carried with it an extra price which might have read, 'with the compliments of the Republican tariff.'"

Tariff

Under the Underwood-Simmons Competitive Tariff Act, revising the Payne-Aldrich Republican "Robber" Tariff, cutting down prohibitive schedules that sheltered monopoly, taking the tariff tax off the necessities of life and placing it upon luxuries, stimulating both imports and exports by providing genuine competition, the nation saw the greatest prosperity in its history.

The present tariff penalizes women at every turn. It declares everything a woman wears that is the least ornamental or particularly beautiful a luxury, and insists that such things be taxed as if the wearing of them was a sin. To an unfair extent it makes it so that only the rich can wear these pretty things, and leaves those of modest means in comparative embarrassment unless they unduly strain their financial resources to keep up appearances.

The makers of the present tariff ignore the age-old longing of women for beauty in dress. They seem to seek by law to force the woman of moderate means to stifle all such craving.

Silk, for instance, is not now a luxury for women's wear—it is a necessity. It is, in fact, an actual economy in these days of high laundry charges. Hundreds of thousands of self-supporting women must wear silk. Congress should not add a penny of unnecessary tax to their needful purchases.

It is estimated that under the stimulus of the high rates in the Fordney-McCumber bill the women of the

United States have been forced to pay approximately \$1,000,000,000 more for clothing than they paid under the Underwood-Simmons law. This includes all articles of women's wearing apparel, from lace to hair nets.

Textiles

A study of the following estimates will bring home to most women a realization of the toll they are now paying the tariff gougers.

Cotton Goods

One-half of the average cost of all textiles is in the raw material. In respect to cotton, we Americans have an advantage in that we grow most of the world's cotton and supply the mills of the world. In silks, all countries are on an even basis buying in Japan and China.

Any duty, therefore, on cottons and silks, properly concerns only the other one-half of the cost represented by wages, overhead expense, and profits. A tariff, therefore, like the present one, averaging about 51 cents on the dollar on cotton goods of all sorts, is equivalent to \$1.02 on all these elements of difference, wages, overhead and profits. The present tariff averaging 57 per cent on silks is equivalent to \$1.14 on these elements of difference, that is, \$1.14 to protect gross costs and profits of 50 cents.

The tariff is so high that not a yard of ordinary competing cotton or silk piece-goods is imported, but only novelties, in design or quality, the finest kind of cotton goods, and the cheap Chinese pongee or Shantung rough, brown silks that are not made in this country, and the cheap "habutai" Japanese silk made from raw material of such inferior quality as cannot be used on our machines, as we choose to run them.

Cotton mills, in recent years, under the Underwood tariff, have made 50 per cent, 70 per cent, and rarely 100 per cent per annum, with no restraining imports to keep prices in reason.

It is a significant fact that the only two decades in the history of the American Republic, from 1840 to 1920, a period of 80 years—when the general wealth of the country increased over 100 per cent—were the two decades when the Democracy was in control and the tariff had been reduced.

Protection has never been reflected in the pay envelope of the workingman.

The Democratic cotton tariff of 1913, if anything, needed revision downward in 1922, and would have been so revised had not tariff profiteers controlled the Republican Congress, which raised the cotton rates from an average of 34 cents on each dollar produced to 51 cents when our wage-cost was only 16¼ cents. The Fordney-McCumber Act raised the silk tariff from 42½ cents to 57 cents when the wage-cost was only 15¼ cents. It invites cotton manufacturers, many of them among the wealthiest companies in the world, to add to their prices as much as they can and dare of the \$560,000,000, given to them on tariff allowances.

For example, the new Republican law doubled the rate of 15 cents on the dollar on Amoskeag Apron Gingham in the Underwood Tariff, making the present rate 31½ cents. This to benefit among others a corporation that had increased its capital *out of profits* (b. f. t.) from \$4,000,000 to \$44,500,000 and that had made in the last

eight years of the Underwood tariff of 15 per cent, as much as \$27,298,881 profit.

Remember that this is not a great trust, but just one privately owned cotton mill.

In defending the Amoskeag Company, Senator Moses of New Hampshire, said (page 11020, Cong. Record) that, "to break the consumer's strike * * * it had reduced its price from 27½ cents to 12½ cents."

Think of a private concern so entrenched by protection that it can reduce its price two-thirds at will. Think of a Republican Congress doubling the protective duties of such a corporation!

Hosiery

The following is part of a fascinating story of the accomplishment of a typical American industry—hosiery—and the way our over-protected industries get their so-called tariff protection from the Republican party. It was published by the Fair Tariff League in the summer of 1922.

"Thirty years ago," runs this interesting tale of American genius, "a single operator on the machines of those days ran 6 machines, making a total of 18 dozen pairs of socks daily, with a piece-rate of 3 cents per dozen pairs, giving her 54 cents per day.

"Twenty years ago, with better machines, and the same rate of pay, the output was double, giving a wage of \$1.08 per day.

"In the last five years, with full automatic machines, making the entire sock, including the ribbed top, each operator runs 25 machines, making 150 dozen pairs daily. Her piece-rate has been reduced from 3 cents to 2 cents per dozen pairs, and yet she gets \$3.00 per day.

Swear Not!

Darn your stockings!

That's not profanity; it's solicitous advice.

There's a Republican tariff on stockings—ergo, they're going higher.

That is, not becoming longer so that you get more stockings in a pair, so to speak; it only means they're to be dearer.

The regular \$2 stocking is to be \$13.85 instead of \$13.50 a dozen pairs, wholesale, next autumn. The 12 strand, dipped, is to be \$21.50 instead of \$18.50, and the 12 strand, ingrain, \$35 instead of \$33.50.

Increases by the manufacturers are always pyramided all along the line. The consumer ordinarily pays double the percentage of increase made by the manufacturer of clothing.

"These socks cost 81.5 cents per dozen pairs today, including 36 cents for the yarn. A manufacturer tells us they could be sold for 85 cents per dozen pairs. They retail at 10 cents per pair in the ten-cent stores, which used to buy them as low as 50 cents per dozen pairs. This is the miracle and perfect accomplishment of protection. Two cents per dozen pairs for knitting, and \$3.00 per day wage on the piece basis. The total labor cost from raw cotton to finished sock is 2 cents per pair; the lowest wage in the world, and the highest weekly earnings paid any hosiery people in the world.

"A single operator runs from 20 to 30 of the newest type machines knitting women's silk hose and produc-

ing a total of 80 to 90 dozen pairs daily. At 4 cents per dozen pairs, or one-third of one cent per pair, she would earn \$3.00 per day—almost no cost—and a high wage.

