

May 12th, 1911.

In an article called "Both Sides of the Wool Tariff Question," the arguments against the tariff are taken up pretty nearly as I have handled them. On the other side of the question, the following arguments are given:

FIRST: That if five pounds of clean wool were used in a suit of clothes, the price of a \$40 suit would be increased only \$1.21; the price of a cheap \$12 suit only 55 cents. (This argument has been used with many variations for the last year. It is the first time so far as I know in the history of the agitation that the fact that the price of the cloth in garments was enhanced even by 10 cents a yard was considered an unimportant matter. This should be taken up in the chapter "Where Every Penny Counts.")

SECOND: The author declares without proof that the reduction in duties on cloth would cause the closing of a great majority of mills in this country and throw thousands of workmen out of employment, laying waste millions of dollars of capital. The first effect, the author says, would be the cutting of wages; the second would be that our mills would have to use more shoddy and cotton.

THIRD: A strong point is made of the fact that a decline of duty would mean an increase of importation of shoddy. There is no attempt to show that many of these so called shoddies are most valuable. The inference from the writer's paragraph would be that shoddy was kept out by the present prohibitory duty and that our goods were made of pure wool. This is all assertion not proof, and the effects of the Wilson Bill are constantly quoted. There is no attempt to show what happened before the Wilson Bill.

The increases in the imports of raw wool under the Wilson Bill are shown. The falling prices of fine Ohio wool, also the decrease in production of wool in the United States. Takes up the four pounds of grease wool to one of cloth. Claims that this is right on the basis that the average shrinkage from grease wool is 60%. Claims that the wording of the act "wholly or in part of wool" is essential to prevent fraud.

It is evident that the writer has accepted in toto Whitman's argument from the following paragraph:

"The complaint that the wool tariff discriminates against the carded woolen branch of the industry is an illustration of how far the revisionists have to go to find something to talk about. The American Woolen Company and the other New England interests make both woolen and worsted cloth, and they would be injuring themselves if they sought to discriminate against the manufacture of carded-woolen fabrics. The president of the big worsted mill in Massachusetts who is charged with having inserted the duty on "tops" so as to benefit himself proved to the Ways and Means Committee in 1908 that this matter was adjusted without his knowledge before the bill was reported to the Senate, and that he actually protested against the arrangement before the final passage of the law in 1897."

The interesting part of it is that this article although signed "H. B. Brewster" is written by L. D. H. Weld. In a letter to Mr. Phillips he says "I am a Columbia Ph. D. in economics and have been engaged for the past ten months by the Census Bureau as an expert special agent in charge of the woolen industry. The bureau has recently issued a preliminary bulletin on this industry under my name." He adds, "I have also recently been aiding the new Ways and Means Committee in the preparation of data on the wool schedule."

The article ends up as follows:

"It is plain that the cost of clothing is due to other things than the tariff on wool and manufactures of wool, and that the harm resulting from low duties would offset a thousand times the slight gain that might accrue therefrom."