

NEW DUTY ON TOBACCO

IT ROBS THE WORKMAN, FARMER AND CONSUMER.

The \$2 Duty, though but Two Years Old, Has Decreased Wages, Closed Factories and Increased Prices or Deteriorated the Goods.

The McKinley Tariff Tree.

If the 53d Congress does not reduce or remove the \$2 per pound duty which McKinley placed on Sumatra tobacco, it will not be because it has not done great injury to legitimate business and has not worked havoc to all except a few monopolists. A McKinley tree, though only two years old, is easily known by its fruit—increased wages, closed factories, increased power to monopolists, benefits to speculators, increased prices or deteriorated goods, deception and perjury. The \$2 duty has already borne all these varieties of fruit.

"There are more cigarmakers tramping the streets to-day," said a manufacturer of Havana cigars in New York the other day, "than I have ever known before." When asked the cause he explained it by stating his own case.

"We have not," said he, "done as most manufacturers did—increase the price of our goods because wrappers cost more. Here is one of our 'Conchas Especial' cigars, which we have sold for \$51 per thousand for five years. We tried to get square with McKinley in the first place by reducing wages. We now pay but \$9 for making that \$51 cigar, instead of \$10 as formerly. Many other houses stopped paying union wages for the same reason. They were compelled to do it in the next place we required our workmen to cut closer. They used to use two and three-quarters pounds to wrap 1,000 cigars, now two and one-quarter is a liberal allowance. This, of course, makes it harder for men to earn high wages. Then we pay less for seed leaf tobacco than ever before. The tobacco growers thought they were getting protection. The fact is that the extraordinarily high duty compels us to pay more for wrappers—which our farmers can't raise—and forces us to pay less for fillers—which they can raise."

In spite of all these facts, we have been unable to keep our workmen busy, and have had to let some go. If it were not for the McKinley duty, we could now be employing twice as many men and paying them union wages, too."

This same man who, by the way, did not wish his name mentioned in print, in connection with reduced wages, said that the \$2 duty had not hurt him as much as it did small manufacturers, nor benefited him like it had benefited larger ones who had sufficient capital, in 1890, with which to purchase a two years' supply of Sumatra tobacco, before the McKinley tax doubled the price. Many small manufacturers have gone to the wall because of this duty, and many workmen are prevented from going into business because it requires so much more capital than formerly, to purchase wrapper tobacco. "The duty," he said, "protects only the monopolists and speculators at the expense of small manufacturers, workmen, farmers and consumers." He mentioned three New York speculators who had made at least \$1,000,000 by buying Sumatra tobacco before the duty took effect, and selling it a year or two later.

That this high duty has, as usual, led to undervaluation and perjury and favored the dishonest importer, is evident from the statement of this manufacturer, accompanied by a wink, that a neighbor manufacturer had actually imported 600 bales of Havana fillers; and that although these bales contained in their centers, enough wrapping tobacco to wrap the fillers outside, yet wrapper duty was paid only on one bale. This, said my informant, has become the usual method of procedure.

Politicians Take Warning. One of the pleasant reflections of this Christmas is the fact that we are on the verge of better times. Everything indicates that the coming year will bring prosperity to all parts of the country. The Manufacturers' Record, of Baltimore, has been making inquiries in all sections, and it reports the outlook as very encouraging, especially in the South.

All business interests in the South, the Record finds, have suffered in common with those of other sections from the financial disturbances of 1891. Cotton growers, and along with them a large proportion of the mercantile and banking interests, suffered from the low price of cotton. To the financial difficulties created by the Baring failure was added the economic drag of the McKinley tariff, increasing the price of articles used by Southern agriculturists.

