Also, petition of International Association of New York, favoring duty on gems—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Association of Lithographers, for a duty on all lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Delilia McGuire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary L. Walker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of J. S. McCready Post, No. 456, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, against engraving picture of Jefferson Davis on silver service of the battle ship *Mississippi*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ellen Leach, widow of Robert A. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition from the business men of Brooten, Minn.; Evansville, Minn.; Browerville, Minn.; and Eagle Bend, Minn., protesting against the enactment of a parcels-post law by Congress—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Petition of Western South Dakota Stock Growers' Association favoring reciprocity with foreign countries relative to meats—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY: Petition of Texas County (Mo.) Farmers' Union, for parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PATTERSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Edwin R. Mears—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of citizens of New Haven, Conn., favoring the reduction of the duty on wheat—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *June 8, 1909.*

The Senate met at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, of the city of Washington.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIM.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims, set out in the findings by the court relating to the vessel sloop *Diana*, Henry Nicoll, master (S. Doc. No. 84), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9541) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SCOTT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., remonstrating against any increase of the duty on print paper and wood pulp, as proposed in the so-called "Payne tariff bill," which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying that an appropriation be made to place in Statuary Hall a suitable memorial to the memory of James Rumsey, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Miami, Fla., praying for the imposition of a duty of at least 40 cents per box or crate on all pineapples imported into this country, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Convoy and of Local Grange No. 873, Patrons of Husbandry, of Little Hocking, all in the State of Ohio, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Fremont, Vanlue, Findlay, Continental, Moline, Walbridge, Curtice, East Toledo, Elmore, and Oak Harbor, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the retention of the present duty on raw sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying that liberal appropriations be made for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens employed in the oil industry at Pleasantville, Tidioute, and Sheffield, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying that a duty of 50 cents per barrel be placed on all crude oil, and also for a corresponding duty on the manufactured products of crude oil coming from foreign countries, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the substitution of specific duties instead of ad valorem duties in the pending tariff bill; for the appointment of a nonpartisan expert tariff commission, and also for the improvement of trade relations with insular possessions, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented a petition of Abraham Lincoln Council, No. 14, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "Overman amendment" to the pending tariff bill, proposing to increase the head tax on immigrants from $4 to $10, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of members of the composing room of the North Side News chapel, of New York City; of members of the Buffalo Electrotype Works, of Buffalo; of members of the New York World composing room, of New York City; and of members of the Evening Call composing-room chapel, of New York City, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the inclusion in the pending tariff bill of any duty on news print paper and wood pulp, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 11, Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, of Morrisonville, N. Y., and a memorial of the International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen, of Troy, N. Y., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on print paper and wood pulp as contained in the Dingley bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry newspaper workers of New York City, Brooklyn, Glendale, Sheepshead Bay, and Bath Beach, all in the State of New York, praying for the retention of the duty on print paper and wood pulp as proposed in the so-called "Payne tariff bill," which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Typhographia No. 4, Zweig der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Typographia, of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against any change in the rates on wood pulp and print paper as fixed by the House bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 2542) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo W. Shedd;

A bill (S. 2543) granting an increase of pension to John H. Sargent (with the accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2544) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Lambert (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 2545) to establish a fish-culture station in New Mexico; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 2546) to correct the military record of John C. Barrett (with the accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2547) to grant an honorable discharge to Harry P. Eakin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2548) granting an increase of pension to John Bell;

A bill (S. 2549) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Bright; and

A bill (S. 2550) to pension volunteer army nurses; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MONEY:

A bill (S. 2551) for the relief of M. T. Sigrest;

A bill (S. 2552) for the relief of heirs or estate of Mrs. Eunice Hurdle, deceased;

A bill (S. 2553) for the relief of J. W. Causey; and

A bill (S. 2554) for the relief of J. R. Hollowell; to the Committee on Claims.

THOMAS COYLE AND BRIDGET COYLE.

On motion of Mr. BURNHAM, it was

Ordered, That there may be withdrawn from the files of the Senate the papers accompanying the bill for the relief of Thomas Coyle and Bridget Coyle (S. 446, 60th Cong., 1st sess.), there having been no adverse report thereon.

SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. NELSON. I present an article prepared by W. C. Dodge, a former trustee of the public schools in the District of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Columbia, relating to the schools and school buildings of the national capital. I move that it be printed as a document (S. Doc. No. 86).

The motion was agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE AT ROME.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a letter from Mr. David Lubin, dated Rome, May 23, 1909, addressed to my colleague and myself, relative to the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome. I move that it be printed as a document (S. Doc. No. 85).

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 9541. An act to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

THE TARIFF.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed, and the calendar is in order.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, in view of the criticism made yesterday by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] of the attitude of some Republican Senators on the tariff bill as not being Republican, I send to the desk and ask to have read the following resolution of the executive committee of the Republican Editorial Association of Indiana, which was passed only a few days ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana, and the Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read as follows:

RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, INDIANA REPUBLICAN EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION.

INDIANA REPUBLICAN EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION.

The executive committee of the Indiana Republican Editorial Association unanimously indorses the attitude of Senator BEVERIDGE on the subject of tariff revision. His efforts to secure a *downward revision* of the tariff are in harmony with the will of the people throughout Indiana and *accord with the platform pledge of the Republican party.* What the people want Congress to do while in special session is to settle the tariff question for a period of years, and *nothing short of a revision downward* along protective lines as advocated by Senator BEVERIDGE will suffice.

The above expression was given out after a meeting of the executive committee held in Indianapolis May 28, 1909. Every member of the committee was present.

EDWARD A. REMY, *Seymour,*
A. M. WILLOUGHBY, *Greensburg,*
HARRY M. SMITH, *Greencastle,*
W. B. MADDOCK, *Bloomfield,*
A. A. MCCAIN, *Crawfordsville,*
Executive Committee.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I had not intended to present this resolution, and would not now but for the criticism to which I referred.

I ask permission also to insert, without reading, excerpts from speeches of President Taft before and since the campaign, as well as an extract from the recent speech of Secretary MacVeagh, at Chicago. I should give more and fuller extracts but for the fact that I have given them heretofore. But they are so pertinent at this moment that I give these few brief extracts again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the request is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

OUR CANDIDATE AT CINCINNATI, JUNE 28, 1908.

The tariff *in a number* of the schedules *exceeds* the difference between the cost of production of such articles abroad and at home, including a reasonable profit to the American producer.

The *excess* over that difference *serves no useful purpose,* but *offers a temptation to those who would monopolize the production and the sale of such articles in this country to profit by the excessive rates.*

On the other hand, there are *some few* other schedules in which the tariff is not sufficiently high to give the measure of protection which they should receive upon Republican principles, and as to those the tariff should be raised.

OUR CANDIDATE AT CINCINNATI, SEPTEMBER 22, 1908.

The Dingley tariff has served the country well, but its rates *have become generally excessive.* They have become excessive because conditions have changed since its passage in 1896. *Some* of the rates are probably too low, due also to the change of conditions.

But on the whole, THE TARIFF OUGHT TO BE LOWERED in accordance with the Republican principles and the policy that it has always upheld of protection of our industries.

The *movement in favor of revision has arisen within* the Republican party and *is pressed forward by members of the* Republican party.

The revision which they desire is a revision *which shall reduce excessive rates* and at the same time preserve the industries of the country.

OUR CANDIDATE AT MILWAUKEE, SEPTEMBER 24, 1908.

It is intended under the protective system, by judicious encouragement, to build up industries as the natural conditions of the country justify to a point *where they can stand alone and fight their own battles in competition of the world.*

There are many articles in common use to-day which were unknown when the Dingley tariff bill was enacted. Conditions with respect to the cost of articles abroad *have changed* just as they have changed in this country, so that the *difference* between the cost of production at home and abroad ten years ago was in many instances different *and less* than it is to-day.

It is my judgment, as it is that of many Republicans, that there are *many schedules of the tariff in which the rates are excessive,* and there are *a few* in which the rates are not sufficient to fill the measure of conservative protection.

It is my judgment that a revision of the tariff in accordance with the pledge of the Republican platform will be, on the whole, a *substantial* REVISION DOWNWARD, though there probably will be a FEW exceptions in this regard.

As the temporary leader of the party, I do not hesitate to say with all the emphasis of which I am capable, that if the party is given the mandate of power in November it will perform its promises *in good faith.*

Our candidate also made these same statements at Des Moines, Iowa, one day later.

THE PRESIDENT-ELECT AT NEW YORK, DECEMBER 17, 1908.

Mr. Taft dwelt almost wholly upon the revision of the tariff, which he singled out as the *most important declaration* made at the last national convention, and, *after having previously referred to the veto power of the Chief Executive,* said, with all the emphasis of which he was capable:

"*Better no revision at all,* BETTER THAT THE NEW BILL SHOULD FAIL, unless we have an *honest and thorough* revision on the basis laid down and the principles outlined in the party platform." (Report of New York Tribune, December 18, 1908.)

THE PRESIDENT IN HIS INAUGURAL, MARCH 4, 1909.

It is thought that there has been such a change in conditions since the enactment of the Dingley Act, drafted on a similarly protective principle, that the measure of the tariff above stated will permit the *reduction* of rates in certain schedules and will require the advancement *of few,* IF ANY.

It is imperatively necessary, therefore, that a tariff bill be drawn in *good faith* in accordance with *promises made before the election* by the party in power, and as promptly passed as *due consideration* will permit.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT CHICAGO, JUNE 5, 1909.

If, then, the people, and especially the people of the Middle West, shall be made satisfied by the new tariff law, the tariff question is likely to be out of the way for a considerable time. *But if they are not made satisfied,* then *we will not have rest,* and we will not have a clear field for currency reform.

It seems to me that the chances are largely in favor of a revision that the people will accept.

What the people expect is what the protectionist Republican party *promised* in its last year's platform; and, while it is *talking against the wind* to argue that the revision expected is *not a* REVISION DOWN, it would be equally futile to say that the revision down was promised to be a revision down and out.

In conclusion, one word about the President. He, too, seems to be of good cheer as to this tariff question. He seems to place great reliance upon the wisdom of the Congress and upon its public spirit. Of course, it is easier to be complacent when you know you have the last word, and that the last word is a combination of language and big stick.

The President is an optimist, and tremendously able, with full confidence in his ability to bring things to pass. He is so strong and big and confident that he will wait a long time, however, before he will fully use his strength, but the impression he makes is that if his antagonism should be aroused nothing could stop him. (Report of Chicago Tribune, June 6, 1909.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will report the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. In Schedule K, wool and manufactures of, page 129, paragraph 368, the committee proposes to strike out the paragraph as printed in the House text and to insert a new paragraph 368, as follows:

368. Top waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, and garnetted waste, 30 cents per pound.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. DOLLIVER obtained the floor.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich	Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	Piles
Bacon	Clay	Heyburn	Rayner
Beveridge	Crane	Hughes	Root
Borah	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bradley	Culberson	Johnston, Ala.	Simmons
Brandegee	Cullom	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Cummins	Lodge	Smoot
Brown	Curtis	McCumber	Stone
Bulkeley	Depew	McLaurin	Sutherland
Burkett	Dixon	Martin	Taliaferro
Burnham	Dolliver	Money	Taylor
Burrows	Fletcher	Nelson	Warner
Burton	Flint	Oliver	Warren
Carter	Frazier	Overman	Wetmore
Chamberlain	Frye	Page	
Clapp	Gallinger	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins	

Mr. PILES. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. JONES] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber for a short time this morning.

Mr. SCOTT. My colleague [Mr. ELKINS] is unavoidably detained this morning, but will be here later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-five Senators have responded to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of antagonizing the amendment which has been offered by the committee to the paragraph now under consideration, although I desire to say that I contemplate offering amendments to paragraphs earlier in the schedule than the one now before the Senate.

The proposition now before the Senate restores the Dingley rates on such forms of wool wastes, including top waste and such like wastes, in the process of cloth manufacture. The Dingley rate was 20 cents a pound. The committee increases it to 30 cents a pound, and it is obviously absurd——

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. I call the Senator's attention to printed page 122 of the bill, which shows that the rate proposed by the amendment to which he referred is identical with the Dingley rate, to wit, 30 cents a pound.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I then have misunderstood what the Senator from Rhode Island said, and I will be compelled to withdraw some observations which I have already made.

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I understood the Senator to state that the committee's amendment as presented restored the rate as it appeared in the House bill. I was in error about that.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; the Dingley rate.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. The amendments of the committee in every instance propose to restore the Dingley rates on everything pertaining to wool

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to what is done in the Dingley law and in this amendment to these forms of wool wastes. They are wastes arising in the process of manufacturing worsted cloths in the main. They are assessed here at 30 cents a pound. They are the raw material of the great carded-wool industry of America, an industry which counts thousands of mills in practically every State in the Union—that branch of the woolen industry the most widely scattered, the most honestly capitalized, and now struggling in the midst of much distress for its very life.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to what this proposition does to the largest department of woolen manufacture in America. As I said a moment ago, these wastes are by-products in the manufacture of worsted yarns and worsted cloths. What duty does the worsted manufacturer or spinner who imports those wools into the United States pay? He pays 12 cents a pound whether the wool is washed or unwashed. Of course such wool comes here washed. Its shrinkage upon the average is so insignificant that nobody will deny the truth of what I state when I assert that the duty upon a scoured pound of it is practically 15 cents. It shrinks less than 20 per cent. Most of the shrinkage has been taken up by washing it, which does not advance its duty at all, since in the case of combing wool when it is scoured the shrinkage is almost negligible, and the duty put upon it is 15 cents a scoured pound.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator tell me what class of wool he refers to?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am talking about English washed combing wool and Canadian wool.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator tell me what proportion of that character of wool goes into consumption?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am not going into statistics now, although I will lay before the Senate a full statement of the statistics. But I want to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question: Is it not true that those wools, shrinking less than 20 per cent, come here under a scoured duty amounting to about 15 cents a pound?

Mr. WARREN. Answering that question, the Senator has placed the percentage of shrinkage considerably lower than what it is, in my judgment. But in connection with that, let me say that the imports of wool that will shrink less than nearly double that is only about 4 or 5 per cent of the consumption of the United States. It merely takes the wools that are used for luster goods, and so forth, and is not the wool in general use in the manufacture of worsted goods for men's and women's wear.

Mr. DOLLIVER. These wools that I am talking about are now coming into the United States at the rate of 2,000,000 pounds a month by our book of statistics, if I have them correctly analyzed, and the peculiar thing about it is that by the original draft or plan of this wool tariff they came in washed at the same rate that the clothing wools came in. They came in washed without any addition to the duty, whereas the clothing wools doubled the duty if they came in washed. And the shrinkage, as I have said, brings these wools into the Boston market at 15 cents a scoured pound.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator assert that the imports of that class of wool are averaging 2,000,000 pounds a month; and if so, how far back does it go?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I noticed that in the carded importations——

Mr. WARREN. I desire to say to the Senator that they do not amount to one-half that, going back over a series of years.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think they are getting ready for the situation that is liable to arise.

Mr. WARREN. I desire further to say that they have not amounted to that for sixteen years. Take sixteen years ago—they formed only 7 per cent of the imports to this country.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Very well. Now, Mr. President, the wools that are imported by the manufacturer of worsted goods are certainly the light-shrinkage wools, whatever their character may be. They do not bring here the heavy-shrinkage wools of South Africa or South America, or the scoured merino grades that fill the wildernesses of this world. They buy light-shrinkage wool, upon which the duty paid is equivalent to a duty of less than 20 cents a scoured pound into the United States.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me there?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. To what class of wools other than the second-class wools does the Senator allude when he says that they shrink but 20 per cent?

Mr. DOLLIVER. There are wools of the other class, I think, that come within that description.

Mr. WARREN. The record shows, let me say in this connection, that worsted manufacturers are bringing wool from every one of the countries the Senator mentioned; bringing, of course, the lightest shrinkage they can get, just the same as the carded-wool people do. All people who wish to get into this market with wool will naturally bring that which shrinks the least in the process of cleansing to scoured wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now, confining myself for the minute to the English combing wool and the Canadian combing wool, which comes in without any addition to their duty after they have been shorn, I repeat that their duty, put upon the average, is not in excess of 15 cents the scoured pound. Yet the proposition here is to take the wastes that fall off in the process of their advancement toward cloth and assess a duty upon it of 20 cents a pound, and that just opens a crack which enables the Senate to see what the complaint is of the great department of woolen industry, having more factories and employing more people than any other, which has been left out of the calculations of the framers of this measure.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the Senator a question. He is addressing his remarks, as I understand, to paragraph 368?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes; and objecting to having a higher specific duty upon top waste and combing waste than the collective duties upon the scoured contents of the fleece from which they fall.

Mr. WARREN. There is not one of those wastes but what is used by the factories that make them in the manufacture of worsted cloth. The Senator is wrong in thinking that those wastes are the ones that the carded-wool men are seeking to get.

CARDED-WOOL INDUSTRY.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I intend to let the carded-wool men speak for themselves.

Mr. WARREN. Very well.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I ask the Secretary to read, for the information of the Senate, from an address to the President of the United States, issued the other day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

CARDED WOOLEN INDUSTRY APPEALS TO THE PRESIDENT—COMMITTEE EXPLAINS THE SERIOUS TARIFF BURDENS—SPECIFIC DUTY ON WOOL IN THE GREASE INEQUITABLE—BULK OF WOOL SUITED FOR CARDED WOOLEN MANUFACTURING IS OF THE HEAVY SHRINKING CLASS.

[New York Journal of Commerce, June 7, 1909.]

Edward Moir, president of the Carded Wool Association and chairman of a special tariff committee of the association, called upon President Taft on Wednesday last with other members of the committee and presented a petition to show the serious burdens now resting on the carded woolen industry and on the consumers of wool goods. The other members of the committee comprised H. J. Hamill and M. D. King, of Germantown, Pa.; W. A. Dickey, jr., of Baltimore, Md.; and P. P. Pilling of Kiameusi, Del. The petition follows:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We appear before you to-day for the purpose of stating certain facts relating to the tariff on wool and wool products in order that you may know of the serious burdens now resting on the carded woolen industry and on the consumer of wool goods.