"Contrast these facts with the tariff attitude of the hosiery and knit goods people. One of their typical representatives declares that they cannot exist without a further increase in their tariff because, says he, average wages in the United States in this industry are \$30 per week; in England \$17.40 per week; in Germany, \$5.50; in France, \$7.14. Were he to tell the truth, he would say that the wage cost per dozen pairs in the United States is about 2 cents per pair on socks, and twice that on women's silk hose of ordinary quality, and correspondingly more for 'full-fashioned.' He pays this; he does not pay \$30 per week, nor does any country pay less than he pays per pair. That is why one-fourth of all the hosiery and knit goods made in the United States is exported the world over; that is why we exported hosiery last year to the amount of \$4,000,000 and imported only \$1,000,000, the imports being mostly novelties, golf stockings, etc., that we did not care to make. That is why our knit goods of all sorts go freely all over the world, and substantially no knit underwear is imported, but only fancy novelties for outer-wear.

The People Pay

"With Congress virtually prohibiting importations by a high tariff, and our domestic manufacturers with their heads together on prices, the people are paying unreasonably for their supplies. Children's mercerized socks, that were from 85 cents to 90 cents per dozen before the war, are now \$2.50. Fortunes have been made in the hosiery business in the last few years. Mills are very busy. *It is for Congress and the people to say whether these manufacturers shall henceforth be self-supporting, or shall have in addition great and unnecessary grant of public funds.*"

When the above was written in 1922, the wage-earners in all American hosiery mills were then receiving an average of 17¾ cents on each dollar of product. The Underwood tariff was 37 cents. It should have been reduced one-half, and would have been if Democratic advices had been followed. Instead, the Republican Bill proposed an increase on the cheap but thoroughly good cotton socks worn by poor people up to \$1 per dozen pairs on socks that were retailing for 10 cents per pair, with a total wage-cost of 28 cents per dozen pairs. The rate finally agreed upon and now in operation averages 50 cents per dozen pairs, and the retail price has advanced from 10 cents per pair to 20 cents per pair.

The wickedness of this tariff rate is shown by the fact that in the first ten months of 1923 following the new tariff, we exported \$10,000,000 worth of hosiery and 4,844,530 pairs, against imports of \$1,228,379 worth, and only 577,295 pairs. That is: We are now exporting \$8 of hosiery to \$1 of imports, and more than 8 pairs to one pair of imports. The tariff has doubled the price of poor people's hosiery while our makers are exporting \$1,000,000 at foreign prices.

Silks

The silks of our grandmothers' day were of much better quality than ours. Some of them have been re-fashioned time and again, and are now worn by grand-daughters. The cost of one of these dresses, new sixty years ago, has been only 40 cents a year, and it is still serviceable. Is that a luxury? If women held

half the seats in Congress, Congress would certainly never so declare.

It is reported that shortly after the passage of the Republican Payne-Aldrich Tariff Bill in 1908 the silk manufacturer chiefly concerned in the writing of that and previous silk schedules in many tariffs, heard the Payne Bill denounced. He exclaimed, "The Payne Tariff bad! Why, it's the best I ever wrote."

The Underwood-Simmons tariff on silk averaged 42.6 cents on each dollar of the factory price including silk laces and embroideries. The present law averages 57.2 cents. This to protect a wage-cost of 15.75 cents on each dollar's worth produced.

The present law invites our silk manufacturers to add \$276,000,000 to their price above those of foreign competitors, *this addition to be picked from the pockets of the women of the United States.* This is twice the Underwood-Simmons rate. Consumers are therefore now wholly at the mercy of domestic manufacturers on the kinds of silks commonly made here.

A few domestic silk manufacturers protested against the present rate of 57.2 per cent, declaring that 30 per cent is enough. This 30 per cent is twice the difference in the cost of production here and abroad as they estimated it.

The raw materials in silks constitute on the average 50 to 70 per cent of the total cost of the goods. Certain crepes are 80 per cent raw material, 10 per cent overhead, and 10 per cent labor. It is only the difference between the cost of this 20 per cent of overhead and labor here and abroad that was entitled to consideration by the Republicans, according to their own rule of protection; and yet they made the average rate 57 per cent. *Why pay? Who gets it?*

Profiteers' Tariff and Republican Defeat

The McKinley high tariff bill beat the Republicans in 1890 and made Cleveland President in 1892.

The Dingley high tariff bill would have beaten the Republicans in 1898 except for the reaction against free silver.

The Payne-Aldrich tariff bill beat the Republicans in 1910 and made Woodrow Wilson President in 1912.

The Fordney-McCumber tariff bill beat the Republicans in 1922 and *it foreshadows the election of a Democratic President in 1924.*

The profits of some silk mills under the lower Democratic tariff is indicated in the increase in the net worth of the Cheney Company from \$7,000,000 in 1905 to \$21,000,000 in 1922, during which time usual dividends are understood to have been declared in addition to this increase in net worth.

Should not our silk mills and others earn their own living in their own factories and counting rooms without such doles as these from the Congress of the United States? Do the Cheney and others need this sort of annual pension from the Government at the expense of every woman in the United States? The men who wrote that tariff were short sighted men—*men who didn't expect to be found out.*

Wool and Woolens

The duties on woolen goods are what is called "compound duties."

They are made up of one duty for the wool grower, being 31 cents per scoured pound of wool, plus a further duty in various amounts on the value of each woolen article imported.

This compound duty makes the average tariff on woven woolen fabrics 72.8 cents on each dollar of goods imported; 90 cents on laces; 61 cents on felt goods; and 65 cents on all other woolen manufactures.

The duty on wool in recent months, according to a report of the Carded Woolen Manufacturers Association, has averaged 62.4 cents on the dollar. It has ranged from 21 cents to \$1.88, the higher rate being on the cheapest wools, and the lower rate on the costliest wools.

The wool duty is so high that there is a great temptation to use over much wool shoddy and cotton.

For instance: A workingman's blue khaki shirt that retails for \$4.50 is composed of 85 per cent of shoddy, and 15 per cent cotton with no virgin wool in it. Thus does the tariff cheat the poor man out of good wool by a duty of 97 per cent on this shirt, while a rich man gets the best possible English pure wool suitings for 62 per cent duty.

The total labor in our woolen mills is only 15¾ cents per dollar produced. *Why a tariff of 65 cents?*

The Republican tariff has so increased the cost of woolen goods that there has virtually been a buyer's strike since the enactment of the present law. Woolen manufacturers produced heavily in 1922 and 1923, expecting to share in the so-called prosperity of those years, but the public refused to buy. Consequently many mills, and particularly our clothing factories, have suffered for want of business, and many people have been inadequately clothed.

Ba, Ba, Black Sheep!

Three-fifths of the American wool crop is raised in Western Mountain States, and four-fifths of the wool there raised is not grown by farmers *for whom the public thinks the wool tariff was enacted.* It is grown by grazers of wild lands who live in towns and cities, some of them owning, as members of corporations or individually, flocks of from 20,000 to 50,000 sheep, divided into bands of one or two thousand each, and cared for by sheep tenders, two such men caring for one thousand or two thousand sheep, besides the lambs which often equal in number three-fourths of the adult sheep.