The November election has had very material results from a business point of view. There is a vivifying hope of lower prices and cheapened production when the protective tariff is reduced. The fear of imminent Congressional legislation has vanished. "Confidence," says the Record, "has been established, and the South will become within the next year the scene of unprecedented industrial and commercial activity, not a boom, but natural, unrestrained growth and progress." The gratifying statement is made by a well-informed business man in Alabama that the farmers of his region are out of debt and—a rare thing—"have no place to run them through another crop." It is the general testimony that the elections have made the people "feel good." They are "cheerful and confident," which means renewed effort, increased enterprise, business activity and progress.—Atlanta Journal.

which the people said "mean" in a voice so loud that it nearly scared Republicans out of their boots.

"Well, what are you going to do about it?" says the protected manufacturer. "Surely you aren't going to stop all the fraud and robbery at once! You will ruin us and the country will go to the dogs if you do."

"Lord, save us from our friends," says the half-heeled, weak-kneed Democratic Representative, as he begins to think about voting to put the duty back on sugar and to leave a little, just a little, "incidental protection" on manufactured goods.

"If protection is robbery, as the people have declared, then incidental protection is incidental robbery," says the stout-backed Democratic Representative, as he prepares to vote to abolish the whole rotten system of favoritism and corruption and to lift the heavy load of taxation from the backs of the workingmen.

The Steel Rail Trust.

The policy of the powerful combination of the manufacturers of steel rails has at last caused a considerable quantity of rails to be imported, in spite of the heavy tariff duty. The Iron Age of the 22d ult. reports the sale of 10,000 tons of foreign rails to be delivered at Seattle for use on the Pacific coast. The price of such rails at Liverpool, free-on-board, is now \$19.44 per ton. The duty is \$13.44, and the ocean freight charges must make the total cost at Seattle about \$40.

The conditions which permit these rails to be imported profitably are exceptional. There are no rail factories west of the Rocky Mountains, and there is only one small one west of Chicago. Consequently, the cost of domestic rails to consumers on the Pacific Slope is largely increased by the overland freight charges. It would not pay to import rails for use on this side of the Rocky Mountains, for foreign rails cannot be laid down at this port, duty paid, for less than \$38 per ton; but the high cost of transportation, added to the high price exacted by the combination, makes it possible now for railroad companies whose lines are near the Pacific coast to save something by bringing rails from Europe by water.

If prices were determined here by competition, even the high cost of overland transportation would not prevent the purchase of domestic rails for use on the Pacific coast. But for more than two years the domestic manufacturers, under the shelter of a duty which is 69 per cent. of the selling price of foreign rails in Liverpool, have suppressed competition and have exacted a uniform price of \$30 per ton at the Eastern mills and \$32.50 at the Illinois mills. In the meantime the cost of their raw material has been reduced by \$2 to \$4 per ton, but the effect of the combination agreement has been to deprive consumers of any benefit on this account.

This is one of the most familiar examples of the manner in which a trust or a similar combination uses a high-tariff duty as an "instrument of extortion," in the words applied to this process by the New York Tribune in an unguarded utterance. The duty is three and one-half times the difference between the labor cost here and the labor cost abroad, as shown clearly by Mr. Harrison's Commission of Labor, and the manufacturers seized upon it as an instrument that would enable them to exact huge profits from the people, for it is upon the people that the cost of railroad equipment truly falls.

The price was so fixed by the combination that imports for any part of the country except the Pacific coast would be unprofitable, and not until now has it been profitable to import for roads there, for the quantity of rails imported is shown by the Treasury reports to have been only 433 tons in the last two years for the whole country. A reduction of the combination price is now predicted.

The South Looking Up.

One of the pleasant reflections of this Christmas is the fact that we are on the verge of better times. Everything indicates that the coming year will bring prosperity to all parts of the country. The Manufacturers' Record, of Baltimore, has been making inquiries in all sections, and it reports the outlook as very encouraging, especially in the South.

All business interests in the South, the Record finds, have suffered in common with those of other sections from the financial disturbances of 1891. Cotton growers, and along with them a large proportion of the mercantile and banking interests, suffered from the low price of cotton. To the financial difficulties created by the Baring failure was added the economic drag of the McKinley tariff, increasing the price of articles used by Southern agriculturists.