1. Schedule K is the same in the Payne bill, now before the Senate, and in the Dingley law. Both provide for a specific duty of 11 cents and 12 cents a pound on wool in the grease. This is the first grievance to which we call your attention. Grease wool contains widely varying proportions of grease and dirt, which is washed out in the first process—scouring—and is of no value whatever to the wool manufacturer. This wool grease and dirt amounts in many cases to as much as 80 per cent of the grease weight of the wool, while on some light shrinkage grades it is much less—as low as 15 per cent.

From this you will understand how wide is the variation in the duty on the clean wool. With a shrinkage of 80 per cent, a duty of 11 cents per grease pound is 55 cents per clean pound. With a shrinkage of 20 per cent, the same 11 cents duty on the grease weight is only 14 cents per clean pound. The result is that the light-shrinking lots of wool can be imported at a very low duty, while the tariff on the heavy-shrinking wools is so high that they can not be imported at all. An application of the Dingley tariff to 80,000,000 pounds of wool recently sold at auction at London, Liverpool, Melbourne, and Sydney showed that the ad valorem equivalent of the Dingley 11 cents duty on grease wool varied from 23 per cent to 733 per cent.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Secretary please go back and read those percentages of shrinkage again?

Mr. DOLLIVER. And, Mr. President, it will not disturb me if the Senator from Wyoming, who is an expert on wool raising, will hold his statistical controversy with those memorialists, rather than with me, because those people are also experts.

Mr. WARREN. I have some acquaintance with those people, and I have some knowledge of wool. I may have misunderstood the statement as to there being 733 per cent of shrinkage, but, as I understood it, it was that certain wools had 733 per cent of shrinkage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will reread the part of the article referred to by the Senator from Wyoming.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the article, as follows:

From this you will understand how wide is the variation in the duty on the clean wool. With a shrinkage of 80 per cent, a duty of 11 cents per grease pound is 55 cents per clean pound. With a shrinkage of 20 per cent, the same 11 cents duty on the grease weight is only 14 cents per clean pound. The result is that the light-shrinking lots of wool can be imported at a very low duty, while the tariff on the heavy-shrinking wools is so high that they can not be imported at all. An application of the Dingley tariff to 80,000,000 pounds of wool recently sold at auction at London, Liverpool, Melbourne, and Sydney showed that the ad valorem equivalent of the Dingley 11 cents duty on grease wool varied from 23 per cent to 733 per cent.

The bulk of the wool suited for our branch of the industry, carded woolen manufacturing, is heavy shrinking, while the wools suited for the other branch of the industry, worsted manufacturing, is light shrinking. The burden under which we are suffering arises from this fact, and hence our appeal to the House, the Senate, and now to you for relief from this injustice. The conditions we have described result not only in the oppression and ruin of the carded woolen industry, dotting the country with idle mills, but also in special privileges of immense value to the worsted spinning industry, which is being rapidly concentrated into a few wealthy, prosperous, and powerful combinations.

At the same time the wool grower is deprived of the protection contemplated by the Dingley tariff law. That law fixes the duty on scoured wool at three times the duty on unwashed grease wool; that is, at 33 cents a scoured pound for class 1 wool, and 36 cents a scoured pound for class 2 wool. This is on the assumption that it requires 3 pounds of grease wool to give 1 pound of scoured wool; and this assumption is further indicated by the Dingley and Payne provisions for compensatory duties on goods, based on the ratio of 4 pounds of grease wool to 1 pound of finished cloth, allowing for a loss of 25 per cent in manufacturing. This legal promise of 33 cents a scoured pound to the woolgrower has proved in practice to be a delusion and a sham, for the law that gives the promise of such protection breaks it by allowing the importation of light-shrinking wool at the 11-cent rate. The protection to the woolgrower is measured, not by the Dingley duty of 33 cents a pound on scoured wool, but by the equivalent per scoured pound of the 11-cent duty on grease wool actually imported, which equivalent runs as low as 14 cents and in practice rarely exceeds 20 cents. The average shrinkage of the grease wool imported during the past five years is 40 per cent, equal to a duty of 18.6 cents per scoured pound.

INCONSISTENCIES OF THE PRESENT TARIFF.

Thus under this present wool tariff the woolgrower is deprived of the expected protection, the carded wool manufacturer is deprived of all access to the foreign wool suited to his requirements, while the worsted spinners enjoy valuable special privileges by being permitted to import the wool they require at a very low duty per scoured pound.

2. Besides the inequality to which we have just called your attention, there are other serious abuses in the Dingley tariff on wool.

First, we will mention the provision by which wool of the first class, if washed on the sheep's back, is subjected to a double duty of 22 cents a pound, while wool of the second class, if washed on the sheep's back, is admitted at the single rate of 12 cents a pound. The result is that all wool of the second class is imported in the washed condition in order to avoid the payment of the duty on grease and dirt, while the very heavy wool of the first class can not be imported at all. The discrimination against one class of people and in favor of another under this arrangement of the tariff arises from the fact that the second-class wool is used for the manufacture of worsted while the wool adapted for carded woolen goods is of the first class. We demand the abolition of this discrimination and special privilege under the law.

Another inequality from which we ask relief is that provision of the Dingley and Payne bills which makes the duty on scoured wool three times the duty on grease wool. This is based on the assumption that 3 pounds of grease wool is required to yield 1 pound of scoured wool, whereas a very large part of the world's wool clip shrinks much less than two-thirds. The result of this inequality is to prohibit the importation of scoured wool and confine the imports to wool shrinking less than two-thirds. The discrimination against one class of people and in favor of another under this arrangement of the tariff arises from the fact that worsted spinners ordinarily buy wool in the grease, whereas scoured wools are used by the carded woolen manufacturers. Thus the scoured wool clause of the Dingley and Payne tariff bills constitute a burdensome discrimination against the carded woolen manufacturers from which we demand relief.

We desire to call your attention to the fact that the carded woolen and worsted branches of wool manufacturing, although distinct in respect to certain technical processes and grades of raw material used, still are competing branches of trade, because worsted and carded woolen goods are used for the same purposes. Consequently these tariff discriminations against the carded woolen industry aid the worsted branch of the business by injuring the latter's competitor.

PROHIBITORY DUTIES ON THE BY-PRODUCTS OF WOOL MANUFACTURING.

3. Another and very serious defect in the Dingley and Payne bills is the practically prohibitory duties on the by-products of wool manufacturing. Here again we find a discrimination against one class of people and special privileges for another, because these by-products can be used only by carded-woolen manufacturers, while worsted spinners, although they can not use them, have them for sale. This is one of the most serious of the tariff abuses from which we ask relief, as the duties on such by-products vary from 50 to 200 per cent.

4. The present wool schedule is practically that of 1867, which was primarily a war-revenue tax; and as all other schedules have been readjusted to meet changed conditions, this schedule should be redrawn to meet the changed conditions of wool growing and the wants of the manufacturers. Take Ohio wool, for example: The quality of wool grown in Ohio is changed in quality as well as in quantity. Fine merino was at one time the staple growth, but in a few years more that quality of wool will not be grown in Ohio. Much of the wool now grown there is from the mutton variety of sheep, and this wool carries a net protection of about 20 cents per scoured pound, against 33 to 44 cents to the grower in the West.

5. We ask for an equal opportunity with all others under the law, in order that we may enjoy the reward of our labor, skill, and enterprise in the business in which we are engaged. It is in this capacity of carded woolen manufacturers that we make our appeal to you. But our demands should be granted not only in justice to us as carded woolen manufacturers, but in justice to the consumer of wool goods. We expressly disclaim any intention of representing here to-day the special interests of the consumer. We, however, call your attention to the fact that every burden on the carded woolen industry that we have mentioned is also a burden on the consumer of wool goods, whether underclothing, outside clothing, blankets, or other articles made of wool; and that the special privileges granted to the worsted branch of this industry result in an increase of these burdens not only on the carded woolen manufacturers, but also on the consumers in this country.

6. It would not be possible at this time to go into detailed discussion of the proper remedies for the abuses to which we have called your attention. We will state, however, that it is our firm belief that the only complete remedy for these inequalities is a tariff based on value. Specific duties based on the scoured weight of the wool and graduated on by-products by classifications according to value, or compound duties consisting of both specific and ad valorem rates would give partial relief. But if the exigencies of the situation ever lead the Government to adopt any of these partial remedies, it should not be forgotten that they are partial, and that the only complete remedy is an ad valorem tariff. The protective rate on wool goods is ad valorem, and if this can be made effective on manufactured goods, there can be no doubt of its efficiency on the raw material.

ASKS THAT WOOL TARIFF BE THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATED AND REVISED.

7. We ask that the tariff on wool and wool goods be thoroughly investigated and revised. We desire to have the principle of protection maintained for all producers, whether of wool, wool goods, or clothing. And we are as ready to have inequalities corrected in the tariff on wool goods as in the tariff on raw materials. We are ready to go into the consideration of the technical details of this problem either with you

or anyone you may designate, and to any extent you may desire. We are ready to do this with representatives of the woolgrowers, worsted manufacturers, and of the Government. We suggested such a conference to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. We have at all times been willing to carry out that suggestion, confident that the better the truth is known the better will be our chances to gain an equal opportunity under the law.

We represent an industry that covers nearly every State in the Union, has over three times the number of establishments to those employed in the combing of wool with a greater number of employees. Under the present schedule many woolen mills have been closed, and a continuance of the same means great distress to many mill owners and operatives. We believe that the platform of the party meant an honest revision of the tariff. On a recent visit to the Finance Committee and placing the injustice of the wool duties before it, and being told that while we had a grievance that the schedule could not be opened, we feel indignant that such treatment should be meted out to us, that the cardinal principles of fair play and even-handed justice, under which we are supposed to live, should be cast aside or subordinated to a coalition of forces that are specially favored under the Dingley bill. Therefore, Mr. President, we appeal to you to use your influence in the proper quarter so that this industry may have what it is entitled to under our Constitution, even-handed justice, neither more or less.

Respectfully, yours,

EDWARD MOIR,
President Carded Wool Association.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President——

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator from Iowa a question before he resumes?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I do not see any proposition in the letter which has been read except the one for ad valorem duties. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if he has any information from the carded-wool people, from whom this comes, which makes any other or different provision for relief?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I entered upon my investigation of this case without knowing that there was a human being interested in it. I had no knowledge of the actual complaints of these good people who were trying to manufacture wool into cloth until I had spent a good deal of time trying to find my way through the wool tariff by myself.

Personally, I do not agree with the opinion which has been so often expressed here that there ought to be specific duties on everything. There are things where specific duties necessarily operate to create almost incredible inequalities, and the specific duty on wool by the pound is a case like that. That method of assessment is 50 years old in the United States and even older. There was a reason for it when it was adopted. We had not, fifty years ago, perfected our scheme of administration of customs laws, and the sheep people had many reasons to suspect ad valorem duties as applied to their product, because the Government was without any facilities to actually assess duties on that article upon the basis of value; but within these fifty years the wool trade of the world has developed in an intelligent way.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Iowa to take into consideration this state of facts and favor us with his views upon the basis furnished by them. When the wool tariff was passed in 1867, 99 per cent of the woolen clothing of the country was of carded woolen manufacture. Owing to a change in fashion and demand, the conditions have been so far reversed *that* we now have from 85 to 90 per cent of our clothing made of worsted goods, and 10 to 15 per cent only of the so-called "carded woolens." There is probably not in this Chamber a single suit of clothes made of carded woolen goods. At the time the carded woolen manufacturers appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, a gentleman present said:

> If these advocates of this disappearing form of manufacture will stand up, I venture to say that every one of them is now wearing a suit of worsted woolen clothes.

And, strange to say, that proved to be the fact.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But General Grosvenor seemed to have on a suit of woolen clothes.

Mr. CARTER. Well, but he was a statesman out of a job. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; he was the representative of the woolgrowers of the United States, proving that an excellent article of woolen clothes was manufactured for $10. I do not intend now, however, to go into the question that the Senator from Montana has raised, because there is no way to settle it, but I will wait a long time before I become convinced that in the climate which prevails in Iowa in the winter time, and which we get notice of two days in advance from our weather stations in Montana, there is likely to be a very unanimous turning away from the woolen clothes, as my friend from Montana seems to believe.

Mr. CARTER. Well, Mr. President, worsted goods are, of course, woolen goods. I refer to the method of manufacture.

Mr. DOLLIVER. And as this debate develops it will be shown that a large range of the woolen goods are deliberately described as half cotton, and if that were not done in the law, it would be done under the eye of almost anybody who looks at them or almost anybody who tries to wear them.

Now, Mr. President, feeling that backwardness that would naturally characterize a man not connected with the wool business or the wool trade, and seeing the honored Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] in the Chair, I desire the Secretary to read what the Woolen Manufacturers' Association of the State of Maine has to say about the business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MAINE WOOLEN MILLS ASK FOR A FAIR TARIFF—GORDON DOBSON ADDRESSES ARGUMENT TO SENATOR HALE—REQUESTS SUCH REVISION OF THE DINGLEY BILL AS WILL GIVE FAIR PLAY TO ALL INTERESTS FROM WOOLGROWER TO CONSUMER—OTHERWISE AGITATION FOR REVISION WILL BE CONTINUED.

BOSTON, *June 2.*

Gordon Dobson, president of the Maine Woolen Manufacturers' Association, recently forwarded to Senator HALE a letter, arguing for more equitable treatment in revising Schedule K. The letter, which has just been given out for publication, is as follows:

Hon. EUGENE HALE, *Washington, D. C.*

SIR: We have your letter of the 12th instant, in which you ask us to strike out from a copy of Schedule K of the Dingley tariff what we do not wish to appear and write in what we want to appear; to make it as we would like to have it read when enacted into law. In complying as far as possible with your request we will at the same time state why we can not do all that you ask.

We are manufacturers of wool goods by the carded woolen process. Schedule K covers all products of wool, whether in the raw state, partly manufactured or finished, and by whatever process. To comply with your request it would be necessary for us to recommend classifications, tariff rates and methods of assessment, not only for the goods we manufacture, but also for those we do not make, and for the raw material for our mills.

Let us begin with the raw material. We have already stated to the Committee on Finance our objections to the present specific duties on grease wool, which are levied on grease and dirt as well as on wool, and to the prohibitory duties on by-products. They shut us out from the supply of foreign wool and by-products suited for our industry, and give the users of light shrinking combing wools access to the foreign markets at a very low rate of duty. By this arrangement the wool grower is deprived of the protection contemplated under the law, the worsted spinning industry enjoys special favors of great value, the carded woolen industry is strangled, while the ultimate consumer is deprived of an adequate supply of wool goods.

The complete remedy for these inequalities under the present law is an ad valorem tariff on wool, which automatically adjusts itself to all the conditions by which a tariff should be regulated. We recommend this complete solution to Congress. It would be manifestly improper for us to do more than to suggest to you a particular rate on wool. First, because we are not familiar with the business or cost of producing wool in this country or abroad; and, second, because we are buyers and users of wool, and therefore financially interested in obtaining a supply of this material at as low a cost as possible. In revising Schedule K the first thing is to fix the tariff rate on wool, which is the basis of the entire schedule of duties. This rate should be fair to the woolgrower and the consumer of wool goods, and should bear uniformly on all branches of the wool-manufacturing industry. The rate on wool must be fixed before it is possible for anyone to frame a system of duties on wool goods. For your guidance in fixing the tariff rate on wool we want to submit the following statement, showing the quantity and value of the wool of classes 1 and 2 imported during the five years ending June, 1907, together with the amount of specific duty collected and the ad valorem equivalent of that duty:

Quantity, 426,036,605 pounds; value, $93,667,059; duty collected, $47,559,548; ad valorem equivalent, 50.8 per cent.

This statement shows that if the duty collected on the wool imports for these five years had been ad valorem it would have been 50.8 per cent. This measures the protection the woolgrower has been receiving under the Dingley tariff on an ad valorem basis. The importations have been confined to grease wools, on which the shrinkage did not exceed 55 per cent, running as low as 15 per cent, the average shrinkage being about 40 per cent. An ad valorem tariff on wool will remove completely the inequalities by which the carded woolen industry is burdened and the worsted industry favored.

We also desire to call your attention to the fact that if the complete remedy for the inequalities in the wool tariff is not applied by the adoption of ad valorem duties, a partial remedy is available by levying a specific duty on the scoured weight. We ask that, whatever duty is levied on wool, it be applied without the arbitrary distinctions that now exist between unwashed, washed, sorted, and scoured wools, and that the division into class 1 and class 2 be abolished. The cost of washing, sorting, and scouring is trifling and the ad valorem or specific rate on the scoured weight can be made to cover such cost.

Either of the methods above suggested would raise the tariff rate on light-shrinkage wools to a point at which all wools, including those heavy-shrinkage grades now excluded by duties rising as high as 800 per cent, would be admitted at the same tariff tax, and thus the woolgrower would obtain better protection than at present.

As a suggestion to you in revising the Dingley tariff on wool, its by-products, and wool goods, we respectfully call your attention to the following extract from the political platform of 1908, which stated the principle that should guide you in the tariff revision in which you are now engaged.

"In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference be-

tween the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries."

Rates of duty on wool and its by-products that bear equally on all branches of wool manufacturing and are satisfactory to both the woolgrower and the American consumer of wool goods will be satisfactory to us. A tariff on the manufactures of wool based on the principle stated in the above contract will also be satisfactory to us. When the rates of duty on wool and its by-products are determined it will be possible to complete the revision of Schedule K.

We want, however, to call your attention again to the fact that Schedule K covers a wide range of fabrics other than carded-woolen goods, and that the proper way to complete the revision is for you to enlist the cooperation of all branches of the wool-manufacturing industry—wool growing, carded woolen, worsted, knitting, carpet, and felt—under conditions that will make it impossible for anyone to obtain an unfair advantage, or for the domestic industry to be deprived of adequate protection.

We do not claim to be less selfish or less anxious to do business under favorable conditions than are those engaged in wool growing or the other branches of wool manufacturing that we have named. What we want to make clear to you is that, burdened by the inequalities of the present tariff and conscious of the powerful popular sentiment in favor of the transaction of public business with justice to all.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, feeling deeply as I do that this framework of wool duties, which has gradually taken on what appears to be permanent and final form for nearly fifty years, is oppressive, burdensome, and unequal in its operation as between great manufacturing interests entitled in common to the protection and guardianship of our laws, I am compelled also to become a very humble spokesman for the agricultural interests of this country, who are perhaps as much interested in this old schedule as any department of wool manufacturing. I have felt it necessary, however, owing to the aspersions that have been cast upon my political character, to occasionally return to the statement that I am within the Republican fold and the old-time Republican faith. I contemplate no attack on the sixth agricultural industry of America. It is the one point in tariff making upon which all parties can naturally agree.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Nobody, perhaps, knows better than I do the genuine Republicanism of the Senator from Iowa, or what feeling of interest he has in the farmer. He is a farmer, so am I. We are both farmers.