These bands of sheep live through the summer in the high mountains, largely on the Forest Reserves at a charge of 2½ cents per month or 8 to 10 cents per summer per adult sheep, with no charge for the lambs. In many states, the lambs go from these mountain pastures, "fat as butter," direct to the packing houses.

The flocks are driven down from the mountains in the autumn to so-called desert lands that have enough of wild grasses, sunflowers and other food that rises through the snow in times of storm to keep them through the winter.

When the winter is mild sometimes no prepared food is necessary. In times of severe storm, alfalfa or other grasses are required for feed temporarily. A Washington sheep grazer estimates his winter feed cost at 80 cents per adult sheep. A Colorado sheep grazer estimates his cost at about 1 cent per day per sheep for 60 to 90 days.

Every penny of the wool tariff is added to the price of wool. About 60 per cent of our annual requirements are imported, and as imports must pay the duty, the domestic product secures the same price.

As we normally import about 375,000,000 pounds as it comes from the sheep's back and the duty is 31 cents per scoured pound and applies to the domestic clip of about 275,000,000 pounds as well as to imports, the cost of the duty is about \$110,000,000. *Only \$45,000,000 of this goes to the wool growers.* The rest is revenue to the Government on imports.

All our wool, however, must go through the hands of wool buyers or commission houses who add 10 per cent for their expense and profit. The spinner buys the wool with this 10 per cent added and adds another 15 per cent of his selling price for his costs and profit. The cloth manufacturer buys it at the additional price, and adds 20 per cent. The clothing manufacturer adds 22½ per cent of his selling price as he passes it to the retailer who adds 33½ per cent to his selling price as he passes it to the consumer.

In consequence of these additions, the \$110,000,000 of wool duty becomes about \$350,000,000 to the consumer!

Women's Dresses

According to the present Republican tariff, beautiful gowns are too much of a luxury for the modestly circumstanced woman.

In truth, the American gowns commonly sold in our stores are made by machinery at as low cost as anywhere in the world. The genius of America substitutes the machine for the hand, thereby making the cost of labor and other items lower than in other countries where the wage-earner earns much less per day. Foreign countries are far behind America in the use of machines.

Our one-piece machine-made gowns will sell in Paris. France asks us to take in return at fair prices, (meaning a fair tariff), hand-made gowns, in the production of which she leads the world. She wants our food-stuffs, our raw materials and certain other products, and can only pay for them with her own products, mostly the things to wear that American women delight in.

But a Republican Congress says, "No." For all it cares, France may go hungry for the wheat that we are feeding to hogs, and in the production of which our farmers are going bankrupt for want of an adequate market. "No matter what happens," it says, "a high tariff on foreign importations we must have."

A beautiful party gown covered with beaded hand embroidery, costing \$7.40 in France, hand made, and competing with no American product, retails here for \$65, because the tariff on it is 75 per cent and the cost of getting it through the Custom House is sometimes 10 per cent, and consequently the importer adds 100 per cent round figures, to cover tariff clearance charges, and the small item of freight. The importer sells this gown costing him \$15, duty paid, to domestic manufacturers for about \$21. The domestic manufacturer uses it "to sweeten his line" and sells it for \$28 to the wholesaler who sells it to the retailer for about \$37 who retails it for \$65.

"It Might Have Been"

If there were no tariff at all on this non-competitive gown, these prices would be halved, and American women would be startled and delighted by seeing an exquisite hand-made French party gown covered with embroidery, priced at only \$32.50.

Here and Abroad

Another gown with lace insertion and drawn work every five inches from top to bottom with the waist embroidered front and back and full panels of lace and drawn work, costing \$16 wholesale in France, retails here for from \$85 up.

The elaborate and expensive dresses retailing here for \$300 are sold wholesale in France by large producers for \$52.50, these being, however, producers other than those whose names are known the world over and who charge for their names without adding to the quality of the garments sold.

The important consideration in connection with these gowns is that there is no profiteering whatever in the prices *except the profiteering of the tariff*, which doubles the prices of the less expensive gowns, and still further greatly increases the prices of the expensive gowns by restricting their sale to the very wealthy who buy in the most exclusive shops.

It is no criticism of American producers to say that we need the importation of foreign articles of peculiar art and beauty. Each nation has its individual taste and accomplishments. We love our own; but we would get sore eyes if we saw only our own. The world and its beauty is for all of us. America is called to world leadership and world fellowship. It is her right and her duty to exchange with other peoples her commodities for theirs upon reasonable terms, the orders of certain men known as Congressmen to the contrary and notwithstanding.

Women's Tweed Suits

A careful computation by a well known maker of women's tweed suits and cloaks shows conclusively that the tariff on the tweed cloth from which these are made adds \$4 to the cost of women's tweed suits and coats, of which 30,000,000 are bought annually. *This is a tax upon American women of \$120,000,000 annually.*

In the days of the Payne and Dingley tariffs, when the very fine broadcloth suits for women were in vogue, the duty on these cloths was 100 per cent. In 50 inch widths they were sold by European factories for \$1 per yard. Our tariff of \$1 made the cost \$2 per yard landed in New York, and the retail price \$4.

Today woolen suitings of the most artistic weaves and colors, costing \$1.15 per yard in 50-inch widths, retail in the United States for about \$4 per yard.

There is no profiteering in these prices except the profiteering of the tariff which generally doubles the retail price on imported articles of superior quality!

Laces and Embroideries

A story is current that representatives of foreign laces took their cost sheets to a member of the Senate Finance Committee and showed him every detail of production in European factories.

Said the Senator, "That's right, we want the facts. You can rely on me for a fair outcome."

Shortly before the law was enacted, a bunch of Weehawken lace manufacturers are said to have gone to this Senator with their hands in their pockets and no figures saying, "We want 90 per cent." *They got 90 per cent.*

And what is the wage-cost of making machine lace? *It is 20.7 per cent on each dollars worth at factory prices, or less than one-tenth of retail prices.*

Cotton laces are made on great weaving machines with a weaving width of from 9 to 11 feet. As many strips

Fordney-McCumber Tariff Facts

The Fordney-McCumber Tariff act (1922) was passed in the interest of a special privilege class of manufacturers, who alone profit at the expense of every other class, including not only persons engaged in great agricultural industries and all other natural industries, but at the expense also of every person who works for his living and every person engaged in legitimate business.

The Fordney-McCumber Tariff act costs the people of the United States not less than \$4,000,000,000 a year in excessive prices of the things they have to buy. Of this enormous sum only \$500,000,000 goes into the United States Treasury as tariff revenue; the other \$3,500,000,000 goes into the pockets of the specially protected manufacturers. That is— $87\frac{1}{2}$ cents goes to profiteers)— $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents goes to the Government.