The November election has had very material results from a business point of view. There is a vivifying hope of lower prices and cheapened production when the protective tariff is reduced. The fear of imminent Congressional legislation has vanished. "Confidence," says the Record, "has been established, and the South will become within the next year the scene of unprecedented industrial and commercial activity, not a boom, but natural, unrestrained growth and progress."

The Iron Age comments as follows upon a significant change of prices:

"While the deal between the National Lead Company and the linseed oil producers has been shrouded in mystery, as usual of late where concentration of interests is involved, a most suggestive move has been made in the shape of an advance of 2 cents per gallon in the price of oil. Not a particle of evidence comes from any quarter that would point to a change in the relation of supply to demand as dictating this advance, nor is the duty of 1 cent produced no revenue to the United States, but is worth about \$20,000,000 a year to the trust.

will resolutely stay away and leave the whole thing to their workmen. Then we shall perhaps see the unwanted spectacle of a lot of mill operatives going to Washington to beg Congress not to do the things that they voted in favor of when they went to the polls in November. For did not President Harrison say in a recent letter that the election was lost because the operative would not walk under the same umbrella with his employer?"—New York Evening Post.

Tariff on Raw Material.

The claim that the tariff encourages industry is nowhere more conclusively exploded than in the numerous and flagrant instances in which we impose tariffs upon our own manufactures. The tariff on raw materials—coal, iron, copper, tin, lead, lumber, wool—is not merely (1) a tax on the laboring man, making his fuel and clothing as well as his tools and every article of furniture, cost him more than it otherwise would, but (2) directly reduces the profitable opportunity and demand for labor, and therefore helps to paralyze industry.

As to (1) it is so well understood that it needs but a word. The tariff enables the owners of raw materials to charge more than they otherwise could. If it did not, there would be no use for a tariff. The manufacturer having to pay more for his materials, his manufactured goods cost him more than they otherwise would, and he has to sell them for more to make a profit. Every suit of clothes costs the buyer more, because of the duty on wool. Every tin pan costs the economical housekeeper more, every tin roof increases the rent of the victims that are under it, every can of tomatoes or oysters costs more because of the tax on tin plates. Every yard of calico costs the woman that wears it more because of the tax on dye-stuffs; every pound of paint costs more because of the tax on lead; every house costs more because of the tax that is levied on the materials of which it is composed. The result of this is, that the wages of the workmen are diminished—that is, he gets less goods for a day's work.

But the second effect of the tariff on raw materials is a still more serious one. Even if our people alone were to be considered, it is plain that the higher the price of any article the fewer will be sold—fewer people can afford to buy it. And since the demand for labor depends upon how many goods are to be made (and not on how much profit the manufacturer makes on each piece), it is easy to see that taxed raw materials reduce the demand for labor and the number of men employed. But this is not the worst. The high price of raw materials caused by the tariff (25 per cent. on coal, 40 per cent. on iron-ore, 75 per cent. on tin plates, 40 per cent. on copper, 20 per cent. on lumber, 50 to 100 per cent. on wool) makes them cost more to our manufacturers, who, therefore, cannot make goods as cheaply as they otherwise could; and hence, cannot afford to sell them as cheaply as do the English and Germans, who get their raw materials free. It therefore is the English and Germans, and not ourselves, who supply the rest of the world at large with manufactured goods.—John DeWitt Warner.

Some Sugar Statistics.

Willet & Gray's Statistical Sugar Trade Journal of Dec. 29 contains weekly quotations of raw and refined sugar since 1882. Those who still think that the tariff is not a tax should glance over these tables. The price of granulated sugar varies from 6 to 9 cents per pound, for eight years, and then it suddenly drops from \$1.13, on March 24, 1891, to 4.50 cents on March 31. A foot note says: "About 2 cents per pound duty taken off April 1, 1891." Since then the price has varied from 4 to 4.92 cents. The price of raw sugar (96 degrees centrifugal) dropped in the same dates from 5.68 to 3.35 cents per pound. If the trust had not been in control at the time, the price of refined sugar would have dropped about exactly 2 cents. But McKinley graciously left a duty of 1 cent per pound on refined sugar to enable the trust to retain control of the market.