Mr. DOLLIVER. You are the greatest shepherd since Abraham. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. Just at this moment, while the Senator is addressing himself to paragraph 368, I want to say to him that it is the woolgrowers' interests that are at stake in that paragraph and not the manufacturers. Not one of these wastes named in this paragraph is necessary to the carded-wool men, because it is all used by the worsted men before it leaves the machinery which creates it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have never been able to understand, although the Senator from Wyoming and myself are both interested in the sheep business—I on a very modest scale and he on a scale that will make his name historic——

Mr. WARREN. I may say to the Senator I own no sheep. I do not own a cow, or even a dog or cat. I own nothing in the live animal line except one horse. It is true I have some interests in the way of capital stock in live-stock companies, the same as I have in other companies—industrial and railroad. I do not personally own a hoof of sheep or a hoof of cattle; only a horse which I sometimes ride.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have been deceived about the matter. When the Senator took me over that territory, he had all the airs of ownership, and afforded all those delicate hospitalities that could not have arisen in the heart of a mere renter. He not only exhibited to me these pastures and these flocks, but he confided to me much fine philosophy of life, both of men and sheep. I remember he told me there was one peculiarity about a sheep. He said a sheep does not seem to care particularly whether it lives or dies. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. I am exceedingly gratified to know that I was able to teach the Senator from Iowa something he did not know before. I hope I may have equal success in the course of this debate.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Senator is not only able to teach me many things, but his generous spirit has a sort of medicinal relation to the wounds I have received in this Chamber. Seeing, then, that we are both farmers, and seeing that the Senator's anxieties appear to be in behalf of agriculture, I should like to know why the American Woolgrowers' Association filled the post-office with letters from Washington to my constituents, telling them to hurry up; that Senator DOLLIVER had gone wrong on wool.

Mr. WARREN. I have not the slightest idea why they should pursue my friend, the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Are you not president of that association?

Mr. WARREN. I am not.

Mr. DOLLIVER. You were.

Mr. WARREN. I am not connected with that association as an officer, and I am not certain that I am even a member. I presume I may pay my dues. That privilege is usually offered to the humblest of shepherds.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is a privilege which ought never to be despised. That is the attitude of 90,000,000 people toward the weavers and shepherds at this hour in the United States. Nevertheless, a hurry-up call was sent to the sheep raisers in Iowa and other Western States, asking them without loss of time to put me right on wool. One of those letters fell into the hands of the Sheep and Woolgrowers' Association, of Minnesota, and was forwarded here to our honored colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], whose service to the cause of a reasonable tariff revision is everywhere appreciated in the United States. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] did me the compliment to send to me the letter of the president of the Sheep Growers' Association, of Minnesota, Mr. Magnus Brown, a great farmer and a great thinker, for a good deal of the deep thinking of the United States is done on the farm, even more than many of us imagine.

Instead of answering his letter at length he sent him a copy of the remarks which I had the honor to make in the Senate some weeks ago, not particularly for what I said, but because I had included in my remarks certain statements of Mr. Samuel Dale, editor of the Textile World Record, of Boston, who in my judgment is the best nonpartisan expert upon all departments of wool and woolens in the United States.

I desire the Secretary to read what the president of the Minnesota Sheep and Wool Growers' Association says in the letter to the Senator from Minnesota, and I want the Senator from Wyoming to listen to it, because this long-headed man seems to think that there is a more natural partnership between certain kinds of wool out in the West and the worsted manufacturers of New England than there is between the ordinary woolgrowers of Iowa and Minnesota and the Mississippi Valley and these same interesting people.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read, if there is no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE MINNESOTA SHEEP AND
WOOLGROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
Farmington, Minn., May 29, 1909.

Hon. MOSES E. CLAPP,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of 25th, will say that I feel indebted to you for sending me Mr. DOLLIVER'S speech, which I take it for granted voices your own sentiments more or less. I feel, from my own observation, that there has been a great deal of misinformation gratuitously distributed by interested parties on the wool tariff.

The worsted people are necessarily interested in a high duty on noils, as they are a by-product which they do not use. Of course we woolgrowers are also interested in the duty on noils being fully protective, although we woolgrowers of Minnesota not so much so as the more western growers, as they produce a shorter fiber wool. This is why they and the worsted people work together, more or less at our expense. The worsted people must have long wool, which we produce largely in Minnesota, while the carded people want short wool. They are now introducing French combs to work a shorter staple into worsted, and these French combs also work cotton and wool together in spinning, which has not been quite successful in the past.

I feel that the only change I would make in the tariff on class 2 wools, which we produce in Minnesota, would be to eliminate the joker in section 362 of the Payne bill, which allows wool of the second class to come in washed at the same duty that it does unwashed. The effect of the present scheme is to allow the worsted people to leave our wool on our hands until the foreign supply is exhausted, or until the grower becomes discouraged and lets go his wool at the price offered. This, in a large measure, accounts for the erratic and violent fluctuations in the wool market. The market must always be in a starved condition to bring us a remunerative price. You can readily see where the high duty on tops and noils, slubbing and roving waste, and the comparatively low duty on washed second-class wool gives the worsted spinners the advantage of us and also the carded men. They kill two birds with one stone.

To summarize:

I would suggest that washed wool of the second class be put on the same basis as washed wool of the first class.

That the adjustment between scoured wool and tops and scoured wool and noils, in the interests of the consumer, be put on a more scientific and equitable basis.

I would put the duty on garnetted waste (shoddy) and shoddy so high that the Europeans would keep it, and if they sent us anything, send us their good wool. I am willing to compete, climatic conditions considered, with a European woolgrower, if public welfare demands it, but I am not willing to compete with European ragpickers, not even for the sake of the carded-woolen manufacturers. We can not compete with Australia, New Zealand, and South America in the production of wool on even terms.

I think if you follow these suggestions and then cut out the thousand and one little cunning phraseologies of the schedule which give some-

body a monopoly and advantage, you will satisfy the woolgrowers of Minnesota and you will see sheep husbandry grow, as it should have done long ago, in Minnesota.

Yours, truly, MAGNUS BROWN, *President*.

P. S. Please send me about 100 copies of DOLLIVER'S speech in franked envelopes and I will distribute them amongst the boys; it's good.

Mr. WARREN and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield, and to whom?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. As the Senator from Iowa asked my particular attention to the letter, I will say there is very much in the letter of which I approve. In fact, I find no fault with any part of the letter, except that the writer has evidently not been in a woolen factory often enough to fully appreciate the difference between garnetted waste and rags and shoddy. The difference is that garnetted waste is a refinement of wool, which is worth about two and a half times as much as the best washed No. 1 wool, while the shoddy is simply rags, clothing that has been worn out, picked to pieces and washed out clean, and is a sort of second-hand wool, and short, poor wool at that. So I say the writer of the letter, when he speaks of prohibiting rags and shoddy, is right. When he speaks of garnetted waste, he evidently is not informed.

In speaking about second-class wool, if the Senator will allow me, I want to say to the Senator and to the Senate that there never has been entire satisfaction on either side regarding Schedule K. There has never been perfect satisfaction regarding any other schedule between the importers, manufacturers, producers, and consumers. The growers of wool have always said that as to second-class wool, if it was to be an important factor there should be duty levied upon it at different rates, unwashed and washed. But the fact is there is so little of it—it is usually washed on the back of the sheep—that it does not become a real factor in competition with other wool. I want to say further——

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President——

Mr. WARREN. Just a moment, please.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Right there, does not the fact that it is accessible to these people at 15 cents on the scoured contents of a pound of wool act as an automatic brake on the price of similar wools in the United States? In other words, do not people who would buy corresponding wools here turn away from this market place the very moment it becomes profitable to import it upon the payment of 15 cents on the scoured pound?

Mr. WARREN. The price of foreign wool is always regulated by the price of scoured wool laid down here duty paid. The consequence is if any class of wool bears a rate of import duty that allows it to be laid down here to advantage, immediately the price of the wool abroad increases.

Another thing. That class of wool is only grown upon mutton sheep—animals raised for mutton first and wool second. They never reach above about 7 per cent and often go down to 2 per cent and a fraction of the total consumption of wool in this country.

I know the Senator wants in whatever he may do to see that the woolgrower is fully protected. I am satisfied of that. But his remarks—and I say this for his information—are addressed to a paragraph where every single denomination of waste mentioned—and waste is a misnomer—where everything mentioned in that paragraph, 368, is a class of wool, a refinement of wool that directly stands in competition with washed wool, or, rather, scoured wool; and to depress that is to depress the American woolgrowers' product. You might as well take off half, or more, of the duty on No. 1 wool—even two-thirds—as to reduce any of these wastes. The unfortunate part and the unreasonable part is that it is not a carded-wool proposition. These wastes, so called, are all used by the worsted men, who create them, in manufacturing yarn for their own product.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. Referring to the letter just read, I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that there is one statement which is hardly borne out by the facts, and that is this: He claims that the western wools are so short that the worsted people can not use them; that they use the long wools of the Middle West. Over 75 per cent of all the western wools are used by the worsted manufacturers of this country. It is true years ago, before they had improved the combs, they could not use the short wool, but to-day they can use short wools, and nearly all the wools raised in the western country——

Mr. WARREN. The Senator need not except any. They can all be combed. I have some samples which have been put into tops——

Mr. SMOOT. That is true. I was going to speak of the very best and finest goods in this country.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am going to have those matters discussed by those who can speak with real authority about them. I desire now——

Mr. SMOOT. As far as the real authority is concerned, I have been in the wool business and handled these goods for twenty years, and that is a great deal longer than Mr. Dale ever handled them.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is your mill in operation now?

Mr. SMOOT. No; and I can tell the Senator, if he wants to know, just why it is not. He is trying to legislate here on a proposition that can not be successful, because of the fact that to-day the American people are using worsted instead of woolens; and the Senator must know that that is the reason.

When the carded woolen people appeared before the Finance Committee asking for some change in these schedules, I called attention to the fact that there was not one single man among them who had a carded woolen suit on. Every one of them had a worsted suit on.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is a very interesting thing. This group of gentlemen were pretty mad when they came away from the interview with the honored Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Do you mean with the committee? I was only a member of the committee.

Mr. DOLLIVER. They said the Senator seemed somewhat unable to share the emotions which they themselves felt at the destruction of their industry.

Mr. SMOOT. I can appreciate just as much as they can the conditions that exist to-day, and I know that those conditions are most unfavorable.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is rather a broad proposition to lay before the Congress of the United States—that proposition which the Senator from Utah laid before the most widely distributed and honestly capitalized department of woolen manufactures in America, employing more people than any other.

Mr. SMOOT. As far as the widely distributed manufacture of woolens to-day is concerned, the great bulk of them are worsted, and the only ones that are complaining that I have heard of do not represent more than 470 sets of cards out of a total of 4,500.

Mr. DOLLIVER. They complain that they have lost several hundred mills as the recent years have gone by—among others that which the Senator from Utah operates.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that there can be no advantage as far as class 1 and class 2 wools are concerned, for the worsted manufacturer can not take advantage of the purchase of either that the carded woolen people can not.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is exactly what they say, and they say the worsted brother has done so.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I did not say that. I said they could not. As far as the second-class wools are concerned, the Senator must know there are only about 7 per cent of the second-class wools imported into this country of the total amount of wool imported.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have promised to put into my speech the exact statistics about that.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator deny it?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am going to give what I myself think about that. The honored Senator from Wyoming has broached that matter gently to me once or twice, and I have stated that as the debate progressed I will discuss it, but I do not want to go into it now because I have not the figures with me. I did not expect we would go into it quite so early this morning.

I was saying that these carded woolen manufacturers from Maine and Pennsylvania and every place else felt the cold chill of the Senator's philosophy on the wool tariff as they left the Senate Office Building, and they were not concealing their resentment. The substance of what the Finance Committee's spokesman told them was that while their situation was desperate, nevertheless nothing could be done for them and nothing would be done, and they reported to their friends on the outside that the message they had from the committee and its spokesman on this question was that the true remedy for their troubles was to lock up their mills and quit a business that had become obsolete and no longer worth anything to the consumer.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator is referring to me, the gentlemen who reported to him reported a condition or circumstance that never happened.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I was undertaking to report accurately what they said, and I would not have alluded to it at all except

it corresponds with what the Senator said on the floor—that they are in a failing business, a business doomed to failure, a business going down hill, which can not be helped; that their troubles were beyond relief; that all that can be done is to let them die peacefully.

Mr. SMOOT. That is an exaggerated statement on the part of the Senator. I can not say and no one else can say but that next year the style of cloth wanted in this country will be carded woolens——

Mr. DOLLIVER. It never will be the style to intentionally select any other kind of clothes except woolens in cold weather.

Mr. SMOOT. Carded woolens are woolen clothes. They keep out the cold just the same. The only difference is in the process of manufacturing the goods.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The ordinary man in the United States can not tell the difference between the two.

Mr. SMOOT. The ordinary clothing manufacturer can tell.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The trouble is not that trouble which arises with respect to the fine turns of fashion and style and cut of clothes, but it is a more mysterious discrimination than that even.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator right there will allow me to express an opinion about the reason why they are not more fashionable.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am, of course, delighted to have a few contributions to the sum total of knowledge.

Mr. WARREN. Worsted goods are woven with all wool both ways or with cotton warp and wool filling, and the man who buys them knows just what he buys; there are no rags or shoddy or waste used in their manufacture except such as I have mentioned, and those are simply a refinement of wool, while a very large proportion of the carded wool manufactured is made of shoddy, rags, flocks, mungo, and stuff of that kind.

I do not say that all their goods are made in that way. They make some beautiful goods of all wool, but unfortunately all of the cheap wastes and rags of other countries that we let in here go into carded-wool fabrics, and consumers have found that out. When a man buys a suit of clothes made out of worsted goods, it is not full of rags and mungo and flocks and stuff of that kind. When he buys a piece of carded-wool goods—called "woolen goods"—he does not know what it is made of; he takes his chances. He may think he is buying all good wool, but in a few days he may find a bag of flocks between the outside cloth and the lining.

Mr. DOLLIVER. There is one feature of this wool situation of a general character that has been interesting me for a long time. Men grow furious at the idea of a few pounds of garnetted waste coming in, or noils or fabrics of woolen manufacture. Men talk and act as if this world, and especially this country, was overrun with woolen goods, whereas the facts are that the sheep-producing business has not kept the wool supply abreast of the growing population of the United States; and the fact is that if all the wool that is produced in the country was put into all the clothes that are produced in the country, and if it had no other kind of clothes, there would not be one available suit of clothes a year for each citizen of the United States.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator certainly does not mean that. We are raising between three and four hundred million pounds of wool per year in this country.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I intend to give my authority for that.

Mr. WARREN. Any authority that the Senator may give will have to be as I stated it, if the Senator takes the authority of the statistics and the census of the United States as recorded in the departments.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The good Lord intended that there should be wool enough for people to wear.

Mr. WARREN. Then give the sheepman a chance to raise enough to furnish it, and do not permit rag waste and other substitutes to come in.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Scoured wool would come in here at a figure——

Mr. WARREN. Why is not the sheepman now furnishing more wool to the world?

Mr. DOLLIVER. He is furnishing more every year.

Mr. WARREN. As compared with the population of the country, yes. Mr. President, I surely did not suppose that the Senator from Iowa was opposed to an increase of population in this country. We glory in the increase in population. We are not the only country whose population is increasing.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Very well, then.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that if it had not been for the tariff act of 1894 we would have had many more sheep in the country than we have now.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not think it is wise for my friend to enter the domain again of speculative statistics.

Mr. SMOOT. I do know that during those years the number of sheep in this country decreased——

Mr. DOLLIVER. Ten million.

Mr. SMOOT. There was a great decrease.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It will not take more than twenty years to recuperate against a loss like that.

Mr. SMOOT. There are more sheep to-day in the United States than we ever had.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not think you can attribute any factor in the increase to something that happened twenty years ago.

Mr. SMOOT. Not twenty years ago.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Pretty near. The good Providence that is above our affairs expressly made wool indestructible, practically. He seems to have had a benevolent outlook upon the world which he had made and upon the children of men. He seems to have known that it was impossible by any law to get sheep enough in nations that were to be like the United States to give everybody the fair chance of a good suit of woolen clothes. So wool was made in its very nature indestructible; so indestructible that if you look at rugs that are the most costly in America you will find some of them are five hundred years old, and some of them have been lying on the ground or the floors of tents in far-off lands century after century. All the wear and tear of centuries has not disturbed the fiber of which they are composed. Yet men are talking now very much as if rags were the offal clothing of the world and ought in some way to be made away with. I do not share that view.

Mr. WARREN. Then the Senator is at variance with the text that he quoted from a woolgrower in Minnesota.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I did not state that I was in harmony with everything that was said there. I think the present methods of making the duty absolutely prohibitory on rags has forced the rag supply of the Old World into England, from which rags are likely to come in the form of cloths, and which, sooner or later, certainly will be unloaded on somebody, and the price at which they have been sold has operated very much to the advantage of British manufacturers. I doubt very much whether these enormously prohibitory duties have operated to any advantage for our own people in the United States.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator permit me to say right there during this discussion that if he will note the market price of rags in this country in a trade journal which I will offer, he will find they start at about an eighth of a cent a pound—certainly the fraction of a cent—and run up, in different grades, to 5 or 6 cents per pound? I do not suppose there is any lack of rags in the markets of this country.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Rags in the United States have received the same fate as everything else. Does it surprise my friend from Wyoming to know that there is a rag trust in the United States? If he will open the Daily Trade Record of February 6, 1909, he will find under the head "Rags" an account of a meeting of the board of directors of the American Woolen By-Products Company and a statement that it has undertaken to reach out into all the cities of America to gather up on the streets and in tailor shops the whole field of rag waste that is left in the country, to be doled out upon their own terms to these woolen manufacturers. Is that a healthy state of society?