In other words, the Fordney-McCumber Tariff act costs the American people annually as much as it costs to run the entire Government of the United States.

The Fordney-McCumber Tariff act not only increases the prices of all manufactured products, but it opens the door to profiteering, first, by shutting out competing articles so that exorbitant prices can be charged, and second, by pyramiding tariff rates and providing the opportunity for additional exorbitant increases.

The Fordney-McCumber Tariff act is the chief and almost the sole cause of the present high cost of living and the continuous increase in living cost from time to time.

An analysis of 29 industries making the merchandise that fills our retail stores—cottons, woolens, aluminum wares, gloves, hosiery, glassware, china, etc., shows that the Fordney-McCumber act permits the manufacturers to charge over \$5,000,000,000 above the price of the imported article. If but two-thirds of the total was added, \$3,300,000,000, to these articles there would be a tariff tax of \$30 per capita or \$150 per year for the average family of five.

(These figures are furnished by the Fair Tariff League, a protection organization composed largely of Republicans, but which stands for a fair tariff and not a robber tariff.)

Every rent payer, every builder and every home-owner is a victim of the tariff. An analysis of seven basis steel industries, pig-iron, bar steel, rails, structural iron, cast and wrought iron pipe, tin-plate and terne plate, and wire and wire work, shows that the Fordney tariff gives these industries allowances of \$351,000,000, which cost the consumers twice this sum at retail, or \$702,000,000. There is no reason for this tariff except price raising. We are the greatest and cheapest producers of steel on earth. In the three years of 1919 and 1921 inclusive, we exported, of these products 50 times more than we imported. The tariff on all railroad construction material is a big factor in existing high freight rates.

The steel tariff, made solely in the interest of the steel trust, is also one of the prime causes for high railroad rates, both passenger and freight.

The American Federation of Farm Bureaus estimates that the Fordney-McCumber Tariff costs the American farmer \$301,000,000 more than all benefits received.

The Fordney-McCumber Tariff act is the chief reason for the heavy decrease in our foreign trade because our European customers have not the cash with which to buy, and the high tariff prevents them paying in many of their products.

This same tariff act is also largely responsible for the decline in the great American merchant marine built up under a Democratic administration as an auxiliary to our Navy in time of war. This great merchant marine cost the American people \$3,000,000,000. It is now officially estimated to be worth only \$226,733,315. After disposing of a large number of ships there are now left only 1,334 and of these only 416 are in use. The others are at their docks and piers largely because of the failure of the Republican Congress to adopt the Democratic plan presented in 1919 for financial, commercial and industrial reconstruction to adjust ourselves to a peace basis following the World War.

or pieces of laces are woven at one time as will fill this weaving space, for instance, 132 strips are woven, of 1-inch lace at a time. The machine resembles to the untechnical observer the ordinary weaving machine for cotton goods. It is tended in the same way by a single operator, so that one operator weaves thousands of yards per day of narrow widths.

These great pieces, 11 feet wide, and as long as the factory cares to make them, are taken from the machine and two threads are pulled out between each piece of lace and the next, when these strips of lace fall apart, and each strip is prepared separately for shipment.

A little baby's white dress that would otherwise carry a duty of about 35 per cent is raised to 90 per cent because it has 3 cents' worth of machine-made lace on the neck and sleeves. Another is raised from about 35 per cent to 75 per cent because it has a touch of machine embroidery on the front. Evidently, men made this tariff, too.

Linens

No linen is made in this country. It is produced from flax stalks "retted," i. e., rotted, in the beds of rivers until the long hard fibers of the stems can be easily separated for spinning. This work is dirty and offensive. Even in Europe fewer and fewer people will do it. Our linen tariff is nothing else than a lending of the legislative power of Congress to the cotton manufacturing interests through the imposition of linen duties running from 35 to 55 per cent and they made them high so as to keep American women, except the rich, from using linen on their tables and elsewhere. It is not a tariff for revenue, but a tariff of oppression and restriction which keeps millions of women from the use of a serviceable fabric, in the use of which they delight.

Gloves

Real kid gloves are not made in the United States, in any quantity deserving of mention. American workers will not produce them. Not long ago a distinguished American firm brought from Europe kid glove makers at large expense, but after a brief experience these people would not work on kid gloves, because these gloves require so much special hand work, manipulation and care. These European expert workers found they could earn more at the easier task of making the Mocha and cape gloves, in which our factories specialize, and produce at substantially as low a cost as anywhere in the world.

Real kid gloves are colored with a brush on the outside only. The American mocha and cape gloves are dyed in a vat by about as simple a process as the washing of sheets and towels in a tub. The skins require no more manipulation in sewing than cotton cloth.

Attention, Women!

In order to force American women to use American made gloves of this sort, the glove lobby secured duties on imported kid gloves of from \$4.40 to \$22.50 per dozen pairs, or from 36½ cents to \$1.87 per pair. *These duties raise retail prices 44 cents per pair on the cheapest gloves and \$2 per pair on the most expensive.*

These duties, as noted in the law, are "not less than 50 nor more than 70 per centum." They offer the industry as much of \$18,000,000 as it can add to its prices, to cost consumers \$36,000,000 at retail. This huge addi-

tion to our glove bill, *to be paid mostly by women*, is made under the false pretense of "protecting" the payrolls of our glove factories, which payrolls totalled only \$8,150,784 in 1919.

Think of protecting \$8,000,000 by a tariff of \$18,000,000, costing consumers \$36,000,000!

Men Fare No Better

Men's gloves now costing \$4.50 to \$5.50 retailed before the war for \$2 per pair. With the same cost for skins and little less cost for manufacture, English men are buying the same gloves for from \$1.20 to \$1.60 per pair. American men have learned to go without gloves because of the price.

Paris Hats

Every woman loves a Paris hat. Paris hats are beautiful and "they are different." They don't cost much in Paris but a certain brand of American men, known as Republican Congressmen, say that only rich women shall wear Paris hats in this country.

As in the case of dresses, many Paris hats are unique in regard to the amount of hand work put upon them—a kind of work requiring exquisite training, care and patience, developed in French women until they have a speed and accuracy that accomplishes wonders in the shortest time, and makes their prices seem to Americans astonishingly low to American buyers.

A beautiful hat, made entirely of hand embroidery, costing \$2.50 in France, retails in the United States as high as \$35 with, however, a little work added for the lining and fitting in the American shop. Invoices substantiate this statement, and yet it is to be taken with some allowances, inasmuch as the employer who produces the hat at this price consigns it to a French firm at about \$8, not knowing whether this entirely original design will catch the public or not, and knowing that the art and the value of the design, as in a picture or art object, are more valuable than his cost of production in the shop.

If the design pleases, it is sold to an importer for about \$8. It pays 90 per cent duty on this so that an American woman is lucky if she gets it with the importer's and retailer's profit added for \$35, while the English woman would get it, with the same margins of profit to the English importer and retailer for \$18.50.