The tables also show the benefits of the "economics of production" from trust. Before the trust was formed, in November, 1887, the difference in the prices of raw and refined sugars had for two years averaged less than 7-10 cents per pound. In 1888 and 1889 it averaged 14 cents. It then decreased, while the trust was waging war upon outside refiners until, on Jan. 14, 1892, it was only 9-20 of a cent. The trust having completed arrangements to purchase all of the competing refineries, the difference began to increase in February, 1892. On March 25 it crossed 1 cent; on May 19, it was 1-16 cents; on September 8, 1-13 cents; on December 29, it was again 1-1-6 cents. It costs about 1 cent to refine sugar. Every difference, then, of 1-16 cent above this means about \$2,500,000 clear profit to the sugar trust. The duty of 1 cent produces no revenue to the United States, but is worth about \$20,000,000 a year to the trust.

Price of Lead Advanced.

The Iron Age comments as follows upon a significant change of prices:

"While the deal between the National Lead Company and the linseed oil producers has been shrouded in mystery, as usual of late where concentration of interests is involved, a most suggestive move has been made in the shape of an advance of 2 cents per gallon in the price of oil. Not a particle of evidence comes from any quarter that would point to a change in the relation of supply to demand as dictating this advance, nor is the duty of 1 cent produced no revenue to the United States, but is worth about \$20,000,000 a year to the trust.

The Iron Age comments as follows upon a significant change of prices:

"While the deal between the National Lead Company and the linseed oil producers has been shrouded in mystery, as usual of late where concentration of interests is involved, a most suggestive move has been made in the shape of an advance of 2 cents per gallon in the price of oil. Not a particle of evidence comes from any quarter that would point to a change in the relation of supply to demand as dictating this advance, nor is the duty of 1 cent produced no revenue to the United States, but is worth about \$20,000,000 a year to the trust.

The Iron Age comments as follows upon a significant change of prices:

"While the deal between the National Lead Company and the linseed oil producers has been shrouded in mystery, as usual of late where concentration of interests is involved, a most suggestive move has been made in the shape of an advance of 2 cents per gallon in the price of oil. Not a particle of evidence comes from any quarter that would point to a change in the relation of supply to demand as dictating this advance, nor is the duty of 1 cent produced no revenue to the United States, but is worth about \$20,000,000 a year to the trust.

Whisky Tax.

The proposal to increase the whisky tax is the one, however, which seems to meet with greatest favor. It would please the temperance people and it would not hurt the liquor manufacturers in the least. On the contrary, it would enrich them.

BANGS ARE BECOMING.

BUT THE HORRID FRIZZLE IS "ON THE LIST."

The Present Bangs Are Each and All Examples of the Survival of the Fittest—Don't Let Talk About New Hair Adjustments Bother You.

Captivating Coiffures.

New York correspondence:

AFTER all the talk about fillets, coronets and Greek "parts," and so on is over it will still remain a fact that the girl to whom the bang is distincitively becoming is always to be seen as she always has been, a very pretty kind of girl. Incidentally she is apt to look badly in a Greek part. She is bright enough to know it, and smart enough—the bang-style of girl is always smart—to pointedly stick to her bang, and let those who can do it, or who have not the sense to see that they can't, wear their Grecian effects. She stays pretty in her own particular way, retaining her own dear bang. So, here abouts bangs.

The horrid frizzle is, let us hope, gone forever. You may have as much or as little hair in the bang as you please, and as you can, but there must be only that. That was an ugly style, too. Who has been most congratulating ourselves that the present bangs are each and all examples of the survival of the fittest.