Mr. WARREN. The Senator surely has been seeing things, or some one else has.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I saw that, not in my mind's eye but in a trade paper of the wool business of the United States.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator does not believe there is a rag trust when you find rag peddlers going about in every town and in the backwoods country all over the United States, picking up rags and selling them at the nearest market they get. A rag trust at the present time strikes me as a bogey man.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It struck me as a little funny, but the daily trade journal of the woolen trade in New York, giving the news of the trade, gave the names of the president and the board of directors, and the meeting at which they changed officers and reelected the board. It gave the name of it, the American Woolen By-Products Company.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator, does he wish to lower the customs rates on rags so as to compete with the trust in this country, and so that we may have plenty of rags in our clothing?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I shall show before the debate closes that we have worn plenty of rags in our clothing under the situation we now enjoy.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. I understood the Senator to say that the number of sheep had decreased under the Wilson law only ten million.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That was just the recollection——

Mr. CURTIS. The record shows that the number decreased over eleven million.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator might go further than that. The number decreased from over fifty million to about thirty-six million.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It depends a little on the dates given. Mine was only a fugitive recollection of an old speech that I once made, I think, out in the country of the Senator from Kansas.

Now, Mr. President, I think we have overstated and exaggerated the danger to the wool industry of the United States in these elaborate preparations to guard this market against the approach of these things that are everywhere in the world used as a substitute for wool and ought to be used in the manufacture of cloth. Even in this despised shoddy there is no element of rags. The chemist has done his work until he has nothing left but the pure, clean animal fiber. The only thing about it is that it is a short fiber and liable, more or less, to destruction in ordinary use; but until we can get a supply of wool not only equal to the business of giving everybody at least one suit of clothes a year I think we waste a good deal of time filling the air with complaints about these wastes and by-products. I had my suspicions aroused about it when I found that these high rates of duty were not so much intended to keep the substitutes for wool out of the country as they were intended and are operating to enable a certain class of woolen manufacturers to unload their waste by-products on their competitors at exorbitant prices.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. So far as my knowledge of conditions goes and of those interested in this subject, I will state that the reason they want to keep out top waste, roving waste, and slubbing waste is for the very purpose of having the American people use the American wool, because if that class of wastes are imported they displace just that many pounds of wool. The Senator himself knows that under the law of 1883 the rates on wastes were so low that they even manufactured tops in England and shipped them here. I say to the Senator now that top waste is worth more in the market than a scoured pound of wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it worth more than noils?

Mr. SMOOT. Top waste is worth more than noils and, Mr. President, top waste is carded wool with all the substances other than wool in it taken out.

Mr. DOLLIVER. How does it become a waste?

Mr. SMOOT. It comes through carding. It runs through different machines, passing through the cards to the comb. Every time you handle the wool there is an additional waste. There is no manufactured article where so much waste is made in the manufacturing as that of wool—from wool to cloth.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I am still of the opinion that we should get enough wool into this country, either from the backs of our own sheep or from other sources, to give each man, especially those of us who live in cold climates, one good, "square" suit of woolen clothes a year. If we had that situation I would regard the argument against the introduction of these by-products from other countries with a little more interest than I do under the situation that now prevails in the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Iowa, as I understand his position, is in favor of protecting the woolgrower.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Surely.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, I want to call his attention to the fact that if you lower the rates upon top waste, slubbing waste, and roving waste, every pound of that waste that enters this country will take the place of so many pounds of American wool, and you might just as well have no duty upon the greased wool itself if you are going to take it off the roving waste, the top waste, and the slubbing waste.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not propose to take it off. I propose to reduce it so that those who produce it will also have a little mercy in selling it. That is all I am talking about.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator said he would be satisfied if there were wool enough here to buy a suit of clothes for every man once a year.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. They are raising that amount of wool, and more, of clean, new, pure wool. Now, as to this matter of rags and its effect upon wool. The Senator will remember the Wilson-Gorman law of 1894, and he will probably remember it was not especially intended to protect the sheepman or the wool manufacturer. That bill gave free wool, and yet, Mr. President, they put 15 per cent ad valorem upon shoddy and other wastes. They were careful enough and thoughtful enough, even when attacking the woolgrower and making his product free, to protect in some measure the consumer by putting a duty upon wastes and upon shoddy.

But, even with that duty upon wastes and shoddy, and even with wool free, the importations increased over 2,000 per cent in one year after the passage of the law of 1894. We were importing annually in rags and shoddy something like a quarter-million pounds, and before the end of the first year in which that law prevailed we were importing at the rate of over 17,000,000 pounds per year, and this, too, with the 15 per cent ad valorem on shoddy and with wool free.

Mr. DOLLIVER. A few weeks ago, when I ventured to express in the Senate some views about this wool schedule, I encountered a rather peculiar storm of criticism. I thought in my guileless inexperience that when the Republican party talked about revising the tariff it must certainly have been in their minds that this schedule, which has survived for fifty years practically without any change——

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that that statement might be true as a general proposition. There is one of the wastes for which the Senator is pleading that was reduced 50 per cent in the Dingley law from the McKinley law.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, these wastes in manufacturing yarns can not be so important after all. They certainly can not be as important as this English washed wool and Canadian wool, which my friend has dismissed as unworthy of any further discussion.

Mr. WARREN. One of those wastes amounts in each year to several times the total amount of importations of No. 2 wool; just one of those wastes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I was, of course, confused a little when I found myself turned on by our great party leader in the Senate and found the RECORD littered up with a lot of old speeches, Democratic in their origin and purpose, made here years ago. I do not know whether the Senator intended to accuse me of stealing these speeches or simply following the ideas that were suggested in them. In either case I thought it was a very curious proceeding to leave the impression upon the Senate that I was exploiting here some raw, crude views that had been left over in an old debate in the Senate of the United States, in which Democratic leaders mainly had participated. So I have taken the liberty to reduce to writing a conversation with the editor of the Textile World Record, of Boston, who began his life on a farm, continued it in every stage of woolen manufacture in the greatest mills of New England, and finally, in the development of extraordinary knowledge of the subject, came to be the editor of the trade journal of the wool manufacturing world of America, and, as I have more than once described him, he is the most reliable and least partisan expert on these questions now living in the United States.

I want to have read at the Clerk's desk what he said, because it is a series of questions and answers, and if Senators who are listening so kindly to me will listen to him they will get a good deal more light on this subject than they will acquire either from this desk, or from the desk of the Senator from Utah, or that of the Senator from Wyoming. I ask that this dialogue be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read, if there be no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. May I——

Mr. DOLLIVER. Because the amendments which I have offered are suggested by the wisdom which is suggested by this great textile editor, and they are not inspired from any Democratic sources, because this man is one of the leading Republicans of New England, and is a protectionist who has defended the faith without fear and without reproach.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply want to say to the Senator from Iowa that Mr. Dale was employed by the Merchants' Wool Company, of Dedham, Mass., and remained there about two years and four months. Mr. Dale, with all of the protection given to the wool industry, has never made a success of it in this country.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not now think, after my friend confessed a failure of his own woolen mills, he ought to be heard to disparage the business career of others.

Mr. SMOOT. No; as long as I was manager of the woolen mill it ran and never shut down, and within the last few years——

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is certainly just as becoming for an editor——

Mr. SMOOT. I ran the mill for twenty years.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is just as becoming for an editor of a great textile journal to be heard here, who is a nonpartisan witness in these matters, as it is to have our attentions directed to the judgment and opinion of a retired wool merchant, who has added the graces of statesmanship to the achievements of a long business career.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to thank the Senator from Iowa for his kind words, but I certainly did not go from the manufacture of woolens after making a failure of it to become the editor of a paper to tell men how to run woolen mills.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Senator locked up his woolen mill and came to the Senate, and Mr. Dale seems to have retired from the woolen mill and gone into the editorial chair. I think at least from his own statement they stand upon a common footing.

Mr. SMOOT. The statement made by the Senator is altogether wrong. I have been here in the Senate for six years and more and the mill was run three years after I quit the management of it. When I did leave it I want to say that woolens were then in the height of fashion and we were running night and day. We never closed the mill, and we could not furnish enough woolen goods to the customers we had. But at that time woolens were fashionable and were demanded by the American people. I believe, as I said before, that it will not be long until they will be fashionable again, and then every woolen mill in Maine and every other State will be fully employed.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. Is it because these people have begun to use mercerized goods that they have abandoned the use of wools?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course the Senator knows that wool is not mercerized. There is no need of trying to answer the question, because I take it as a little pleasantry on the part of the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the matter sent to the desk by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Before the Secretary reads, I wish to say I am very glad that the Senator from Rhode Island is here. I have no hope, I say, of being able to push my views upon the committee or upon the Senate, but I have a very grave anxiety that this schedule, which has remained practically in the same form for so many years—more than a generation—should be included in our scheme of revision of the tariff. If it is not amended in the Senate, if the House propositions are accepted, then it is not in conference. I have a hope, based upon my anxiety to solidify and harmonize our views, that some measure will be taken to give jurisdiction to the conference committee of the disputed matters in the woolen schedule, so that at their leisure and without the disturbance of debate and controversy they may sit down and make at least a few revisions along the lines which I have suggested.

Therefore I am exceedingly anxious that the Senator from Rhode Island, who is engrossed with a thousand cares in the Chamber and outside, should hear not what I say, but what is said by this authority, the editor of the Textile World, who has carried into the subject his investigations into all departments, standardizing wools, examining them, and studying them with patient research now for more than twenty years.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know the gentleman to whom the Senator refers.

Mr. DOLLIVER. He is the editor of the Textile World, of Boston.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have never heard of him, but I have no doubt he is an authority.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is in the hands of the entire cotton and woolen trade of the United States, I believe. The newspaper is almost as large as your tariff bill, on account of the advertisements it carries in all departments of textile industry.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is probably because I have not been familiar with the literature on this subject recently, but I never happened to hear of either the newspaper or the editor.

Mr. FLINT. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will not place too much weight on this article of the editor. The Senator from Utah, who knows him, states that he was formerly in the wool business and failed and left it to go into the newspaper business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Q. Will you state what the present condition of the woolen manufacturing industry is in the United States at present?—A. The worsted business is very prosperous and developing rapidly, while the carded woolen industry is very much depressed. This depression is due to two causes: First, the greater popularity of smooth, hard-faced finish for which worsteds are adapted; second, the fact that the carded woolen mills are excluded from access to the foreign wools adapted to their goods, while the worsted mills have a comparatively easy access to such sources of supply. These conditions have forced the carded woolen mills into idleness or to the use of wool substitutes and have stimulated the manufacture of inferior fabrics known as "cotton worsteds," made principally of cotton yarn with a small amount of worsted. These cotton worsteds are attractive to the eye before being worn, but they do not protect the body against cold and damp and make a generally unsatisfactory garment.

Q. What materials are open to the manufacturer of carded woolen cloth besides new wool?—A. There are noils and the wastes from the manufacture of wool, and the material commonly known as "shoddy," which is made by tearing into a loose, fluffy, fibrous mass suitable for reworking into cloth the tailors' clippings and the woolen rags that are collected around the country. The use of these materials is essential, because the supply of new wool is entirely inadequate to clothe the people. As careful an estimate as I have been able to make from the best statistics available shows that if all the wool grown in the world were converted into cloth, without the admixture of any other material, and distributed pro rata among the people who inhabit the globe outside the Tropics, where very little wool cloth is required, the annual per capita share would be 14 ounces of pure wool cloth. The production of wool in the United States, if divided among the people of the United States, would amount to practically the same quantity—14 ounces—of pure wool cloth for each person. This is little more than enough for a breechcloth. The ordinary light-weight cloth weighs about 14 ounces per yard, 55 inches wide. A suit of clothes requires 3½ yards. A man's share of the wool clip is, therefore, enough cloth to make a light-weight suit every three and one-half years.

Q. What effect on the clothing, bedding, and household furnishings of the people has this situation which you describe produced, and what would be its ultimate effect upon the woolgrowing industry?—A. It has deprived the people of an adequate supply of wool clothing, blankets, and other articles of wool. It has compelled the use of inferior substitutes for wool, which do not give the protection against dampness and changes in temperature that is afforded by wool. It has forced manufacturers to reduce the weight of all-wool cloths, so that these goods, although made of wool only, fail to give proper protection to the wearer. The prohibitory duties on wool wastes, noils, and similar materials restrict the mills to the comparatively limited domestic supply of these materials, so that the goods made of wool substitutes are much inferior to what they would be if a supply of the better grades of wool substitutes were made available by an equitable duty on these materials. The prohibitory duty on the heavy shrinking wools and on wool substitutes suited for the lower-priced goods and the low duties on the light shrinking wools suited for the higher-priced goods make it difficult to produce warm and durable wool garments at a low cost and at the same time facilitate the production of the high-priced cloths. My judgment is that these conditions will ultimately bring the tariff on wool and wool goods into such popular disfavor as may result in the violent removal of all duties on wool and its substitutes, as was the case in 1894, and that, therefore, the ultimate effect of these conditions is likely to be very injurious to the domestic woolgrowing industry.

Q. You spoke of the manufacturers of carded woolens being driven to the use of certain waste and by-products; you mentioned particularly noils. Taking the sample of English wool which we have here, and which you say enters at 12 cents a pound washed, and pays a duty of only 15 cents on the contents of the scoured pound, owing to its light shrinkage, I will ask you to trace that wool from the condition in which we have it here to the cloth or dress goods for which it is adapted, stating as you go along what waste arises in the various processes of manufacture.—A. The first process is scouring. The waste from scouring wool runs almost invariably to waste in the stream, so that it need not be taken into consideration. The next process is carding; the waste here is a very small percentage of the weight of the wool, and its value is low, owing to the dirt and grease clinging to it. The next process is combing, which divides the wool into two parts, the long fiber called "tops" and the short fiber called "noils." The noils can not be used by the worsted mills and are therefore sold as a raw material for the carded woolen mills. The tops are converted into worsted, the process after combing being drawing; a comparatively small quantity of slubbing waste is produced in this process. The drawing process converts the tops into roving, and in the last operation of drawing a small quantity of roving waste is made. The roving is spun and twisted into yarn. During this process and in the subsequent operations of spooling, warping, and weaving a quantity of yarn waste is made. This is run through a garnett machine which converts it into a loose fibrous mass known as "garnetted waste."

Q. These wastes are, therefore, a sort of by-product in the manufacture of worsteds, and do not arise in the conversion of wool into woolen goods?—A. Wastes are made in the carded woolen manufacture, but they are of a different quality and character entirely.

Q. What becomes of these latter wastes?—A. They are used over again by the carded woolen manufacturers.

Q. Now, if I understand you, these wastes, noils, slubbing wastes, roving wastes, and garnetted wastes are sold by the worsted factories to the carded wool people?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What are noils worth now a pound?—A. Prices vary widely with the quality and state of the market. They vary from 15 to 50 cents per pound, and some perhaps higher.

Q. What are these noils worth abroad?—A. I recently received a large number of samples of noils and worsted waste from Bradford, England. Following is a list of them, with prices, at Bradford:

Memorandum of prices of foreign noils, waste, and shoddy.

		d.	Cts.
2540.	Crossbred 40s noils	6¼	=12½
2541.	Crossbred 40s noils	7	=14
2537.	Crossbred 40s noils	7½	=15
2534.	Crossbred 44s noils	8¼	=16½
2536.	Sliped New Zealand noils	8½	=17
2535.	Crossbred 46s noils	8¾	=17½
2539.	50s noils	9¾	=19½
2533.	Lister-combed English noils	10	=20
2532.	Lister-combed English noils	10¼	=20½
26.	Australian crossbred 56/58s noils	11½	=23½
27.	Australian Botany noils	15¾	=31½
28.	Cape Holden's dry combed noils	16½	=33
25.	Australian 80s noils	17½	=35
3155.	Carded light waste	11	=22
2880.	Medium olive, medium shoddy	7½	=15
2990.	Wd. carb. light shoddy	11	=22
2785.	Wd. medium black shoddy	11	=22
2469.	Fine fancy comforters, shoddy	8	=16
2.	Dyed black-brown mungo	4¼	= 8½
3.	Dyed green mungo	4¼	= 8½
6.	Green cheviots, shoddy	3¼	= 6½
4.	Dyed black-brown cheviots, shoddy	3¼	= 6½
1.	Dyed green medium worsteds, shoddy	4	= 8
5.	Dyed light green medium worsteds, shoddy	4½	= 9
7.	White merino noils	14½	=29
8.	English blanket noils	10	=20
9.	English noils	8¼	=16½
10.	English noils	8	=16
11.	English noils	7½	=15
12.	English Down noils	10¾	=21½
13.	Pulled white hosiery waste	10½	=21
14.	Colored hosiery waste	11½	=23
15.	Gray hosiery waste	10¼	=20½
16.	Colored waste, carded	6½	=13
17.	White waste	10¼	=20½
18.	Gray waste, carded	7½	=15
19.	White Botany waste	17½	=35
20.	Colored crossbred	9½	=19
21.	Colored Botany	19½	=39
22.	Carbonized black serge, pulled	3½	= 7
23.	Carbonized black worsted	4½	= 9
24.	New black worsted, carded	5¼	=10½

NOTE.—The trade discount on noils, 7 to 12, inclusive, is 1¼ per cent, payment one month; also on tops, from 13 to 21, inclusive, terms net.

* * * * * * *

Q. I wish to talk with you a little about the framework of Schedule K, as it relates to the specific duties applicable to the weight of cloths and dress goods manufactured here. Have you ever studied the question of whether the multiples of 3 and 4 by which this compensatory duty on cloth as related to the duties on wools of the first class has been calculated for so many years?—A. Yes; I have.

Q. I would like to know what conclusions you have reached about that?—A. You will find my conclusions in this article, "How much wool to make a pound of cloth?" No tariff on wool goods should be based on a ratio between grease wool and finished cloth. As well might one attempt to fix a ratio between iron ore and watch springs. No wool manufacturer attempts to estimate the cost of his finished fabrics from the cost of the grease wool. Such a basis would result in gross errors and ultimate bankruptcy. In buying grease wool, the first considerations are the amount of scoured wool that the grease wool will yield, and the intrinsic worth of the scoured fiber. About twenty years ago I made an extensive test to determine the shrinkage in manufacturing all-wool cloth, and the result was that 1.54 pounds of scoured wool was required for 1 pound of cloth. The ratio between the grease wool and the finished cloth varies widely because of the difference in the shrinkage of wool in scouring. During the four years I was making the test referred to, I used many different lots of wool which varied widely in shrinkage. This variation of shrinkage is illustrated by 6 lots of grease wool, which in scouring shrank 76, 69, 62, 47, 35, and 16 per cent, respectively. Calculating the ratio between these lots of grease wool and the finished cloth from the ratio of 1.54 between the scoured wool and the finished cloth, we find the following ratios between the grease wool and the finished cloth: 6⅔, 5, 4, 3, 2⅔, and 1⅞. This shows plainly that no single ratio can be true of all kinds of wool.