Buttons

There is no wickeder tariff than the 99 per cent on buttons. The buying of buttons would seem but a trifling thing in the usual family budget. But as a matter of fact, American women use annually \$50,000,000 worth of buttons at factory prices, according to the census of 1919. This equals probably \$150,000,000 at retail. If an importer could steal many ordinary kinds of buttons abroad he still could not bring them in and sell at a profit after paying the duty. The button tariff gives button makers \$30,000,000 costing consumers \$60,000,000 at retail.

Furs

A prohibitive tariff rests on furs. Not a single fur garment can be imported at a profit. The only ones imported are used as models and then sold at a loss. American women buy \$600,000,000 of furs annually (1919 census). The duty which averages 28 per cent on fur garments and 60 per cent on felt hats

invites domestic manufacturers to add \$30,000,000 to their prices on garments to cost at retail \$60,000,000; and to add \$34,000,000 on felt hats, costing \$78,000,000 at retail.

Floor Covering

Carpets and rugs are taxed 53 per cent, giving domestic makers the right to add \$44,000,000 to their prices, costing consumers upwards of \$80,000,000. Our carpet manufacturers are closely associated. They know what to do with any tariff price lifting opportunity. At the same time their costs are substantially as low as anywhere, and they have sold as low as their European competitors when times were dull and they couldn't over-charge.

The Sugar Gouge

Of whom were the Republicans thinking when they burdened the country with a sugar duty of \$216,000,000 a year?

Certainly not of the consumers, for to Republican protectionists *consumers are not worth thinking about.*

They claimed they were thinking of our poor abused sugar growers, and yet they gave our beet-sugar growers only \$19,000,000 out of this \$216,000,000 and the cane-sugar growers of Louisiana \$5,000,000—a total of \$24,000,000 to American sugar growers, at a cost to the public of \$216,000,000. An expensive process, this—spending \$216,000,000 in order to get \$24,000,000 to our sugar growers.

Or perhaps they were thinking of the little brown people in our Island Possessions—Hawaii, the Philippines and Porto Rico—to whom Congress requires American sugar users to send \$42,000,000 a year in cash.

This cash remittance of \$42,000,000 annually for the one item of sugar is taken mostly from the pockets of the poor. The poor pay three-fourths of the sugar duty because they are so much greater in numbers than the rich.

Even Republican high priests of protection in earlier days denounced the idea of any tariff on sugar, because it is a necessary food for all the people and like bread and meat, and salt and sugar should never be taxed.

The Truth Revealed

The fact is, that *the sugar duty was put upon the public by sugar factories that handle the home-grown product.*

It was championed in the Senate particularly by Senator Reed Smoot, of Utah, whose friends and relatives, it is claimed, have great interests in these Western factories.

There is no honest reason for levying special taxes for domestic sugar factories, and yet this tariff gives those factories, net, about \$24,000,000 annually. The wage cost in these factories is about one-fifth of one cent per pound, and the same as in the seaboard factories that refine alike imported raw sugars and, in Louisiana, domestic cane.

Why protect or favor the domestic factories as against the seaboard factories when the factory costs are the same?

Can you protect "one-fifth of a cent of labor per pound of sugar in an 8-cent selling price?"

The seaboard factories are making satisfactory profits, with a net margin of about one-quarter of a cent per pound. The Great Western Sugar Company that dominates the beet-sugar districts in our Mountain

"Suffer Little Children"—

The Beet Sugar Trust is a large employer of children and one of the chief opponents of Child Labor legislation. Senator Smoot (Republican), of Utah, who was the chief advocate and engineer of the tariff on sugar, made a speech in the Senate in 1923 ridiculing the individuals and organizations which had been investigating the condition of thousands of little children, who toil from eight to eleven hours a day in the beet fields and contract physical deformities and lose the chance for schooling while doing this labor.

The Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor and the National Child Labor Committee of New York revealed in recent reports the deprivations and positive hardships endured by these little ones of the beet fields. For their long hours of work and the physical and mental defects which result from their occupation they receive only a pittance. The Beet Sugar Trust, which profits by the sweat and sufferings of these children, is "protected" by a tariff amounting to two cents a pound on all its product, and takes many millions annually from the American people by this tax on 24,000,000 homes.

One dollar of every eight levied by the Federal Government is taken from the users of sugar. The total of this tax which a Republican Congress has imposed on consumers of this commonest of all household necessities was \$216,000,000. Only about \$124,000,000 of this goes into the Federal Treasury. The remainder is taken by the Sugar Trust.

"Unto the Least of These"

Twenty million American housewives are asked to pay \$5 a year in tariff and an additional \$5 in profiteers' tolls for the sugar their families use, in order—so they are told—to "protect" American labor.

In the states where the Beet Sugar Trust is in control of the industry, little white children are hired for \$15 a month to toil ten and twelve hours a day in the fields, while their bodies are being dwarfed and deformed and their minds and souls are stunted by their hardships and lack of schooling.

The tariff on sugar is therefore not merely a burden to consumers but also a bonus for the exploitation of little children. American women will therefore accomplish something more and better than cure an economic wrong when they take the tax off sugar. They will be helping to end the serfdom of little children in the beet fields.

By encouraging the labor of little children on the one hand and keeping down the price paid the grower on the other hand, the Beet Sugar Trust swells its profits enormously. In addition, it has the benefit of a tariff of 2 cents a pound. This tariff, obtained under the pretense that it is to "safeguard American Industry" goes almost wholly to the Trust.

States makes near 3 cents per pound. Its president is credibly said to be ashamed of his company's profits. He wanted a lower tariff in the belief that the present rate cannot last and that a lower rate would be better in the long run.

An important stockholder in one of these Western factories said in May, 1923, that *under free-trade the factories could pay the farmers for their sugar beets the price of that day and still make 25 per cent per annum on that part of its capital that was directly employed in sugar production.*

Huge Profits Made

A recent statement indicates that the Western Sugar Company made \$8,000,000 in the first five months of its present fiscal year, or at the rate of \$20,000,000 per annum. This Company is a consolidation of other factories in 1905. Out of profits in its first 17 years and 5 months ending December 31, 1923, it increased its original common stock of about \$11,000,000 (originally all water) to \$15,000,000—paid cash dividends on this common stock of over \$35,000,000, and made it worth on the market today more than \$45,000,000.

Perhaps now our readers may begin to guess for whom the \$216,000,000 sugar tax was levied?

Question!

Would these sugar companies make as big profits if a sort of Red Cross contribution box were placed on every sugar counter, and the American woman was left to buy her sugar at a reasonably competitive price and then to use her own judgment as to contributing the excess in the price by putting her extra pennies and dollars into that contribution box? Or is the sugar company safer, from the standpoint of its profits, in having the Congress of the United States add by law, as it does now, an extra charge to the price and say to my lady, "Pay or go without?"

