

## "Schedule K's" Little Brother

(From the Literary Digest.)

"That name defeated Taft," and that was reason enough, one Democratic editor feels assured, for the Republicans to call the wool schedule in the new tariff bill "Schedule 11" instead of "Schedule K." But though the wool schedule was thus carefully disguised, everybody seemed to recognize it when it came up for consideration in the Senate. There was an explosion on the floor, there were explosive editorials in dozens of newspapers, senators attacked each other's motives and past records, and public attention was again forcibly directed to the tariff debates which were being well-nigh forgotten in a summer of strikes and exciting primary campaigns. "A change of title can not change the smell, and the stench of old Schedule K has not been made any sweeter by calling it Schedule 11," the New York World (Dem.) somewhat acridly comments. No less irreverently the Newark News (Ind.) observes that "little more luck is expected now to attach to that craphooter's numeral than in 1910 to the eleventh letter of the alphabet." Somehow or other, says the New York Times (Dem.), the wool schedule always seems to be "the fatal part of the heaven-abrading tariff." It is true that the McCumber measure has now "passed through its hardest battle, and the wool schedule as originally reported has been accepted by the Senate." Yet, continues the Mobile Register (Dem.), "the victory has been a costly one for the Republicans." For these reasons:

"It has caused the defection from the tariff ranks of some leading Republican partisans. It has opened the eyes of the voters to the actual effect of the tariff upon their own living expenses. It has brought popular distrust and disapproval of Republican congressional candidates on the very eve of the primaries. It has caused already the defeat of several tariff supporters. What further warning do the Republicans need that theirs is an unpopular measure, not because of prejudice, but because of its lack of merit?"

Reduced to its simplest terms, explains the Detroit Free Press (Ind.), "the tariff is 33 cents a pound upon scoured wool, and equivalent duty on wool which is not clean, and compensating duties of the required amount upon manufacturers of wool." As this paper continues:

"The duty is high, and since there is no hope and no pretense that the United States will raise enough wool for its own use, and finally bring prices down by competition, it is certain that the tariff will increase the price of wool clothing. No dispute arises over that point. The theory of the majority in passing the schedule is that those regions which do not benefit directly by the wool tariff will be benefited in the other schedules, and that the people supporting the tariff theory will support the tariff as a whole even when it operates against the most of them in some particulars."

If the 16-cent duty in the Payne-Aldrich wool schedule split the Republican party wide open in 1910-12, what, asks the Nashville Banner (Dem.), "must be the effect of the 33-cent rate of the Fordney-McCumber measure?" It is difficult for anybody but an expert to make any exact comparison of the two sets of duties, but, the New York Journal of Commerce (Ind.) thinks, "it may safely be assumed that the duties thus laid upon wool and its manufacturers are certainly no less than those of Schedule K." That is

"Manufacturers may not be so highly 'protected,' but wool-growers are far more favored. The burden upon the consumer is no whit less and is probably much greater than that which, in the years following the 1909 tariff, exacted such a heavy toll upon the fortunes of the Republican party."

But no independent or Democratic journal has attacked the new wool schedules more vehemently than the New York Herald (Ind.-Rep.). In fact, its vehemence has called down upon its owner's head wrathful denunciation from Republican senators. The shocking thing about the wool duties, according to the Herald, "is not merely that they are extravagantly, inordinately, incomparably excessive," but that they "were made and are being driven through the Senate under whip and spur by United States senators who are financially interested, directly and heavily, in the growing of sheep and the production of wool." The Republican New York

IT'S PRETTY HARD TO GET A GOOD WATCH-DOG THAT WON'T CHASE THE CAT



—Orr in the Chicago Tribune.

Tribune admits that "the wool senators have been rather indecently conspicuous in behalf of Schedule K."

If such criticism comes from papers inclined to be friendly to Republican policies, it is not surprising to find the "wool senators" denounced for "pocketbook legislation" by such newspapers as the New York World (Dem.), Rochester Herald (Ind.), Newark News (Ind.), Philadelphia Record (Dem.), Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch (Dem.), Louisville Courier-Journal (Dem.), St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Ind.), while the New York Evening Post (Ind.) has this to say of the "schedule of iniquities:"

"Every American must buy wool. The nation can not avoid purchasing 10,000,000 pounds of it abroad each year. Schedule 11 is an effort to tax every one who walks on a carpet, sleeps under a blanket, or dons a coat an outrageously excessive sum for the benefit of an industry which can not and ought not to be greatly expanded."

In an article in the New York Times, Senator David I. Walsh (Dem. Mass.) uses Tariff Commission figures to arrive at the estimate that the McCumber wool tariff would force the consuming public to pay at least \$200,000,000 in increased prices for the wool in their garments.

And when it comes to the effect of the entire new tariff law upon the voting public, there are editors who remind us that the voting public now contains several million women, who will have their first chance to express an opinion on a Republican tariff bill at the polls. And these women, as the Newark News remarks, are not so bound up in party affiliations as are the older voters. So "let them but be convinced that new tariff duties other than those on wool seriously menace family budgets, cutting down the buying power of the dollar with reference to woolen and cotton goods, silk, sugar, and other commodities, and other things being equal, the seeds may be sown of apostasy from the party that enforced the higher charges."