Q. What do you say, then, of the scheme of fixing these compensatory duties as this bill does, on the ratio of 4 to 1, and in the lower grades of 3 to 1? How does that work out?—A. It causes great inequalities in the tariff especially because the ratios named are applied not only to goods made of all wool, but to goods made of mixtures of wool and other materials.

Q. What do you say, then, of the scheme of fixing these compensatory on account of the wool duty, when in point of fact little or no wool appears in the cloth which he makes?—A. There is, of course, no reason for compensating a manufacturer for duties paid on wool that is not used in the manufacture of the cloth. The 4 to 1 ratio between grease wool and cloth is correct only for all-wool cloth made of wool shrinking 60 to 65 per cent. As a matter of fact, no wool shrinking as much as that is imported into the United States. The specific duty of 11 or 12 cents a pound on grease wool forces manufacturers to confine their purchases of foreign wool to the light-shrinking lots. Consequently, the Dingley and Payne bills compensate the manufacturer for wool duties which he has never paid. The defenders of the 4 to 1 ratio sometimes seek to justify it by referring to or paraphrasing Senator ALDRICH'S defense of it twelve years ago. Thus one of them recently said to me: "We need compensation at the rate of 4 to 1 because our foreign competitors use these heavy wools." The large amount of grease and dirt in the heavy-shrinking wools is no advantage to the foreign manufacturer. Wool cloth is made from the wool fiber, not from wool grease and dirt. There can be no justification for compensating for wool duties that have not been paid.

Q. I have no purpose to expose any branch of the woolen manufacturing business of this country to injurious foreign competition, nor any purpose to take away from the woolgrower a fairly advantageous protective tariff; but I have been wondering whether a more equitable basis for the assessment of compensatory duties can not be found, and the result of my reflections upon it has led me to prepare some amendments to the Senate bill running through the schedules of cloths and women's and children's goods, so far as they can be made applicable, by which it is proposed to preserve the ratio of 4 to 1 between grease wool and cloth, and 3 to 1 where that ratio appears, and make the compensatory duty applicable, not to the weight of the cloth, but to the weight of the wool contents of the cloth, which I am informed, can be accurately determined by the analytical bureau connected with the appraiser's office. Have you ever reached a conclusion upon that subject?—A. I have, and was going to suggest that very thing to you; that it is easy to distinguish wool from vegetable materials, and that if that were done it would go far toward correcting the inequality resulting from the 4 and 3 to 1 ratios. It, however, would still leave the inequalities resulting from the wide difference in the shrinkage of wool in scouring and also from the different shrinkages in the conversion of the scoured wool into cloth. The shrinkage from the scoured wool to the finished cloth is by no means uniform, but varies somewhat on different fabrics.

Q. I have caused several calculations to be made of the effect of that change in the law. I find no case in which it appears to increase the existing rates of duty; but on the other hand, it materially reduces the rates of duty, particularly upon the ordinary grades consumed by the masses of the people, both of woolen cloths and dress goods. It eliminates from the woolen schedule rates of duty which are apparently inordinately high, rising sometimes to 150 per cent, and brings all duties on manufactured woolens substantially below the present rates. What effect, in your judgment, would such slight reductions as I have indicated have upon the rates from the standpoint of adequate protection? In other words, what, in your judgment, should be the maximum rates provided for the finished products of Schedule K?—A. The extremely high rates on wool goods which you mention are due largely to the excess of the compensatory duty over the compensation actually required to cover the duty on the raw material consumed in the manufacture of the goods. Such excess is not needed to protect the manufacturer, and consequently the removal of that excess could not injure the manufacturer. The injury to him would result from a continuance of this excess due to protection concealed in the compensatory duties, as the high rates invite attack on the protective system. Limiting the compensatory duties to the wool contents of the cloth, as you propose, would reduce the excess, and therefore would be a step in the right direction. It would, however, still leave an excess of compensation due to the use of light shrinking wools of which less than 4 pounds is required for 1 pound of cloth, and to the use of wool substitutes, such as noils, waste, shoddy, and so forth. These wool substitutes can not be distinguished from new wool in the finished cloth, and consequently would be returned as part of the wool contents of the cloth, on which the 4 to 1 compensatory rate would apply. But your plan would reduce the excess of compensatory duties and could not increase it in any case, and for that reason should be adopted if a better and more thorough method is not adopted.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President——

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to make a statement?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I only want to make one observation as to the article (interview with Samuel S. Dale, editor of the Textile Record) which has just been read; and that is, that it deals in the extraordinary rather than the ordinary. For instance, the statement is made that upon a double width of cloth it takes 3½ yards to make a suit of clothes and that it weighs 14 ounces to the yard. That may be true of some suits of clothes for some men; but 3 yards to the clothing maker is sufficient to make any of the suits that he makes, on the average, including the small and the large.

Again, I doubt very much whether there is a piece of worsted goods upon any Senator's back here at present that will weigh 14 ounces per yard. As to this suit that I have on myself, I weighed the cloth carefully before it was made; it was about as good as I could get, and it weighs but 12 ounces to the yard. It took a little over 3 yards to make it—possibly 3½—and I am somewhat larger than the majority of men.

When the question is asked about the waste, the Senator from Iowa asked if noils and slubbing waste, and so forth, are used by the carded-wool men, and he says "yes." If the Senator had asked if it was the usual practice for a worsted man to sell those wastes, except noils, he, of course, would have to say "no," for they are not often sold by the worsted men and are not usually bought by the carded-wool men, because they can not afford to buy them. The wastes, garnetted wastes, slubbing wastes, and so forth, as I said before, are a refinement of wool that comes off in one process, goes back and is worked in another, and is just as good as the original, and is worth, pound for pound, as much.

As to the price of noils, while I am not going to say that Mr. Dale, whose name has been used, would willingly state an untruth, undoubtedly a man interested in a business is likely to use those figures which best suit his purpose. He quoted from the price of noils abroad. I will not say to you, Mr. President; I will not say to the Senator from Iowa; I will not say to anybody that Mr. Dale gave the entire list of the prices of noils. He may have given it just as the firm abroad quoted it, but I have in my hand the latest market price of noils here. You may mark them in a range from one end to the other, from the cheapest to the highest, and this list gives the price of noils in Boston on June 5. We find they are quoted as low as 27 cents, 30 cents, 35 cents, and 38 cents, and yet

they run as high as 67 and even 70 cents. The consequence is that the range for noils runs from 27 cents to 70 cents in Boston. Of course, the range is in proportion abroad. Yet the statement submitted does not show the high-priced noils.

Mr. SMOOT. And, Mr. President, that is according to the grade of wool that is in the noils.

Mr. WARREN. So I want to say, without casting any reflection upon Mr. Dale, that he has, in the matter of noils and in the matter of cloth and in the matter of wool, undertaken in his paper to attack the manufacturers and show that the compensation of 3 to 1 and 4 to 1 is wrong, and yet, according to his own figures, he shows that it takes 6¾ to 1 in some cases as a compensatory duty.

He gives the shrinkage of wool in that statement. Why, Mr. President, the shrinkage of wool will run all the way from 1 per cent to 90 per cent, but that is not an average. I have seen wool where there was 18 per cent shrinkage in washing, and again where it was not over 10 per cent, and other cases where there was nearly 90 per cent shrinkage. I have seen wool that would shrink 10 per cent, possibly, or 12 per cent; but I submit that those are not fair statements as applied to the general market or to the general product.

The shrinkage in wool is well known. The carded-wool men, in their statement to the President, have said that the worsted men are using wool that shrinks 14 per cent. They know just as well as I know that there is not wool enough of that kind to last the worsted manufacturers in this country for one week. They know, furthermore, that that wool does not go into men's clothing. They know that that wool comes over here and goes into luster goods and braids, and so forth; and they know that the wools that go into worsteds are brought from South America and from other points, and that their shrinkage seldom, if ever, goes below 32 per cent, and from that up to 66 per cent. So it is begging the question, when this position of the carded-wool men is put before us, to say that the worsted man gets in his wool for his manufacture at 14 per cent shrinkage.

Again, when this arrangement of ratios was first established, as stated by the Senator from Montana, it was established by the carded-wool men themselves; and it has remained that way without very much change ever since. If it is unfair now to the carded-wool men, then it was unfair when they sought to have it made.

It is said again that the worsted men construct their goods from No. 2 wool, as if they could not do it from other wool. I have here, and will show it before we leave this question, about as mean a sample of tag locks as I ever saw in my life, and in almost every year of my life I have seen sheep shorn. That sample has passed through a Noble comb and the product is top and noils the same as if it were No. 1 or No. 2, only of a lower grade. I assert that there is not 1 per cent of the wool raised in this country that can not go into worsted top and noils and that does not go into worsted, because while heretofore they only had combs that took the very long wools, we now have the Heilmann comb, and we have the Noble comb.

All this talk about waste and noils, all of this making faces at No. 2 is nonsense, because there are no noils of any consequence in No. 2. Noils are simply short wool, the fibers of which are not long enough to go into yarn for worsteds. When you take the regular long No. 2 wool there are no noils of consequence. Only one-sixth of the wool goes into noils, even of ordinary short wools. The tags that I shall show later were shrunk 80 per cent in scouring, and in making top yielded 37 per cent noils. They are simply short pieces of wool, and look like the rakings of the yard. They are clipped from certain portions of the sheep.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I inquire the present parliamentary status of paragraph 365, and likewise paragraph 366 as amended? Have both been adopted?

Mr. WARREN. Those paragraphs have already been adopted up to paragraph 368.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Those have all been agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. Then, with reference to paragraph 368?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the paragraph under consideration, to which an amendment is pending.

Mr. CARTER. That is the amendment pending, and the amendment to which the Senator from Iowa directed his attention.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, so that——

Mr. CARTER. Does the Senator desire to proceed?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I had just yielded the floor to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I would say I simply asked the Senator from Iowa to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I very gladly yield to the Senator from Montana, but I desire to retain the floor for a moment or two after he is through.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the word "waste" implies inferiority in quality, and the natural implication to be drawn from the phraseology of this paragraph would be that the form in which wool appears as slubbing waste, or top waste, or roving waste, or ring waste, or garnetted waste represents a quality of wool inferior in character to the scoured wool. It must be borne in mind, in considering this paragraph or the committee amendments proposed to it, that the Senate and the House are in agreement on 11 cents per pound on unwashed wool of the first class. It must also be taken into consideration that the various definitions preceding paragraph 365 have been adopted by the Senate as they came from the House.

It is important, in attempting to fairly pass upon the amendment of the Senate, to determine the quality of the waste referred to as compared with the scoured wool. The bill provides that, as to the first-class wool in the grease, 11 cents per pound of duty shall be assessed; first-class wool, washed, 22 cents per pound; first-class wool, scoured, 33 cents per pound; or, in other words, 3 pounds of unwashed wool are taken as the equivalent of 1 pound of scoured wool, and 1 pound of washed wool is regarded as the equivalent of 2 pounds of unwashed wool. This classification or definition of the relation is based upon the theory that the wools of this country of the first class practically shrink two-thirds in scouring, and will shrink one-half in the process of washing on the back of the sheep.

In order, therefore, to determine the relation of the wastes described in this amendment to either the washed wool or the scoured wool or the wool in the grease, it is important to examine the process of manufacture. I have here, Mr. President, a series of samples. The first [exhibiting] shows wool in the grease, upon which the duty is 11 cents per pound, made so in this bill by concurrent action of the two Houses.

The second [exhibiting] is the scoured article, upon which we have agreed to place a duty of 33 cents a pound. For the purposes of this discussion, I will refer only hereafter to the scoured wool and the relation thereof to the various so-called "by-products." This scoured wool [exhibiting] in the process of manufacturing what is called "worsted goods" is carded and combed, and the process of carding and combing evolves what we know as "tops," wool in this refined form [exhibiting] and in long strands.

In order to produce these tops the process of carding and combing eliminates what is known as "noils"—short fibers carded and combed out of the scoured wool. These noils, together with certain other refuse matter of a very inferior grade, consisting of every kind of impurity in the scoured wool, amount to about one-sixth of all the weight of the scoured wool. So that this top [exhibiting] represents the purified form of the scoured wool, all noils and other impurities being eliminated from the scoured wool to produce the tops in the process of manufacture. These tops are finally advanced into what is called "slubbing" [exhibiting], which merely means another stage of advance toward yarn. In rolling these tops into balls, if you please, it occurs that the lengths do not always come out even, and in order that the lengths may be made even the operatives tear off pieces from the end [exhibiting], and that is called "top waste." It is the same identical material as the tops. It is free from noils, and it is free from all the impurities contained in the scoured wool. The noils and impurities make up one-sixth of the waste of the scoured wool.

We have agreed to place 33 cents per pound duty on the scoured wool [exhibiting], and yet the Senator from Iowa thinks we should preserve proportions by taking this refined product of scoured wool and giving it a duty of 20 cents per pound.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. CARTER. I am glad to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it not true that the wool out of which those tops was made is liable to come in here with a duty upon the scoured contents of a pound very much less than 33 cents?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I will address myself to that feature of this schedule a little later. There is a virtue in the contention of the Senator in that behalf. It is inherent in the effort which always obtains to secure an agreement between contending forces.

This is what is known as the "slubbing waste" [exhibiting]. The slubbing is the same identical quality of wool as the top. This has advanced just one stage further toward a yarn than the top. In the process of forwarding this slubbing to yarn it occurs, just as in the other case, that certain strands are now and then found of unequal lengths, and pieces are left on the coils in order to make uniform lengths, and the pieces thus resulting, longer as a rule than the others—that is, the top waste—become known as "slubbing waste."

This slubbing waste, as I say, is of the same quality as the top waste, and both the top waste and the slubbing waste are superior in quality to the scoured wool. The Senator would place only 20 cents protective duty on this refined article in the same bill in which by common consent 33 cents per pound is pronounced a necessary protective duty on the raw article out of which this was made.

The same is true of garnetted wastes and the various wastes referred to in this amendment. I will not detain the Senate by going through the various wastes—the ring waste and the roving waste and the various wastes presented.

A little beyond the slubbing waste comes what is known as the roving waste. That is yarn in the initial stage, after passing from the form of slubbing. This [exhibiting] you will observe is a coarse yarn. This is called "roving," and in the course of trimming these rovings down into yarn, the single yarn, which is the refined product, and the 2-ply yarn, which is a little coarser, there is worked off a certain part of this slubbing, and that becomes known as "roving waste." It does not change in any sense or degree in quality from the material of which the top and the slubbing wastes are made. It is equally refined. It happens to be eliminated in the process of manufacture. The Senator would have us place 20 cents per pound as an alleged protective duty upon this refined article, while insisting that 33 cents per pound is a necessary duty on the scoured wool.

I am not now dealing with noils, be it known. These noils, cut out of the scoured wool, constitute about one-sixth of its weight, and I am informed that this product is worth only about 60 per cent of the market value of scoured wool. It is a shorter fiber, but useful; not in the worsted manufacture, because the fiber is too short for use in that class of manufacture, but it does become useful in the manufacture of so-called "carded woolens," and is a by-product sold to the carded woolen manufacturers.

Not so, sir, with the so-called "waste," called "slubbing," and "top waste," because the slubbing waste and the top waste are each in regular order and without any considerable expense thrown back into this long strand known as "tops" and run through the mill again until they end up in yarns and finally in cloth.

Mr. President, we are confronted with this situation by the proposal of the Senator from Iowa—either the 33 cents per pound duty on the scoured wool is too high or the proposed protective duty on the refined product of scoured wool is too low.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President——

Mr. CARTER. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I used to think that the duty on scoured wool was 33 cents a pound. I got that notion from reading the statutes, and I find that the statute has made that kind of an impression on several other good people. But a little association with people who have become accustomed to paying these duties and understand the mechanism of the market as well as the mechanism of the tariff bill has convinced me that the duty of 33 cents a pound on scoured wool is a mythical sort of thing.

The actual duty, the actual amount of money that it costs a man to get wool into this country is not based upon that rate. It is based upon the shrinkage of the wool. If a man brings in a wool that shrinks 70 per cent, he actually pays 36⅔ cents as duty upon the scoured contents of that fleece, and if he brings in here wool that shrinks only 20 per cent he actually pays only 15 cents a pound on the scoured contents of the fleece. Therefore I hope the Senator from Montana, who is now getting along in years, will not spend the remainder of his great career in laboring under the hallucination that that statute has fixed the amount that it costs people to get a scoured pound of wool into the United States.

Mr. CARTER. I have heretofore taken occasion to state that there is an element of virtue in the contention of the Senator from Iowa in that particular. It is true, undoubtedly, that the 33 cents per pound is guaranteed as a protective duty on the scoured wool only where the wool shrinks 66⅔ per cent, or thereabouts—66 or more. Certain wool shrinks less than 66 per cent, some as low as 30 per cent, and possibly some wools lower than that still.

This classification or fixing of the proportions is of ancient origin—as old as our legislative history goes. In 1867 a tariff commission reported on the proper basis for the wool schedule, and the due proportions of duty to be laid on the wool in the grease, the washed wool, and the scoured wool. That commission reported that the wools of the United States did shrink then as they do now, substantially 66 per cent. That is not true of all, but true of the great body of clothing wool known as "merino wool." Certain wools which shrink less are brought into our market and substituted for the first-class American wools to some extent, and to the extent that the substitution occurs, it proves injurious to the American woolgrower by reducing the nominal duty to a lower actual duty than that contemplated by the law.

But there is another view to be taken of this. First, that the low-shrinking wools of Canada and England are not generally used in the manufacture of worsted goods. But, as stated by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], they go, as a rule, into the manufacture of certain lustrous fabrics and do not compete with our clothing wools at all or with the worsted goods to any considerable extent.

One test which may be applied in the midst of the wilderness of contentions is the test produced by experience. We do know that under the present arrangement of these schedules the woolen industry prospered in this country from the enactment of the law of 1867 until it was changed or made applicable to different conditions in 1883.