The sugar duty is peculiar in that every other duty, so far as it is added to the price at all, is added directly by the producer who puts it in his own pocket with, of course, later additions for handling charges, etc., by middlemen.

The wool grower adds his duty to every pound of wool as it leaves the shearer's hands. So of steel, hosiery, textiles and everything else except sugar.

Do Sugar Growers Get it? Not Much!

The sugar duty, however, which was supposed by an innocent public, to be entirely for the benefit of sugar growers, *is paid entirely to the domestic sugar factories and not to sugar growers.* These factories take their \$48,000,000 worth of tariff benefits as if intended for and belonging to themselves. They then turn to the sugar-beet and cane growers and drive as hard bargains as they can. This results in their retaining one-half of the \$48,000,000 for themselves.

Until now, the contracts with the beet-sugar growers have been almost entirely on the basis of \$5 per ton for beets of certain standard specifications, as the "contract" or minimum price.

Farmers Aroused

This year the farmers have organized and forced the factories to a price of \$5.50 per ton with the further proviso, which also obtained in former contracts, that

when the price of refined sugar exceeds 5 cents per pound at the factory the farmers get one-half of the increase in the price.

Farmers everywhere contend, and facts and figures support the contention, that sugar raising at \$5.50 per ton for beets is unprofitable, and that other crops, including corn, potatoes, oats, alfalfa and the like, pay better on the average of the years. Indeed, many farmers in the best sugar growing states refuse to raise sugar-beets.

It is evident, therefore, that if beet sugar-growers get any of the tariff tax on this \$5.50 basis they put it in the ground with the seed and never get it out, for they are as hard up on this basis and as unable to pay their mortgages and other bills as the average wheat farmer was last autumn.

Uneven Division

Any tariff benefit to farmers begins with this minimum contract price of \$5.50 per ton, and as the farmer gets only one-half of the increase above 5 cents per pound for sugar, and the tariff is, in round figures, 2 cents per pound, it is evident that the farmer gets one-half only of the tariff, and that the sugar factories have driven a bargain with the farmers that *leaves one-half the tariff in the pockets of the sugar factories,* and accounts for their present profits, which one of their number, at least, declares to be shameful in amount.

As the tariff is only 2 cents, any tariff benefit to the farmers stops when the price of sugar reaches $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents, and the division of profits from a higher price than $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents is simply due to the ability of the factories to raise their prices to the public above this $7\frac{1}{2}$ cent limit.

It is on this basis that beet and sugar-cane growers get \$24,000,000 from the tariff and the sugar factories keep the other \$24,000,000 of the \$48,000,000.

In the Underwood-Simmons Law the Democratic party put a revenue tariff on sugar of 1 cent per pound, which saved the public at the rate of \$108,000,000 annually as compared with the present tariff. It was ample for the successful growing of sugar wherever American sugar lands are well fitted for that product. If honestly delivered to the growers and not withheld by domestic sugar factories, it would give them precisely the protection, or what the Democratic party called, the "incidental protection" that our sugar growers are now getting.

The tariff, and the opportunity it gave the gougers, has cost the American people \$300,000,000 in the last few months.

Glucose

Why did a Republican Congress enormously increase the Underwood-Simmons rates on glucose by a tariff higher and more wicked than the country had ever known before?

Glucose, a product of universal consumption in corn syrup, certain sugars, candy and other manufactures is made of corn, the cheapest material for the purpose in the world. There is only 6 cents of labor in a dollar's worth of glucose at the factory price. The Underwood law placed a duty of 15 cents of each dollar's worth imported. Under that law we exported \$15,139,944 of glucose in 1919, and \$10,067,830 in 1920, showing that we could sell it at a profit in competition with the world. We imported in 1919 only \$3,040 worth and in 1920, \$5 worth, upon which the Government collected 75 cents in revenue.

In the face of this and with the glucose, trust under indictment in the Federal Courts for price-fixing, the Republican Congress of 1922 raised the duty from 15 cents to 50 cents on the dollar. The recent declaration of a 52 per cent dividend on the common stock of the principal glucose manufacturer shows why Congress increased the duty and for whose benefit.

Salt

Without salt scarcely an article of food can be properly seasoned. Salt was on the free-list in the Underwood-Simmons tariff. Why?

There is a salt bed extending from north of Detroit nearly to the Hudson River. Another extends from Nebraska down through Kansas, and there are many others. Some of these beds are 600 miles long and 50 to 200 miles wide.

There has been one salt trust after another for a generation, with the Courts after them time and again. The total wage cost in mining and refining salt is about 19 cents on each dollar sold at the factories.

The present tariff gives the salt makers with their malodorous history upwards of 50 per cent to add to their prices. They have added the tariff whenever they could. We need not doubt but they do now. This is a present to salt makers of \$11,000,000, costing consumers \$22,000,000 at retail.

Other Steals

So of linseed oil whose trust affiliations have just been disclosed by a court decision. Oil cloth and linoleum carry a 35 per cent duty; starch 35 per cent; toys 70 per cent, a tax on childhood; carpets and rugs 53 per cent; earthen ware, crockery and china ware from 30 per cent to 70 per cent.

Aluminum

Every young American bride who "sets up" house-keeping this year will feel the heavy tariff burden imposed by Republican profiteers on all kitchen utensils and articles of household use.

These young housewives, if they want to have shining new aluminum pots and pans on their kitchen shelves, will have to hoard all their pennies to pay the extra toll levied on such articles by the Profiteers Tariff for the benefit of the powerful aluminum trust in which the Secretary of the Treasury is heavily interested.

The aluminum trust is powerful, so powerful that its European competitors say they must be very careful what prices they make in this country for fear of punishment here and abroad by the American trust.

The aluminum trust began in 1888 with a cash capital of \$100,000. It now has a capital of \$110,000,000. Its President recently said that its profits had been well above \$10,000,000 annually for many years, including the Underwood-Simmons period.

This trust has been twice attacked in the Federal Courts on charges of violating the Sherman Act prohibiting practices in restraint of trade.

Wasn't this profit enough? Why did the Republicans increase this profit at the expense of the American people? Women who like a tidy kitchen suffer especially from this tax.

Aluminum is made of dirt by the use of coal and water power.

Which did Congress have in mind in its 45 per cent duty—the dirt, which is almost as common as clay, or the coal, which is cheaper here than anywhere else and is freely exported, or water, which we commonly think needs no protection?

The Underwood-Simmons duty on aluminum was 20 cents on the dollar against a wage-cost of 17¾ cents.

Why did the Republicans raise the duty to 45 cents?

Sewing Machines

Sewing machines that have notoriously sold abroad under every protective tariff at far less than domestic prices were taken from the free list, where the Democrats placed them, and given duties of from 15 to 30 per cent.