If your hair is very thick at the forehead, you may make just a little fringe. Curve it down in the center, for now no bang is ever cut concave. Let it be a genuine fringe that shows the clear color of the skin where it lies over the forehead. This fringe is not curled at all, though, of course, it is not exactly straight. It has a turn in it. If it has naturally, you need not bother about what sort it is, but if you have to "do" it, don't risk more than one-half turn of the iron. The hair at the sides and top of the head back of the bang may be waved, and the two ends, for once, is more dressy and becomes. If you have just a bit part of a previous bang in favor of the present fringe, you will find the hair very rebellious unless it is waved. Then, too, may be your hair is not very thick at the forehead, in which case the waving makes it seem so.

This fringe is as becoming to-day to young girls, or to older faces that have

in boxes, for the McAllisterian "exclusives" make it a point to sit and beam on the assemblage at the Charity ball, without mixing much with the affair.

Tickets are sold, you know, to whomsoever will pay ten dollars apiece for the ball, and that makes the occasion a little more elaborate. Our girls are dressed in the corsages a clear notion of the new styles in low-necked gowns, as seen at this notable yearly exhibition. The subjects of portraiture sat regally

enough—the bangs are each and all

examples of the survival of the fittest.

Don't let talk about new hair adjustments bother you.

—New York Evening Post.

most of you, do not do it. Fashions are not made to adapt yourself to, they are made to be adapted to you. They are not made to rule, but to serve, and if it suits your beauty, beauty may consider them. If not, make up a fashion for yourself, or take one from some other period, or stick to the old one, like the bang, and continue looking well in your own way.

The women with long, heavy hair had better cut the lengths off. Shoulder length is the most convenient. It knots and is easy to keep curled and arranged. Then, too, you are much more apt to have nice hair when you get up, and need a few charms to help you to live. Above all, you will be more in the present mode. Very heavy and long hair is more of a nuisance than anything else. There is no way of doing it up, and you can't always be pretending Ophelia or Judith and let it hang.

What has been written concerning the coiffures of the fashionable women is illustrated in the accompanying pictures. It may be added that these sketches were made at the great annual Charity ball in this city, and that they are portraits of five belles of the Four Hundred, drawn from life, in the Madison Square Garden, exactly as the original girls appeared as they posed unconsciously for the pencil of the artist. Not only are the faces of these girls of swell gait and with aristocratic bearing, but the transient expression of the moment, but feminine readers will find in the corsages a clear notion of the new styles in low-necked gowns, as seen at this notable yearly exhibition. The subjects of portraiture sat regally

enough—the bangs are each and all

examples of the survival of the fittest.

Don't let talk about new hair adjustments bother you.

—New York Evening Post.

most of you, do not do it. Fashions are not made to adapt yourself to, they are made to be adapted to you. They are not made to rule, but to serve, and if it suits your beauty, beauty may consider them. If not, make up a fashion for yourself, or take one from some other period, or stick to the old one, like the bang, and continue looking well in your own way.

The women with long, heavy hair had better cut the lengths off. Shoulder length is the most convenient. It knots and is easy to keep curled and arranged. Then, too, you are much more apt to have nice hair when you get up, and need a few charms to help you to live. Above all, you will be more in the present mode. Very heavy and long hair is more of a nuisance than anything else. There is no way of doing it up, and you can't always be pretending Ophelia or Judith and let it hang.

What has been written concerning the coiffures of the fashionable women is illustrated in the accompanying pictures. It may be added that these sketches were made at the great annual Charity ball in this city, and that they are portraits of five belles of the Four Hundred, drawn from life, in the Madison Square Garden, exactly as the original girls appeared as they posed unconsciously for the pencil of the artist. Not only are the faces of these girls of swell gait and with aristocratic bearing, but the transient expression of the moment, but feminine readers will find in the corsages a clear notion of the new styles in low-necked gowns, as seen at this notable yearly exhibition. The subjects of portraiture sat regally

enough—the bangs are each and all

examples of the survival of the fittest.

Don't let talk about new hair adjustments bother you.

—New York Evening Post.