Under the tariff of 1883 the domain of the American woolgrower was invaded by foreign competition to such an extent that our flocks were, as they always are under evil conditions, sent to the slaughter. Under the McKinley bill, which corrected the defects of the law of 1883, the number of sheep and the pounds of wool of American origin gradually increased. Under the Wilson tariff law our flocks almost disappeared in open competition with the world. The cutting down of the flocks was cruel, constant, and disastrous to the American woolgrower.

When the Dingley bill was passed we observed an immediate return to a steady increase, and if this increase is continued for the next ten years, we will be producing in this country every pound of wool required for the clothing of the American people.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If it will not disturb the Senator I should like the cooperation of the Senator from Montana to get an adequate protection on such wools as are produced on the farms of the Mississippi Valley, and those who are expert in the matter tell me, inasmuch as our wools are the English wools, this failure of Congress to put them upon a plane of equality with the clothing wools has operated almost fatally upon our wool industries, as was stated in the letter which I had read from the president of the Minnesota Woolgrowers' Association. May we have the cooperation of the Senator from Montana in putting clothing wools and combing wools upon the same basis in this tariff law?

Mr. CARTER. If the Senator needs cooperation in placing the so-called second-class wools in better relation to the protective tariff, I will be glad to cooperate with the Senator.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Our trouble is this: We have these English combing wools for sale. People come from all over the country to buy them or we send them to the wool markets for sale. They buy them, but they never pay us more for them than 15 cents above the London price of similar wools. The result is, whenever we think we are going to make money, when there is a scarcity of or a special demand for wool our prices rise gradually, but when it reaches 15 cents above the level of the London price the demand for our wool ceases altogether and our customers turn their attention to the London wool market, thereby creating what one of our oldest farmers describes to me as an automatic retarder of the price of the wool we are raising, a retarder that is working night and day.

Mr. CARTER. The class of wools referred to by the Senator are produced from mutton sheep. They are produced from flocks near the market, and are a coarse grade of wool and of limited use. I would be glad to cooperate, however, in a movement which would give the American farmer raising these mutton sheep all the protection he needs to develop that great industry in competition with the outside, on favorable terms fixed by our tariff laws.

I think it is a matter of very grave importance, aside from the production of wool, to maintain a healthy growth in the raising of sheep, because the mutton sheep is one of our staple sources of food supply, as well as a reliable source of supply for our clothing. I would be glad to see on every farm in this country a band of sheep as a guaranty not only of clothing wool, but of a meat supply; and as an assurance that the soil of the country would be bettered by running the sheep upon its pastures.

But I desire to ask the Senator how he expects to benefit the raiser of mutton sheep by putting the wool of this refined quality at 13 cents a pound lower in the tariff scale than the scoured wool?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Until a man knows——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CUMMINS in the chair). Will the Senator suspend, in order that the Chair may state what he understands the situation to be? The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has the floor, and he yielded temporarily to the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is all right if it is understood by Senators.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Senator from Iowa will not seek to recover the floor except upon equitable terms with the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. I am under many obligations to the Senator from Iowa for his indulgence.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is no use to talk to me about what the duty on that scoured wool is until you tell me what the shrinkage of the material out of which it was made actually was. It is not worth while to waste our time talking about 33 cents a scoured pound. The duty put on the scoured contents of that fleece was determined entirely by its shrinkage. For example, that wool came here unwashed at 12 cents a pound, and it had a very slight shrinkage after that, and the duty paid on the scoured contents in the fleece was not 33 cents a scoured pound, but between 14 and 15 cents a scoured pound. And yet on that wool, my honored friend, the Senator from Montana, would insist that when it rises to the dignity of a top waste it ought to command 33 cents a pound.

Mr. CARTER. Thirty.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Thirty cents a pound. He might just as well say 50. It bears no actual relation; and that leads me to say that I desire——

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. CARTER. It is for the Senator from Iowa to say.

Mr. WARREN. I merely wish to make one observation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I want to say to the Senator from Iowa that this repetition over and over again that these products are made from wool which shrinks 15 or 16 or 14 per cent is entirely erroneous. It can not be true. Only a small percentage, as I remarked before, less than 6 per cent——

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes; my friend did remark before——

Mr. WARREN. And that is true.

Mr. DOLLIVER. My friend remarked before——

Mr. WARREN. It matters not how many times it may be repeated.

Mr. DOLLIVER. My friend remarked before that the percentage of these wool wastes and wool substitutes imported was as great as the wool marked "second class."

Mr. WARREN. What is that?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I understood my friend to say that the wool waste imported equaled in value the amount of wool of class 2 that had been imported.

Mr. WARREN. I did not make that observation, but I quoted the price in this country of noils as reaching, in some cases, as high as 70 per cent. But I did not make the statement the Senator gives.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I understood the Senator from Wyoming, in his effort to emphasize the importance of these wool wastes and his effort to belittle the importance of class 2 wool, to say these wool wastes were a more important element in the wool market than the second-class wools themselves.

Mr. WARREN. I stated that in quantity the noils themselves amounted to more than the entire product imported of second-class wools.

Mr. DOLLIVER. And that led me to observe that the Estimated Revenues——

Mr. WARREN. I did not say imported, but the amount used here in this country.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have no figures about that, but I know there were 9,807,394 pounds of wool of class 2 imported into the United States in 1907.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; there was more than that, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Then the Senator corrects the official figures of the Government.

Mr. WARREN. No; I will say furthermore that there were less than half a million pounds of noils imported in the same year. But my observation as to the amount that went into consumption in this country is that there were more noils than second-class goods.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not know what sources of information the Senator has on that point. I wish I could get to some definite figures. The Senator's judgment is good, but I do not propose to spend another minute operating on even the judgment of good men when figures are available.

I wish to make another proposition to the Senator from Montana. We are here together in the presence of this great legislative assembly. Suppose I should offer an amendment placing the duty on wool and hair of the first and second classes in one paragraph, to be estimated, levied, and paid according to the shrinkage which would occur in scouring such wools, the ascertainment of such shrinkage to be made under such regulations as the Secretary will prescribe and levy duties like this. What would the Senator say to it? On wool and hair of the first and second classes, shrinking 65 per cent or more, 11 cents a pound; shrinking less than 65 per cent and not more than 55 per cent, 13 cents a pound; shrinking less than 55 per cent and not more than 45 per cent, 16 cents a pound; and so carrying the shrinkage down with the proportionate assessment, until finally upon shrinkage less than 15 per cent there shall be levied 33 cents a pound. What would the Senator say to that?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. To that I say that, in my judgment, if the basis proposed by the Senator from Iowa were presented as an original proposition, it would be infinitely superior from the woolgrowers' standpoint to that now provided by the statute. But I wish, with the Senator's indulgence, to say why, in my opinion, it is inexpedient to give adherence to that proposed amendment now.

In the first place, paragraph 365, which fixes the duty at 11 cents on first class, and 12 cents on second class, has been approved by the Senate as it came from the House. Preceding paragraphs have been adopted by the Senate as they came to us providing for the relation to which I have referred between wool in the grease or washed wool and scoured wool at 11, 22, and 33 cents.

Mr. DOLLIVER. When were those amendments adopted? I did not agree to that.

Mr. CARTER. I understand when we went over the bill the Senate agreed to those paragraphs.

Mr. DOLLIVER. With unanimous consent to reopen any paragraph that anybody desired.

Mr. CARTER. I suppose that could be done, but aside from a motion to reconsider, let me suggest to the Senator the reason. I represent, with my colleague, the largest wool-producing State in the Union.

Mr. WARREN. I beg the Senator's pardon, Wyoming——

Mr. CARTER. I know, but the figures are against Wyoming. Montana leads all the States in the production of wool.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that the figures of the department show that out of three years that was true of Montana in one year, and of Wyoming in the other two years. But there is very little difference, I will say to the Senator. There is a difference of less than 2,000, I think, in the number recorded.

Mr. CARTER. Wyoming has been doing handsomely, following our example, and I am very happy to know that. The adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa would throw this entire wool schedule into conference.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Would not that be an easy thing?

Mr. CARTER. It might be an easy thing to throw it in, but I do not know what would evolve from a conference. We do know that under the present law this great industry of supreme importance to all this country is prosperous; that our flocks are increasing in number; that they have increased from about 37,000,000 head of sheep in 1897 to about 60,000,000 head now; that our wool clip has run from something like 200,000,000 pounds within the last ten years up to 311,000,000 pounds annually. The increase has been healthy and continuous under the existing law, which we hope to reenact in the pending bill. With the fate of so many people, the fate of this great industry, hanging in the balance, I, for one, do not propose to cast the whole responsibility and practically the whole power to control this entire matter in the hands of any conference committee, if I can help it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, on the theory which the Senator from Montana has stated I have found a great deal of comfort for my own heart. He thinks it would be all right to more adequately take care of the sheep in all the Middle West. He thinks that schedule that I have proposed is infinitely better than the old schedule, and yet he fears that if the box is opened you can not tell after the things are out whether you will be able to get them all back in. I should like to ask him at what period in the history of the United States it is to be done? This tariff schedule has escaped on that theory for nearly fifty

years. When in the evolution of free institutions upon this continent is the time likely to become opportune for opening this schedule, as my friend has just opened the wool casket behind him and, picking out with some intelligence, brought it up to a modern day, picking out the things that have grown obsolete, reducing the things that have damaged the husbandry and have nearly destroyed the greatest and most influential branch of woolen manufacture in the United States, which have brought here the protests of the knitting industry of America?

When, in the history of this country, is the time likely to come when it will be possible to reduce this schedule without taking up the details of it as some of us have suggested here? Are we to be forever placed upon this old schedule, now half a century old, simply because the conference committee under our rules is liable to put things in and leave things out in a mysterious and complex manner that is hard to understand in advance?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I am warranted in hoping that the time will come when we may have placed upon the statute books a better classification for wool than that which now exists. This hope is born of the advance made by the Senator from Iowa, for in 1897, speaking of the identical schedule which he now would amend if he could, and if he could it would be well, the Senator from Iowa made some observations in the House, and they are so apt as indicating the progress of the Senator's mind and the basis of my hope that I will ask the Secretary to read them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

SENATOR DOLLIVER ON THE DINGLEY LAW, DELIVERED DURING CONSIDERATION OF PRESENT DINGLEY LAW.

The proposed bill reclassifies the clothing wool, notwithstanding the statement of my friend from Colorado [Mr. Bell] to the contrary. It puts in the class of clothing wool all the wools of the world that can be used for clothing wools, and it restores the protective rates of 1890, in order that the American flocks may not be further scattered and in order that agriculture may enter upon and possess this half-occupied field of domestic production. The existing law was ingeniously framed to give cheap wool to the factories, and it accomplished that, incidentally putting most of them into the hands of a receiver. [Laughter.] Therein lies a double affliction on the American farm, because no rate of duty, as my friend from South Carolina ought to know, is worth anything to the farmer unless the factories of the United States are busy, since the American clip must either be sold in the United States or kept over as a souvenir of legislative stupidity. [Laughter.]

The woolen factories of New England, which my friend from South Carolina talked about, never asked for free wool, and they accepted it with doubts and fears; nor is it too much to say that all their fears have been realized, for the statement made yesterday by our honored leader [Mr. Dingley] as to the effect of this legislation on the farm and factory and on the Treasury is fully corroborated by the official reports. It was intended only to slaughter the sheep; it has operated to slaughter the factories and to slaughter the Treasury. They said that the price of wool would be kept up by the activity of the mills and the revenues of the Government would be kept up by the activity of the custom-house. Their theory is as beautiful as any dream that ever grew in the imagination of man. We were not only to hold our own, but we were to go out with our free-wool cloth and divide with Bradford and Chemnitz the job of clothing the naked inhabitants of the earth. [Laughter.]

That was the theory. What has actually happened may be stated in a few plain words and figures. Ten million sheep driven to the slaughter; 80,000,000 pounds of American wool displaced in our own market; the importation of cloth multiplied by 2; half the woolen mills idle and locked up, and the other half on scant wages and short time; the Treasury of the United States $21,000,000 shy [laughter]; our choice and select gentlemen disporting themselves in German, English and French clothes, and the rest of us shinning around in overcoats purchased during Harrison's administration. [Applause and great laughter.]

Mr. MAGUIRE. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion, would not the remedy for that be to do away with the civil-service rules?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Possibly that might help in the case of some of the gentleman's constituents. [Laughter.] Now, gentlemen, we propose to stop the slaughter of American flocks. That is the first thing. We propose to reopen the doors of the American factory; that is the second thing; and we propose to put $40,000,000 into the Treasury every year instead of $20,000,000; that is the third thing. What we have done we have done in the face of the world and before the eyes of all men, and I tell you right now that, so far as I am concerned, I welcome the lightning calculators of the Democratic party to begin their figuring on the McKinley ad valorem [laughter], and I will tell you another thing, gentlemen: Your sympathy for the poor man compelled to work a week for his clothes and another week to get them out of the custom-house has grown somewhat stupid and ridiculous in the glare of experience.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator from Iowa, of course, would repeat that speech to-day, because I do not question nor do I wish to have anyone question his loyalty to the party or his loyalty to the great body of American woolgrowers on farm and ranch, but I do feel that since in 1897 the Senator approved the schedules of the present law, his rather pronounced advance in the science of framing a tariff bill as far as the wool schedule is concerned shows that in the future a sufficient number of Senators may become qualified by study to frame a scientific if not a perfect wool schedule.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, of course I appreciate the compliment which the Senator from Montana pays to me in saying that in the course of ten or fifteen years I have been able by diligence to pick up a few practical notions that I did not have twenty years ago.

I regret, however, that the Senator from Montana seems to be oblivious to the kind of tariff revision we were indulging in in 1897. We were revising the Wilson tariff law, which had put wool on the free list, and my remarks were directed to the effect of that proposition on the flocks and the factories and the Treasury.

I will say another thing to the Senator from Montana. I have not only in that time acquired some new notions about what ought to be done in these matters, but I am glad to see that my friend from Montana seems to have acquired practically the same notions, although he is afraid to let them out of the front yard by night for fear that they might be set upon by the wolves of the conference committee. Our ideas do not seem to differ enough to get up much of a joint debate. I believe that he is more afraid of the conference committee than I am.

Not only have I succeeded in acquiring some little knowledge about these matters since the Dingley tariff law was framed, but I have also acquired a rather more generous interpretation of the industrial and commercial situation of 1897 than I was accustomed in those days to put into my speeches either in the House of Representatives or upon the stump.

If I were called upon now, in the calm light of twelve years' reflection, to say that putting wool on the free list resulted in closing factories and destroying the flocks of the country and ruining the business of the country, I should hesitate to do it. It is a very wise man who can tell what was the cause of the industrial depression which burst in a panic upon the United States in all departments of its affairs in 1893. I have become satisfied that we, as Republican partisans, finding the argument too convenient, have exaggerated the relation of the tariff controversy to that great industrial crisis. It always was a little difficult to connect the panic of 1893 with the tariff act of 1894, in view of the fact that the event seemed to precede the cause in such a way as to put almost any ordinary man upon suspicion. So I am not going to discuss that question except to say that we have already had two or three mistakes made in this bill by misinterpreting the industrial con ditions of 1894, 1895, 1896, and 1897.

My honored friend from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] the other day brought tears to my eyes when he was making his magnificent plea for putting a duty on certain mineral ores, because he said under certain tariffs the mines were shut. We ought to know that the mines were shut, not because of certain particular tariffs, but because the business of the country and of the world was long prostrate in the midst of financial disaster up to that time unapproached in our commercial history. While all these things entered into it, I do not think that it was necessary to attribute all of it to the tariff, and certainly not all the trouble that happened to lead and paint and the consumption of such merchandise to the little change that had been effected in tariff schedules some years before. And so the closing of these factories and the falling off in the demand for sheep and a thousand things entered into it.

He is not a wise man in the interpretation of statistics or commercial and industrial history who attributes to one thing a result of world-wide significance, to the production of which a thousand causes, some of them too obscure even to observe, operated over a long period of time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to ask the Senator if he is not aware of the fact that while the sheep industry was ruined in this country, the importation of wool increased to the extent of over a hundred million pounds?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Oh, yes; after killing the sheep, before we could restore the flocks. I do not deny that putting wool upon the free list was a fatal error, injurious to the sheep industry in the United States. I never want to see it repeated. On the contrary, I offer here a proposition to enlarge and make certain the full measure of the protection which we have been laboring under the impression that we have been enjoying during the past twelve years without actually getting the benefit from it in most cases.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I have been listening carefully to what the Senator said about the effect of the panic of 1893-94, and so

forth. I think the Senator will agree with me that since the wool industry was established—and it is a very old industry—any attack on the tariff upon either raw wool or the manufactures of wool has caused a diminution of the number of sheep.

If the Senator has studied the statistics, he has found in every case, starting back before he and I were born, up to the present time, that the number of sheep have run down after every tariff act that affected unfavorably either the woolgrower or the manufacturer. So you can not argue away the loss of sheep that occurred between 1894 and 1897 on the premise that other business troubles than the admission of wool free entered into it. The fact is it takes only just one thing to drive the sheep down or up in numbers, and that is unfavorable or favorable legislation for wool and its product, and when I say its product I mean the manufactures of wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, there is some sound philosophy in what the Senator says, and it is only part of the general drift of what I have been trying myself to say. We make an error, I think, in attributing the business disaster of the fiscal year 1908 to any one cause. Our Democratic friends find it very convenient to say that it was caused by protection, or at least that protection was not able to prevent it, and technically they are correct in the last statement. We claim nothing of that sort had anything to do with it, and so we bandy with one another explanations about great movements in the commercial life of the whole world which none of us understand. If I were called upon now to repeat what I said as an enthusiastic youth in the House of Representatives many years ago, I would blue pencil a good many of the explanations I gave there for industrial conditions which surrounded our industries during that far-off period.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. DOLLIVER. With a delight I have not experienced for years. [Laughter.]