There is no justice in this even under the avowed Republican principle that a protective duty should equal the difference in cost of production here and abroad. The Singer Sewing Machine Company, which is estimated to make 80 per cent of all the sewing machines in the world, supplies its trade in China and the Orient from its factory in Elizabeth, N. J., because it is cheaper to do so than from its factory in free-trade England—another instance of American wages being cheaper per unit of product than the lower paid wages of free-trade England, lower because less efficient than our well paid, well fed, well conditioned wage-earners.

The Singer Sewing Machine Company's capital stock in 1912 was \$60,000,000. From 1912 to 1919, inclusive, it paid dividends on this stock amounting to \$51,000,000 and in 1920 it declared a stock dividend of 50 per cent, or \$130. All this while sewing machines were on the free list.

Why 25 per cent, duty now, which lets the company add another \$10,000,000 annually to its prices? *Who pays?*

Household Helps Taxed]

This is the day of electrical appliances in the home. Through the use of electric washing machines, electric irons, electric ranges, etc., the grinding house work of the mothers of the nation can be vastly lightened.

But a Republican Congress has raised the tariff on electrical machinery from an average of 26½ per cent to 41 per cent, although none was imported at the lower rate. The result is that only the well-to-do woman is able to take advantage of these labor saving devices in the home.

Likewise the duty on Sanitary Ware, bath tubs, etc., has been doubled, although none has ever been imported. When these duties were granted the makers of this sanitary ware were under indictment by a Federal Court for criminal price-fixing and several of these manufacturers have since been sentenced to jail, with money fines. Congress didn't mind a little thing like that and invited them to add another \$2,000,000 to their prices, to cost American homes, at retail, \$4,000,000.

Window Glass

Similarly, the makers of window glass were under indictment for criminally and arbitrarily raising their prices by conspiracy. The Grand Jury declared that they permitted no factory to run more than three or four months in the year. Also, that their costs were figured on the basis of glass blown by mouth, when

most of it is blown by mouth blowers. Alexander Hamilton, the father of Protection, gave the mouth blowers 10 per cent protection. The present Republican Congress gave the machine and its alleged criminal owners 60 per cent protection.

Think of this when you buy your next piece of window glass!

Cutlery

The United States makes ordinary table cutlery for kitchen use so cheaply that in the three years, from 1919 to 1921, it exported about half of all it produced, meeting the competition of the world.

When the present tariff was passed, the ordinary bread knife with fluted edge and 10-inch blade was sold by American factories for 6½ cents. There was about 3 cents of labor on it. Why did Congress make the tariff 10 cents, or 1½ times the factory selling price, including profit? The common table knife with wood handle, then selling for 4½ cents was given a duty of 10 cents. Likewise, good cheap nickel cast plated iron scissors, 8 inches long, selling for 11½ cents, were given a tariff of 20 cents. Seven inch forged steel, nickel plated scissors, selling for 21 cents were given a tariff of 29 cents. All this under pressure of cutlery manufacturers largely from Connecticut, who were accustomed to use the tariff and fix their prices at will against the public, while exporting as indicated at world prices.

Germany excels all other countries in the finest quality of pocket knives and certain other cutlery. This fact was used to bolster the demands of the tariff profiteers in lines we excel in.

The duty on table cutlery in the Underwood-Simmons Law was 30 per cent. In the present law it averages 235 per cent, or nearly eight times more! The duty on scissors was raised from 30 per cent to 150 per cent.

The makers of these and other light steel products, hardware, typewriters, gas engines, washing machines, enamel ware and the like are invited by the present tariff law to add \$1,580,000,000 to their prices above the prices of foreign producers, whose costs of production are a little lower, and above competing export prices.

General Store Merchandise

In 1922 when the present tariff was under consideration in Congress, the Fair Tariff League—a protectionist organization, consisting of representatives of some 2,000,000 farmers, 800,000 wage-earners, representative women, business men and manufacturers—made a study of the tariff in relation to the goods commonly carried in the great department and other stores of the country: Cotton, silk, and woolen goods of all sorts, clothing, carpets, hosiery and knit goods, furs, earthen, stone and china ware, glassware, sugar, paints, starch, toys, hardware, clocks, etc. It was assisted in its computation by experienced experts in the government employ and elsewhere.

Its analysis covered merchandise of a total factory value of \$15,000,000,000, retailing for approximately \$30,000,000,000.

This investigation showed that only \$2.70 of American store merchandise was imported out of each \$100 consumed in this country. Also, that imports were mostly different in design or quality, and therefore really not competitive.

This shows that so far as American manufacturers use their tariff allowances on these articles, they collect for themselves on \$97.30 of domestic products consumed, while the Government collects on only \$2.70 of imports.

Summing Up

All this is just the merest part of the enormous penalty American women are paying each year for the Republican practise of permitting interested manufacturers and producers to write their own high tariff rates.

There is only one cure for a too-high tariff—

That is a return of the Democratic Party to power, so that a Democratic Congress may wipe from the statute books of the country the iniquitous Fordney-McCumber Tariff Law and enact in its stead one that is fair and equitable in its rates.

Certainly no slightest relief can be expected from the Republican Party. It always has been the party of high tariff. It makes no amend—it offers no promises for better behavior in the future.

It has been shown in these pages that women pay an especially heavy toll to the tariff barons. As buyers of a large percentage of all manufactured goods for their own use, for the use of their families, and for use in their homes, they have felt this burden keenly.

But they now have the remedy in their own hands. With the ballot as their weapon they can battle, and battle successfully, against the High Cost of Living as imposed by the exorbitant rates of the Republican profiteers tariff. A reduction of 50 per cent in the present tariff taxes would mean a saving to every American family of considerably more than the average income tax now being paid, and would not materially affect the revenues of the Government. The Democrats have demanded that such a reduction be made. *The Republicans have refused to make it.*

How many women will consent to again vote into power a party which has put into effect the most unscientific, the most selfish, and the most shortsighted piece of tariff legislation ever enacted into law; which, instead of reducing the cost of living, as the Republican platform of 1920 emphatically promised to do, has resulted in increasing the price of every article the American people wear or use, thereby swelling the general cost of living not less than 4 billions of dollars annually; which has come near putting the farmers out of business by taking from them \$300,000,000 more than it has returned to them in benefits; and which has added to the wage workers' cost of living without giving them anything like a fair equivalent in higher wages?

In an article appearing in the January Forum, outlining some of the many evils of the Republican Protective Tariff, Cordell Hull, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, writes:

"The most striking truth which recent tariff history reveals is the great contrast between the *professions* and *practices* of Republicans in dealing with the tariff. They have invented many different formulas and catch-phrases to define the Republican tariff theory, such as protection of "our manufacturers," "our home industries," "our home markets," "American labor," a tariff that will equal "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad plus a reasonable profit," and, finally, that will equal "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad." Dominant Republicans, at the same time, have pursued a uniform but vastly different practice in applying their tariffs. Disregarding all their professed tariff theories and formulas, when in control of the Government, they permit all interested manufacturers or producers—who as a rule, have first made large campaign contributions—to send their lobbyists to Washington and with graft aforethought write their own high, arbitrary, prohibitive rates in utter defiance of every sound rule of even pro-

tective tariff taxation. Republican tariffs are thus framed and the lobbyists, departing, sing with glee—

"I care not for the stars that shine,
I only know that I've got mine."