Yet it is by no means true that even "Schedule 11" is quite without friends. In California, the Oakland Tribune (Rep.), speaking for the wool industry of California says that "if there is to be a great home production of wool, the 33-cent rate must obtain. A settled policy distributed over a number of years would make America independent of foreign supplies, and would be reflected in returns to sheepmen and laborers." While some of the rates in the McCumber schedule may be too high, the Albany Knickerbocker Press (Rep.) declares that a high rate on wool imports "is essential because the United States at present does not produce one-third of the wool which its common necessities require, and because whenever we have an unduly low tariff rate on wool the American wool industry is prostrated."

The wool-marketing department of the American Farm Bureau Federation has issued a statement denying the widely published assertions that a tariff on raw wool will increase the cost of clothing. It asserts that the reduction in the wholesale price of clothes since 1913, in spite of the fact that an emergency tariff on high wool went into effect last year, "shows conclusively that there is little or no relation between the tariff on raw wool and the price of finished product to the consumer." It also figures out that the 33 cents per clean pound of the new bill "is exactly equivalent to the 11 cents per grease pound of the old Payne-Aldrich bill." So, it is asked, where is the great increase that the critics of the tariff have been talking about? The Washington Post takes up the cudgels

for the so-called "wool senators." The attack on them by Democratic senators and newspapers is declared to be "a case of mud for mud's sake."

### WOOL SCHEDULE "MOST VICIOUS" IN TARIFF BILL

(By a Staff Correspondent in Chicago Tribune.)

Washington, D. C., July 28.—Acceptance of amendments designed to eliminate "hidden protection" in compensatory duties on woven fabrics of wool was forced by Senator Lenroot (Wis.), Republican, in the Senate today. Amendments by Senator Lenroot and by Senator Walsh (Mass.) leading the fight for the minority, to reduce duties, however, were rejected.

One of the features of the day's debate was an attack upon the tariff bill by Senator Nelson (Minn.), Republican, who described the wool schedule as the "most vicious" in the measure.

The Lenroot amendments, which were accepted by Senator Smoot (Utah), who is in charge of the woolen schedule, provided that the compensatory duty of 49 cents per pound on fabrics valued at more than 80 cents per pound shall apply only "upon the wool content thereof."

Senator Lenroot charged that without this clause the effect was to give the manufacturer of cloth, which is not all wool, a concealed protection. Approval of his amendment, he said, will mean a reduction amounting to about 20 per cent in the duty on certain kinds of woolen fabrics.

Senator Smoot, however, refused to accept the Lenroot amendment in the case of fabrics valued at not more than 80 cents per pound. An amendment applying to the cheaper fabrics, which presumably would be more likely to contain substitutes for wool, was defeated by a vote of 25 to 33.

Following the defeat of the amendment applying to the cheaper fabrics, Senator Lenroot offered the same amendment to the higher brackets in the same paragraph and then launched into a denunciation of those Republicans who would approve "hidden protection" of this nature. After his speech the amendment was accepted without a roll call.

Senator Nelson was prompted to make an attack upon the bill during the discussion of the duties on woolen cloth, which he pointed out, when the compensatory and protective duties are added together, would range from 100 to 131 per cent ad valorem.

"It seems to me there should be a more moderate duty on wool," said Senator Nelson. "The duties on some of the agricultural products are too high. I suppose it is to make a big showing to the farmers and make them believe that they will get all that excessive duty in one form or another, and to make it easier for the farmer to swallow the high duties on manufactured goods and on wool."

### LLOYD GEORGE SAYS NEXT WAR WORSE YET

A London dispatch, dated July 28, says: "More terrible machines than in the late war are being constructed," said Prime Minister Lloyd George at a luncheon given by 300 prominent free churchmen today.

"What for?" he asked, and continued, "to attack cities and maim, destroy and burn helpless women and children. Keep your eyes on what is happening. If the churches of Europe and America allow that to fructify, they had better close their doors."

"We reduced our armaments and if other nations follow the example, there will be no serious menace to peace."

Mr. Lloyd George said that the next war, if it came, would be a war on civilization. Speaking of the suddenness in which wars came he said:

"The war germ, like another germ—you do not know that you have it until it has got you. It is of no use arguing with an epileptic when the fit is on him. There is that atmosphere in the world now and the explosive material is scattered over the face of Europe."

"When a match is dropped, it is too late to wave the covenant of the league of nations. It is the new spirit that is wanted."

The prime minister said he attached high hopes to the league of nations. He said that civilization would be safe if the league succeeded but if it failed, civilization was doomed.

Hides and leather and boots and shoes were placed on the free list as the tariff bill finally passed the Senate. Considering the fact that the prices of footwear are yet two or three times what they once were, maybe the tariff-makers concluded that it had found one infant industry that is able to stand alone.