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, the Senator is always interesting, and always will be; and he was never more interesting than when I last heard him in our own State make a speech for which we are largely indebted for the phenomenal majority which we received in illuminating all the arguments upon which McKinley was elected and upon which our great success was due at that time. He stated that he would wipe out, put a blue pencil through, the speeches that he made twenty years ago in his salad days in the House of Representatives. As a mature statesman, as the star orator of the party, traversing the country, making speeches in the campaign of 1896, he made speeches which largely produced the result for which we are so grateful in looking back that they occurred. Would he pass a blue pencil through those speeches?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, when I spoke with the Senator I was reported in very brief fashion to the effect, "Mr. DOLLIVER" or "Mr. Dollinger" also spoke. I would be glad if I could get a blue pencil through that some time. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, I am afraid I will be charged with having occupied the floor all this time, but I have not yet said exactly what I propose to try to do. I propose to present an amendment which will eliminate the unnecessary distinction between wool of the first and second class, and which will assess the duty upon wool on the basis of its proportionate shrinkage, the duty rising as the wool shrinks less, until at last, when it does not shrink at all, it stands at 33 cents to the scoured pound. I do not expect it to pass, but——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understood the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] to say, when the Senator from Iowa presented his proposition, that he liked it better than the present law and would be glad to see it adopted but for fear of what might happen in the conference committee. Is that correct?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes; that is what the Senator said.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I was wondering if that was also the view of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think it is.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If it is, of course, and the Senator from Iowa, who has the floor and has the amendment, finds out from those two Senators that it is true that the only thing against the amendment is a fear of what might happen to it in conference committee, we might arrive at a conclusion very soon.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to the Senator from Indiana, I wish to state that that is not the reason why I would oppose any such proposition, but the reason is that it is absolutely impossible of administration. That is one objection. Another is that to administer it every pound of wool that comes into this country would have to be scoured.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, just a moment. I wish to put a question. Then the Senator thinks the Senator from Montana, who is a defender of the wool schedule, was wrong when he said a moment ago that he liked the amendment of the Senator from Iowa better than the present law.

Mr. SMOOT. He certainly was wrong, as far as my idea is concerned. I am going to tell the Senator from practical experience what this amendment would mean to a manufacturer. I think that is the proper way to consider this question.

Every manufacturer of woolen goods first wants to assort his own wool, and the success or failure of a woolen mill many times depends upon the assorting of wool. One man may have a half dozen grades; another man, a manufacturer of woolens, may have only three; another may have ten. The manufacturer wants to assort the wool for the particular goods that he makes to suit his own idea as to what the effect and result of the assortment will be.

This amendment is impossible of administration. Take one fleece of wool; I can take out of one fleece of wool five grades of wool. Who is going to administer the provision? Is it going to be assorted at the ports of New York or Boston, or whatever port it enters into the United States? Is it going to be scoured there?

Mr. President, there are hardly two manufacturers in the United States that scour their wool the same way or with the same process. Why? One, perchance, will want to scour with caustic soda, another with caustic potash, another with a manufactured article for scouring wool, all depending upon the judgment of the manufacturer.

Another thing, Mr. President, every manufacturer wants his wool in the grease.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator allow me a question there?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then I understand the Senator to say if it were capable of administration, if that difficulty were removed, the Senator would join the Senator from Montana in preferring the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the present law. Is that correct?

Mr. SMOOT. I would see no harm as to the ad valorem rate if such a thing could be administered properly, but it is impossible of administration.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; the Senator said that, but we are trying now to get down to a sort of issue. There seems to be an understanding that is being arrived at here. The Senator from Montana unreservedly prefers the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, except for his fear as to the action in conference. The Senator from Utah occupies the same position himself.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. He says it is impossible of administration. Now, I say to the Senator in case that difficulty were removed and if it were possible of administration, would he also join the Senator from Montana in preferring the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the present law?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say again, I am positive that it can not be administered successfully, and no manufacturer in this country would approve of any such plan.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am simply supposing a case, putting a hypothetical question. Suppose it were capable of administration, then would the Senator prefer it, as the Senator from Montana does, to the present law?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President. So far as that is concerned, I wish to say that I do not want to take into consideration or pass an opinion upon a proposition that is absolutely impossible to carry out.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I present, the Senator understands, a hypothetical question.

Mr. SMOOT. As to a hypothetical question, there is no need, I will submit to the Senator, of submitting such a question and asking for the passing of an opinion upon it when the person asked to pass his opinion says that the proposition is absolutely impossible of administration.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I thought it might possibly be demonstrated a little later on in the debate that it could be administered. If it could be administered, then would the Senator think it was better than the present law?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that, as I said before, in a fleece of wool one can take a

part of the fleece from the shoulder, and if he take a sample from the shoulder, it would not shrink as much as if you took it from the skirting. In assorting the wool there may be three grades of it, or even five grades in many cases in the same fleece. Therefore, under this amendment which is proposed here by the Senator from Iowa, I say again it would be absolutely impossible of administration, and because of that fact no manufacturer would ever in the world give his consent to it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President——

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I shall only detain the Senate for a moment. As the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] spoke for me to some extent, I wish to say that I shall undertake to give reasons why I shall not support the amendment. I say very frankly that I shall not support the amendment, because it is not at the present time for the good of the woolgrower. There would have to be an entire rearrangement; and that is utterly impossible at this time, as I shall attempt to show when the Senator from Iowa has concluded.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, another thing I wanted to say was that I did not hear the amendment read; therefore I simply speak upon the question of principle contained in it, because I do not recall just now how the grades were named as to the amount of protection; but the principle is wrong. Therefore I can not support the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Utah knows that it would require an entire readjustment of the whole schedule of compensatory duties as to every fabric that is made from wool.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will yield if he will agree not to begin to retract the kind words that he spoke about my amendment.

Mr. CARTER. I would, if I spoke from my heart at length, add to the kind words I spoke.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield indefinitely to the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] would give to the woolgrower a protection of 33 cents a pound on every scoured pound of wool brought into the United States, or on wool that would be the equivalent of a pound of scoured wool; but as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] well says, a complete readjustment, not only of the wool schedule, but of certain definitions and likewise of the schedules relating to woolens, would then be indispensable and unavoidable. I say that, while representing the woolgrowers, I would, if I could, have the identical arrangement proposed by the Senator from Iowa; yet I do feel that at this stage in the parliamentary proceedings to venture all of these schedules, all of the adjustments necessary to reach and become accommodated to that amendment, is extremely perilous for the woolgrower. I do not want to have all their interests referred to a committee of conference.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Montana, if I understand his remarks correctly, concedes that this woolen schedule could be well amended and changed in several particulars. This is one of the most ancient schedules in the bill, it being over fifty years since it was first established. Great changes have taken place since that time. If you will look at the ad valorem rates you will find that the woolen schedule contains the highest of all rates. If we are here to revise the tariff, why, in God's name, should not the Finance Committee or the Senate attempt to do something with this woolen schedule, and not leave it in the shape it is? Is that to be immune from all revision? Are we to revise everything else except this woolen schedule? Is that to remain for ever and ever sacred, like a Hindoo idol?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Minnesota, I very cheerfully assert that it would be well if we could readjust schedules in the interest of the woolgrower, but I aver this to be true, as sustained by a long experience extending over a wide territory, that the rate of duty fixed for the protection of the woolgrower is barely adequate, and in no sense excessive, and that it can not be reduced without starting a retrograde movement which will ultimately result in practically wiping out the wool production of this country. That would not be to the advantage of the consumer, because when it becomes commercially unprofitable to raise wool in this country, the sheep will inevitably go to the slaughter. There is always a demand for mutton, and no one will keep a wool-bearing animal on the ranch or on the farm when the wool can not be produced at a profit. The open market being ready to receive the sheep and turn the sheep into mutton, the individual withdraws his investment by selling the sheep to the butcher. This would, in the natural course of events, under the operation of a law that has never been enacted and can not be repealed, result in the extermination of our flocks; and the subtraction of 311,000,000 pounds of wool from the world's supply would, in the end, leave our clothing woolens more expensive than they are now.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Iowa has pointed out here that there is a discrimination in this schedule against what is called the "mutton wool" of Minnesota and other States in the West. Why should our sheep in Minnesota, in Iowa, and in the Mississippi Valley, be discriminated against in favor of the sheep of the mountain States? They have the whole government range there; and they have nobody to deal with except Uncle Sam and Brother Pinchot. [Laughter.] They have all that range and a few sheep herders to look after all their sheep. But how is it with the farmers of Minnesota and of the Mississippi Valley? We have to stable our sheep, we have to mow hay for them, we have to feed them, and it costs us twice as much in the Mississippi Valley to raise sheep and raise wool as it does out in the range States; yet Senators who are representing the mountain States, the range States, where they have a free government range, where the Government gives them free pasture, and where their only struggle is to keep away the cattle men from their sheep ranges, are unwilling to give us as fair an advantage for our sheep in Minnesota, Iowa, and the Mississippi Valley. I refer this to the Senator from Iowa, who will correct me if I am not correct.

Mr. HEYBURN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. WARREN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HEYBURN. I desire, with the permission of the Senator from Iowa, to ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho for that purpose.

Mr. HEYBURN. Is not the Senator from Minnesota advised that the Rocky Mountain sheep, to which he refers, pay a grazing fee of 7 cents a head, which amounts to $98 on a flock of 1,400 sheep?

Mr. NELSON. Not all of them. That only refers to the few who get on a forest reserve. There are great quantities of Uncle Sam's lands outside of forest reserves which are grazed without money and without price.

Mr. HEYBURN. Not in Idaho.

Mr. NELSON. The sheepmen and the cattlemen get in there, and through their herders they keep away homestead settlers and prevent the country from being settled up.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I deny the fact that the woolgrowers of Minnesota or the Middle West are not protected. Speaking of the shrinkage of wool, does not the Senator know that all American wools are bought upon the scoured basis?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Senator has just proved to the Senate that it is impossible to assess the duty upon scoured wool.

Mr. SMOOT. Ah, but, Mr. President, it is purchased upon the judgment of the purchaser as to what the shrinkage will be; and I want to say to the Senator that I have purchased wool sheared from sheep from the same pen, that ran upon the same territory, and I have paid from 5 to 6 and even 7 cents a pound more for one clip than the other. Why? Because one shrinks less than the other; and the low-shrinkage wools of Minnesota are purchased upon the basis of the amount of shrinkage in those wools, and the price is paid accordingly.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Utah, with the permission of the Senator from Iowa——

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON (continuing). Why it is that you put our washed wool on the same basis as unwashed wool? Why discriminate? Why, when it comes to our wool, not have the same rate of duty on washed wool and unwashed wool? The Senator can speak for Utah, but he can not speak altogether for Minnesota and the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am speaking for no State. I am speaking for the great woolen interest of this country. The Senator wants to know what about washed wool of the second class, calling that "Minnesota wool." The second-class wools coming into this country have amounted to only 7 per cent of the importations for all of the time during the life of the present law. Those wools, Mr. President, are not used in common clothing; they are used in braids and luster goods. I say now that the total importation of second-class wool—which, the Senator claimed, is dutiable at only 12 cents a pound, instead of 24, on account of being washed—amounted to only 7 per cent of all the wool that has come into this country under the present law.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will the Senator state what the total value of the importation of wools was in 1907?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the figures here, and I can not give them offhand, but I can get them in a very few minutes if the Senator so desires. They, however, would not tell him how much of the second-class wools were imported——

Mr. DOLLIVER. Exactly.

Mr. SMOOT. But we can, under the importations of second-class wools, fix the amount of them, as the customs office keeps them separate.

Mr. DOLLIVER. In 1907 there were 9,809,794 pounds of this second-class wool brought in.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask now, if the Senator has the figures, how much were the importations of third-class wool, and how much were the importations of first-class wool? The answer will demonstrate whether my statement was correct. There were only 12,000,000 pounds of second-class wool imported last year, and that went mostly into the manufacture of braids and luster goods. That is the use for which that class of wool is put to to-day.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, these statistics do not show the proportion of washed and unwashed wool of the second class that came in, for the reason that they all came in under the same duty, and hence the custom-house figures do not throw any light upon that subject.

Mr. SMOOT. That is just the reason I am taking all of them, the washed and unwashed. The Senator from Minnesota can see that they take the other forms of wool——

Mr. NELSON. Perhaps our wools are mercerized. Is that the trouble? [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. "Mercerized" seems to haunt the Senator from Minnesota. He does not seem to be able to get over it somehow or other.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has the floor.

Mr. WARREN. I will later on give the exact amount of importations of second-class wool, but the importations of the first and third class amount to well up toward 200,000,000 pounds, while the importations of wool of the second class amount to something more than the Senator said, because he is giving the amounts without taking into account what comes in on the skin.

The Senator from Minnesota surely does not want to do the western sheep man an injustice. There was a time when the western sheep grower could take his flock of sheep and go out on the government domain. I want to assure the Senator now that for every sheep there is in Wyoming—and I think I can speak for Montana as well—there is an investment of from $10 to $15 in land, fences, reservoirs, and ditches, in machinery and hay and feed, and so forth; that is, there is a standing investment of from $10 to $15 for every sheep. Then comes the expense of running them. The public range as such is a thing of the past.

The Senator from Minnesota says that the wool in his State does not bring the amount that wool in the West does; that he is discriminated against. I do not know that Minnesota wools are given as such, but I assume that they would be given in the class of Michigan and Wisconsin wools. Am I right about that, I ask the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. NELSON. I can not say as to Michigan wools, but I should think they might be classed with Wisconsin wools.

Mr. WARREN. The wools of Michigan and Wisconsin are to-day bringing 50 per cent more than the wools from the West, pound for pound.

The Senator talks about revision and says the wool schedule is an idol; that it never has been revised, and that it should now be revised. Mr. President, that is what has been the matter. The subject of wool and woolens has been revised and revised over and over again. More than twenty times it has been revised. That is the trouble. All these revisions have brought out a result, and that result is, of course, the ultimate success or nonsuccess of raising wool on the one hand and of manufacturing woolens on the other.

I am here to say that with all the twenty-odd tariff bills that have covered wool and woolens, the only time when there has been success has been when the laws of 1864, 1867, 1890, and 1897 have been closely adhered to. Every time the rates have been lowered the result has been disastrous. For instance, in 1883 the woolman was not attacked upon the surface, but the manufacturer was attacked. Hence our wool went down in price and our sheep went to the slaughter; and at the end of a very few years we had lost 18 per cent of our sheep, our manufactories were largely closed, and we were bringing in three or four times as much woolen goods from foreign countries as before, and bringing in, of course, much less unmanufactured wool.

It is true that this subject has been considered heretofore. The manufacture of wool, at least, is a highly technical industry. There is an individuality about wool that scarcely——

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator say that the raising of sheep is a technical industry?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator had waited a moment I would have come to that. I said that the manufacture of wool was a technical business, and I want to say that the raising of sheep, if not technical, is a very hazardous business. Now I will ask the Senator if he knows of any time—he is a reader of history—when both the woolmen and the manufacturers have been successful for any length of time, except under tariff bills that run closely parallel with that of 1897.

The Senator says that we do not revise. Here is the article of noils. While it has not developed yet perhaps as much as it may, I may say—I will not say this entire subject, but a large percentage of this difficulty and this proposition of the carded-wool men refers to noils. Noils have been reduced. In the McKinley Act the duty on noils was 30 cents a pound, and we reduced it to 20 in the Dingley Act. Was not that revision, and was it not revision downward?

It is asked to reduce the rate of duty from that point, and the wool men object because the reduction has gone down to a point where to accept the proposition of lowering the duty on noils would result in bringing in noils from foreign countries at a figure the equivalent of which would not be perhaps over one-third of what the present duty is on scoured wool.

The woolgrower simply asks a chance to live; he asks a chance to supply this country with all the clothing that it needs; and until the time comes when he can do that, he asks that such wool as may be brought in here shall be in the natural condition, as near as possible, so that the labor of making that wool into goods shall all be performed in this country and this country shall get the benefit of it. You may place a barrel of water on that table where the reporters are working and drive the head in solid and drive the bung in solid until you think it is water-tight, but if there is a gimlet hole on the other side, even if not seen, it will drain the entire vessel.

So if you open a place in this schedule on noils, and there are a dozen other, yes, two dozen other products—and when I say "products" I mean various stages of wool from the sheep's back to the cloth—that could be named, you reduce those duties and your importations all follow on the basis of the price that it costs to get it in as scoured wool.

So that we have had plenty of revision; we have had revision up and we have had revision down; we have had the duty on wool considerably higher than it is in the present tariff; we have had the duty on woolen manufactures lower; we have had wool lower; we have been up and down; we have been from free wool up to 12 or 13 or 14 cents a pound; and we have arrived at that stage when, enlightened by experience, we know that, taking the duty as it is, with business adjusted to it, we can proceed so that the woolgrower and the manufacturer can both be successful; but undertake to revise it, and, with the diversity of opinion, it is manifest on its face that it can not be done at this juncture.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senator's argument is that because there is a diversity of opinion here, we ought not to revise the tariff on wool.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming, as he seems to be well informed in regard to this matter, whether he thinks it is practicable to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, even though he agrees to the provision?

Mr. WARREN. By no manner of means, Mr. President; because to undertake to enter that domain means to take up the entire schedule, from its title to its end. I submit that when we are proceeding along under a schedule that has had many years of study, that has been changed from time to time, and we have had the most illustrious woolmen and the most experienced woolmen working upon it as commissioners, in undertaking a revision of the entire schedule we must resort to something more than the thought of any one Senator, however able he may be, submitted on this floor at this time.

Mr. PAGE. I have had some experience in this matter. I have been handling wool for fifty-odd years, and have been a woolgrower for perhaps twenty years; and, instead of there being 3 or 4 or 5 kinds of wool, as has been stated here, I know I make 36 kinds. I can say that the more this matter is discussed the more it seems to me impracticable to make up a schedule in a moment. It must be the subject of a great deal of research and study, and I am quite confident that if the Senator from Iowa would study the whole problem to its source he would find that every movement he makes would involve him in more trouble in regard to the adjustment of his ideas to the grading and the producing of wool. I, myself, do not know as to the Minnesota and the Wyoming wool, but I imagine that the difference in the price is due not so much to the difference in the quality of the wool as to the difference in the shrinkage.

To-day the price of "A-super" scoured wool is somewhere from 70 to 75 cents, and we have wool which we call our "seller" wool, which runs down as low as 5 cents a pound. I do not know just where they would come in under any schedule, but I do know that the whole matter of wools is an intricate one. For instance, we have to-day an excellent market for every class of wool that goes into the ordinary clothing we wear, and I do not know that there has been a day in the year when there has not been a pretty good demand for all of that class of wool. On the other hand, ordinary carding wools have been so dull that there have been times in the last two years when we could not get enough for them, because the claim of the manufacturer was that the wools had gone out of style, and therefore there was no demand for them.