Time overtakes even an economic falsehood. For two generations the American people have been taught that Republican high tariffs were an infallible assurance of prosperity. The truth is that every panic, beginning with that of 1873, has occurred either under Republican administrations or Republican legislation. The American farmers recently learned by the clearest demonstration that under Republican high tariffs, prices of most of their products went lower, their foreign markets went to pieces, while the prices of all they must buy went skyward. Farmers now realize that they were not saved from ruin by the Morrill high tariff during the panic of 1873, nor by the McKinley high tariff during the panic of 1890-1893, nor by the Dingley high tariff during the panic of 1907, nor by the farmers' high tariff during the panic of 1921-1922.

The American people have recently experienced much tariff disillusionment. They now know that every industry producing a substantial surplus must depend upon stable foreign markets and that the latter are the chief factors in fixing domestic prices in America. This desired end requires moderate tariffs, efficient production costs, and economic cooperation in order to maintain sound reciprocal trade and market conditions. In the face of Republican pretense that high tariffs increase wages, labor has discovered that brick masons, carpenters, artisans, and most other labor in the unprotected industries receive higher wages than most of that in the protected industries. In the most highly protected industries—the textiles—labor for forty years has received the lowest wages.

All financial, commercial, and trade developments but serve to expose the utter unsoundness of Republican post-war economic policies, both domestic and international, while they strongly confirm the wisdom and timeliness of the great Democratic reconstruction program which embraced moderate revenue tariffs, the general removal of economic barriers, international finance, credit, and trade cooperation, the maintenance of a healthy growing foreign trade, and stable domestic prosperity.

The Women, the Farmers and the Wage-Earners can look for no relief under a Republican administration.

Your vote counts—cast it next November for the Democratic candidate for President and you cast it for a lower cost of living!

The United States Tariff Commission

To fortify the country against new and disturbing conditions such as might reasonably be expected to follow the ending of the world war, the Wilson Administration in 1916 established a permanent, non-partisan Tariff Commission in order that future tariff revision might be made in the light of accurate information, scientifically and impartially obtained. This Commission was charged with the duty of studying the economic and tariff conditions of a changed and still changing world, and was empowered to investigate every phase of the tariff question. It was to be made up of six commissioners, appointed by the President, and with each of the two major political parties having equal representation on it.

Ever since President Harding, in 1922, turned over to the Tariff Commission authority to act for him in the execution of the so-called "flexible" section of the Fordney-McCumber law, the Commission has been a house divided against itself. The initial controversy raged around the question of whether or not the Commission had the right to make a general investigation of all schedules of the existing tariff law, upon its own initiative, or was supposed only to investigate the duties on commodities that had been protested by importers making formal appeal for revision.

Reactionary Republicans have brought all their influence to bear in favor of letting the Fordney-McCumber Act entirely alone and of confining the Tariff Commission to investigation only of specific complaints. President Harding showed sympathy with this viewpoint when he issued orders in March, 1923, that the Commission proceed with the investigation of 17 commodities upon which complainants wanted the duties increased or lowered. This was considered at the time a victory for the "protectionist" element in the Commission.

It seems also to be taken for granted that President Coolidge, as a high protectionist of the rock-ribbed New England variety, likewise inclines to this view of the situation.

Democratic leaders, of course, have been eager to reopen various schedules for examination, but high tariff advocates, who dreaded the flexible provision from the beginning, have been horrified at even the prospect of touching any of the schedules.

Torn with internal strife, the Federal Tariff Commission has likewise been the target of much adverse criticism from the country at large, chiefly because of the make-up of the present personnel, several members of which are charged with having money invested in enterprises dealing in the very commodities on which tariff rates are being considered by the Commission. The propriety of any member of the Tariff Commission passing on rates on a commodity in which he himself or members of his family are financially interested has been challenged, not only by the public, but by the Commission itself—three Commissioners having protested the right of Mr. Glassie to participate in the hearings on the sugar schedule when that subject came before the board for consideration last January—the reason given being that his wife owned stock in a Louisiana sugar company.

Mr. Glassie, claims that this fact was well known at the time President Harding appointed him to the Commission, and has stoutly maintained his ability to "honestly, fairly and impartially discharge the duties of his office" and his intention so to do. He has been supported in this contention by Chairman Marvin and

by Mr. Burgess, of Pennsylvania, both of whom, however, are themselves the subjects of criticism because they are said to have business interests which disqualify them from considering tariff rates on certain commodities. Commissioners Culberston, Costigan and Lewis deny the right of Mr. Glassie to participate in the sugar case—and have been upheld in their contention by a large section of the press. On January 23, 1924, Senator Robinson, of Arkansas, Democratic leader, sponsored a resolution which would, if enacted, instruct the Commission to adopt rules barring any member from considering a tariff subject in which his family was financially interested. Senator Robinson claimed that under the legal maxim that "a man cannot be a judge in his own case" such a situation constitutes a "disqualifying interest."

The Fair Tariff League has launched an intensive campaign for the retirement of Mr. Glassie and the two other members of the Commission who, it is claimed, "came hot-foot to the Commission from the long-time paid service of special interests exceedingly concerned in and profiting by excess tariff rates."

President Coolidge, who has been appealed to by the whole Commission to settle the issue, has so far refused to do so. The controversy still rages.

Disconcert. The tariff would cost as here estimated if it were added, but often competition prevents the addition

What the Profiteers' Tariff Bill Gives Its Beneficiaries, and What it Will Cost the American Consumer

Articles Taxed	Amount of Protection	Annual Cost to Consumer
Sugar.....	\$105,000,000	\$210,000,000
Meats and Fish.....	200,000,000	400,000,000
Woolen Goods.....	300,000,000	550,000,000
Hosiery and Knit Goods.....	289,000,000	578,000,000
Corsets.....	29,000,000	58,000,000
Cotton Manufactures.....	580,000,000	850,000,000
Silks.....	274,000,000	548,000,000
Aluminum ware.....	23,000,000	46,000,000
Copper and Brass ware.....	352,000,000	700,000,000
Hardware (all kinds).....	44,000,000	88,000,000
Stamped and Enameled ware.....	47,000,000	94,000,000
Window Glass.....	35,000,000	70,000,000
Cutlery and Edge Tools.....	43,000,000	86,000,000
Sewing Machines and Parts.....	10,000,000	30,000,000
Children's Toys and Games.....	12,000,000	24,000,000
	2,343,000,000	4,332,000,000