I do not know exactly what the Senator from Iowa means when he says that the people can not get clothing at a fair price, because I know that wools that were sold at 40 cents a pound three or four years ago have, by reason of the change in fashion, gone down to 25. The reduction has been immense. I imagine that the more this question is studied the more difficult it will be found to adjust any schedule here upon the spur of the moment.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, nobody has ever intended to settle this matter on "the spur of the moment." These schedules have been made from generation to generation, practically, so far as Congress is concerned. They were originally made outside of Congress. They have been perpetuated because it has been easier for Congress to allow outsiders to adjust all these matters than to attend to them within the walls of this Chamber and the Chamber of the House. I am not complaining particularly about that. It is an ugly mess; it can not be approached without watchfulness and pious meditations of all sorts; but is that any reason why it should be left undisturbed for fifty years? What I am seeking now to have done is to have a genuine, scientific protection and Republican revision, and the word "revision" means "look at it again." Let us see whether what was fairly good fifty years ago has not become outgrown and behind these times. I regret that we are being denied even that poor privilege.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to carry out the suggestion one step further. "Revise" means to look at it again, but there is nothing implied in the term "revision" that compels you to change, is there? You merely look at it to see whether a change is necessary.

Mr. DOLLIVER. When you look at it with the impartial and well-trained mind of the Senator from Montana the first thing you see is that it can be infinitely improved, and that is an interesting aspect of this matter to me.

Mr. President, I started out to tell what I intended to do or should try to do, and I have yielded without any embarrassment to everybody who desired to participate in the running discussion, and I am very glad that I did so. I now desire to state the amendment which I propose. I propose, in the first place, to offer an amendment placing the wool duties upon the basis of the proportional shrinkage of the wools imported.

My honored friend the Senator from Utah says that it is impracticable, because he once was deceived in buying a wagon load of wool in Utah, during the early settlement of that country. He overlooks the fact that the Government of the United States is now spending nearly a hundred thousand dollars a year for an analytical bureau in connection with the appraisers' stores in the city of New York to do with modern scientific accuracy what was impossible and incredible only twenty years ago. He overlooks the fact that we are able not only to tell the scoured contents of the fleece to-day by scientific means, but we can tell the moisture contained in the fleece as well. Beside every wool market in England stands a conditioning plant, which reports with scientific accuracy even the moisture contained in a scoured piece of wool submitted to this modern scientific instrument.

It is also interesting to find from the literature on this subject, that every international wool market is crowded with experts who almost at a glance can report with perfect accuracy the state of a fleece as to its wool contents. That seems incredible to the Senator from Wyoming, and yet such is the skill acquired at these London and Liverpool and Bradford auctions that there are there men who do not even need a machine to report with accuracy for those for whom they act the wool contents of every fleece sold at that auction.

Nobody in this world buys the dirt and grease in wool. Every man who buys wool buys the wool contents of the fleece or the bale, and if it were not possible to find out what it is, how would it be possible to conduct these auctions at the great centers of wool distribution throughout the world?

But I intend to accompany this proposed amendment with a little Treasury regulation, which is feasible, according to the testimony of our own Bureau of Standards, upon which we have also spent a good many thousand dollars since the Senator from Utah made an erroneous calculation as to the wool contents of a wagonload of wool in the early settlement of Utah, and I have spent many golden hours in the society of these great scientists. If any man will inquire of them, they will tell him it is perfectly feasible to levy this duty upon the scoured contents of the fleece and to determine with scientific accuracy, without scouring the wools, exactly what are the wool contents of every cargo of wool entering the ports.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that the Bureau of Standards, in my judgment, has laid out its work to attack about every problem on the earth and some under the earth and over it. They have succeeded in some. They have made no progress whatever and give no promise regarding this wool matter. There is not a single buyer of wool for direct manufacture within my acquaintance—and I have followed the matter for a great many years—who will trust his own judgment to buy closely on wool shrinkage, if a large amount of wool is at stake, but insists always upon samples and the scouring of such samples.

I wish to state to the Senator that if he goes to England and the markets there he will find a crowd of men there before the wool is taken up, taking samples and scouring them. So that the men buy each lot of wool upon what it actually shrinks.

Mr. President, go to Boston or New York. If a man wants to buy any wool of any consequence, and especially if it is close, he has sample bags sent to his place and he scours them. The trade is all conducted along that line rather than on the judgment of any man. I do not believe you can find a single wool dealer who would say to you that he can insure a correct estimate within 1 to 5 per cent on different wools of what the shrinkage actually will be. It is always a guess, although it may be a close one, and wool being such a valuable product guesses alone are not to be relied upon.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Then if that is true it is not necessary in the present state of the science to guess on this subject. So I will have printed in connection with that amendment the regulation—a brief one—which I have drawn to put the Government through just about the same process that the wool buyer puts his agent through in determining what to pay for his wool. I use the same process to determine what duty to assess upon it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I ask a question?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator's last remark seems to me a demonstration that the amendment is susceptible of being administered.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have never submitted it to any expert who doubted it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I asked the question some time ago, when the Senator from Montana had said that he preferred the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the present law, if that was also the opinion of the Senator from Utah—whether he would also prefer this amendment to the present law—and he said it was incapable of administration. The Senator from Iowa has demonstrated, by reason of these scientific tests, and so forth, that it is capable of administration. That being true, or supposing it is true, supposing the Senator from Iowa happens to be right about it, and it is capable of administration, will the Senator from Utah agree with the Senator from Montana that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is better than the present law?

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to that, I wish to say that no one can tell what the wool shrinks until it is scoured, and then there are no two men who shrink wool who will get exactly the same result. If it was shrunk in New York port it may show one result. If it was shrunk in Boston port it may show a different result. It depends upon how the wool is scoured, and it is impossible to tell the shrinkage until it is scoured.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Could it possibly show such a startling variety of injustices as are involved in assessing a fixed amount upon the raw wool without any regard whatever to whether it shrunk 1 per cent or 75?

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. Would it not be possible, with a consignment of wool arriving at the custom-house, to take a bunch of that wool and put it through a process of scouring and determine just what the net amount of wool is?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to the fact that that can not be done. One bag of wool may shrink 60 per cent, another may shrink 65, just the same as the fleeces may differ.

Mr. NELSON. We have a way of inspecting wheat in Minnesota. We take out of every load of wheat a sample, and one out of every sack; and so if the wool comes in different bags or bundles, you can take a sample out of each and put it through the process of scouring and arrive definitely at the amount of net wool there is in the consignment.

Mr. SMOOT. Cleaning of wheat and wool are entirely different propositions.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I now desire to proceed a step further.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Would the Senator object to my asking a question?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly not.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not want to insist on the Senator from Utah answering unless he wanted to. Therefore I did not pursue the question at first very much, because he said it was impossible of administration. But, now that the Senator from Iowa has demonstrated to his own satisfaction at least, and it looks plausible to us, that it is capable of administration, my question to the Senator is this: Supposing the Senator from Iowa is right about that, then would the Senator from Utah be in favor of this amendment rather than the present law, as the Senator from Montana has said he was?

Mr. SMOOT. I answered before, and I will answer again, that it is not possible of administration; and I say to the Senator now, as I said then, upon the hypothesis that he submits to me, I do not particularly care about offering an opinion.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then the Senator declines to give an opinion as to whether he prefers this amendment rather than the present law, supposing that the Senator from Iowa is right and that it can be administered?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not desire to discuss the matter further except to say I will print the Treasury regulations with which I propose to accompany this proposition. If that amendment is adopted it equalizes these duties as between the carded wool people and the worsted people and the spinning people so far as raw wool is concerned, and that, in my judgment, is the first thing necessary to be done if we are going to preserve the woolen manufacturing industry in the United States.

I again propose an amendment which relates to paragraph 371. I propose to strike it out and insert these words:

Woolens advanced from the scoured state, known as tops, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, 30 cents per pound; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound; and in addition thereto on all the foregoing 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator knows what the Wilson Act provided. The Wilson Act, with free wool, made the duty on tops 20 per cent.

Mr. DOLLIVER. This is vastly more than that. It is 20 per cent ad valorem in addition to the specific assessments.

Mr. WARREN. You have now 30 per cent on tops.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Thirty and 35.

Mr. WARREN. How many pounds of wool make a pound of tops?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I understand that the tops are over two-thirds of the pound; the noils are less than one-third.

Mr. WARREN. There is a shrinkage besides the noils and the top.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes; there is a further shrinkage after you start in to make yarn.

Mr. WARREN. In other words, the top is an advancement beyond scoured wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I want to show my honored friend, the Senator from Wyoming, exactly what is done. If you will look into the coffin there, at the wool exibition, you will see everything white and clean and beautiful. It is really an attractive thing, and yet it is a mere exhibit. I believe it is the same exhibit that the State of Montana had at the world's fair in 1903. I may be mistaken about that. If you showed an ordinary old carded-wool manufacturer those specimens he would laugh in your face. These are not the tops of commerce. These are not the noils of commerce. These are not the wastes of commerce. If you want to see a genuine noil just as these poor fellows buy it in the market, I show it to you there [exhibiting]. If you come up here with me you will find the seeds of plants and burs and everything else in it. How does that happen? The man who is combing English wool does not scour it at all; or at least if he scours it, he touches it very lightly for fear of breaking the fibers still further, and his object is to get as many long hairs preserved in the fleece as possible.

So he hardly touches it. He does not put it in soda, but he combs it, and as he combs it out come the dirt and the burs and the accumulations—everything that was left in it after it was washed in the stream—and that is the noil of commerce, as I found out by talking to 20 manufacturers who are engaged——

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand the Senator to say they card wool unwashed or unscoured?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I did not say carded. I said combed it.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course if the Senator knew——

Mr. DOLLIVER. If they did not comb it, how did they produce a noil like that?

Mr. SMOOT. Before they could comb it they had to card it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the question whether the Senator said that they carded the wool and combed it without scouring?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I did say that these long, delicate wools are not so scoured as to prevent the noils appearing of that color, which I undertake to say is the ordinary commercial noil that is sold to the carded woolen mills of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator calls that what? What designation does he give it?

Mr. DOLLIVER. A noil.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not mean that; but what kind of wool—a delicate wool?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Whatever wool——

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that that is a coarse-fiber wool of the very lowest grade.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Do not make any unkind remarks about it. [Laughter.] That is not the only kind of noils we have here. There [exhibiting] is the noil produced in the preparation of wool for the weaving of carpets. Did you ever see that kind of noil out in Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. We do not make carpets in Utah. But this is hardly wool. This is camel's hair. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. And the peculiarity about this tariff act is that it treats camel's hair and goat's hair exactly as it does wool. [Laughter.] The hair of any animal has the same dignity as wool under this law, which has passed beneath the eyes of the wisdom that has come here from the State of Utah. There is no question about that. Why should I be derided for presenting camel's hair, when the statesmen for fifty years have rated it as wool and treated it with the same dignity throughout every paragraph of those schedules?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator wants to know, I will tell him.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Well, it would be interesting, seeing your contemptuous allusion to camel's hair, to know how it hap-

pened to creep into this schedule and say there for fifty years without any comments from anybody.

Mr. SMOOT. Camel's hair is used in the very coarest goods, and is mixed with wool for the purpose of manufacturing horse blankets, carpets——

Mr. DOLLIVER. Have you made provision in this bill for noils arising out of the manufacture of wool into horse blankets?

Mr. SMOOT. The provision we put into this bill is to protect all noils, and if we put a rate on noils that would protect that class, what would become of the great majority of the high-priced noils that are worth the same as scoured wool? They would not be protected.

Mr. DOLLIVER. When I come to noils I am going to tell you exactly what I think ought to become of them. I think it is not an act of statesmanship, but of very ordinary everyday—I will not say stupidity, but I can not think of a synonym that moderates that expression—that treats noils of camel's hair, ready to be thrown away, with the same dignity as the finest noils exhibited by my friend, the Senator from Montana, are treated. If I had the writing of it, I would put on a reasonable ad valorem to protect it. I would make it high enough to be prohibitory if necessary, but not so written as to make it ridiculous before the community.

Mr. President, the reason I do not like the rates upon these wool tops is that I do not think, while that is a beautiful specimen of tops, scoured, I have no doubt, with selected chemicals, for the instruction of my honored friend, the Senator from Montana, that even the top which he exhibited there ought to be protected by the same rate that is applied to woolen cloth of the highest kind. I feel sure that if there is any sense in making this tariff schedule, the duty on these wool tops ought to be somewhere above the duty on scoured wool and below the duty on finished yarns; and I should like to see somebody who has the leisure and the scientific taste to locate that duty about in the right place.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator thinks that in this readjustment the carded-wool men are the men who suffer and they are the ones he would like to relieve?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes; they are the ones I heard complaining.

Mr. WARREN. That being true, how does the Senator propose to relieve the carded-wool men by changing the duty on tops, for I want to say to the Senator what he perhaps already knows that tops are not used by the carded-wool men at all.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I know that; but they are bought and sold in this market.

Mr. WARREN. They have no effect whatever upon the carded-wool men——

Mr. DOLLIVER. I know.

Mr. WARREN (continuing). Unless they are put down low enough to cheat the woolgrower out of the tariff on wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. They are, however, made for sale. Somebody buys them.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Somebody sells them.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If I did not know who the parties were, I would still want to take some precaution to see that an advantage was not given to the seller over the buyer by making the rate absurdly prohibitory.

Mr. WARREN. Would the Senator rather have the tops made abroad than here?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; it is not necessary to make the tops abroad. The tops ought to be made here.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But where a combination of top makers is organized here, selling its product to the public, selling it to those who want to buy, I would have the rate so arranged that after it got to about the level of real extortion the man could turn with a cheerful countenance to the world's markets and relieve himself without being robbed world without end. That is the theory in my head.

Mr. WARREN. But, Mr. President, there is no combination of top makers. There is no trust in that business. The concerns which make tops are all separate and distinct. They have arbitrary qualities, and the nature of wool is such that they could no more combine in the top business than they could in any other branch of the woolen business. The three largest top makers in the country also comb on commission; that is, for a nominal fee they take wool from either merchants, or spinners who do only drawing and spinning, and comb the wool into tops, thus enabling men of small capital to engage in the worsted-spinning business without the investment necessary for washing, carding, and combing machinery, which constitutes half of the cost of equipment of a complete worsted-spinning plant making yarn from raw wool. No manufacturer has to buy tops, because tops are simply one of the products of wool as it goes along toward cloth, and if tops are too high, bring wool in and make the tops or make it into yarn, and bring in the yarn.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I instructed by self by wandering around the woolen mills of New England a good deal, and while I find it is true that everybody could make tops if he wanted to, and had the machinery and the capital to attend to it, is is not true that everybody does. But, on the contrary, there are many humble folk who are relying on their more highly capitalized neighbors for their tops, and within the last few years the largest top mill in the world has been built, largely as a mercantile proposition to manufacture and sell its articles to those who are not so situated as to make it themselves.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the Senator one more question.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator know of a single manufacturer in the United States who is asking us to reduce the tariff on cotton so that he may buy the tops? I do not know of a single one in the United States who is asking us to reduce the price of tops so that he may buy those tops for his own use.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I know it has been twenty-two years since the farmer was put forward for the first time to remove this chestnut from the fire. In 1888 substantially the same duty on tops was suggested by a leading worsted manufacturer of New England. Here it is in this book exactly as he proposed it. Up to that time there is no trace of anybody else wanting it, and yet from that time to this every time a controversy has been raised about it, every time anybody has felt called on to say it is too high, the brethren who originated it drop into the background and outstep the magnificent wool raisers and sheep breeders, like my friend from Wyoming, to take the laboring oar in defense of a proposition that is absolutely indefensible.

Mr. WARREN. Shall I tell the Senator why that originated and what was the interest of the woolmen?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think I know what the Senator is going to say. He says, "You do not want tops to come in;" but I say it is not necessary to have tops come in from abroad. It is not necessary to choose between having them come in in large quantities and this duty, which is so high that nobody would ever think of such a thing as undertaking any commerce in them whatever.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator guessed wrong. I will tell the Senator, if he will wait a moment—and it will take but a moment—why the farmer was interested.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think I know what the Senator has in that envelope.

Mr. WARREN. I am glad the Senator does know. Following the law of 1883, under which neither the wool men nor the manufacturers were successful, the Treasury Department ruled that this material [exhibiting], which is tops, a refinement of wool, and costs a great deal more than scoured wools and a great deal more than washed wools, was subject to a duty of only 10 cents a pound, and that is what they collected.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That was wrong.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator wonder that the woolman, who was put out of business because this product was brought in at 10 cents, which left him but 2 or 3 cents protection on the wool he raised, awoke to the fact that tops ought to be looked after?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have no reason to be astonished that he woke up, but I am amazed that he broke down the door and upset the furniture and in his effort to get that duty reenacted allowed people to write a schedule that put it upon the exact level with manufactured and finished cloth.

Mr. WARREN. Which hurts nobody.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It may hurt nobody, but is it not a mighty comfortable protection for a gentleman who is manufacturing tops for sale? If you find a man who is entitled, for example, to 25 or 30 cents protection, and by reason of the fright of the woolgrowers is given 44 cents a pound and 55 per cent ad valorem, as if the product was woolen cloth, do you not think such a man engaged in making tops for sale might be interested more than the public is in keeping such a duty upon them?

Mr. WARREN. There is only one use the tops can be put to, and that is to make them into yarns, unless you give them to the carded wool men as waste stock. The man who is making tops——

Mr. DOLLIVER. Did you ever hear of anyone giving anything to the carded wool men?

Mr. WARREN. They have had everything they have asked for up to date, and they could have everything they ask for now, if they did not ask the woolgrowers of this country to lay down and let them walk over them with a rate about a half and from that to a third of what we enjoy now upon wool.

Tops can only be made into yarn, and yarn is imported as yarn. Nobody need buy tops that are made in this country, because they can get it in yarn, and the Senator says that yarns are lower. Then the tops come in in yarn. If he is making tops, all he has to do is to bring in wool and scour his own wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I went into that more fully than I intended to do. I want now to approach one of the complaints that these great American manufacturers have made to me, and I confess it has not only convinced my judgment, but it has touched my heart. I am not so cold-blooded as some. When a man comes to me and says, "For fifty years my father and I have been building up a great woolen manufacturing industry, and I find myself ground to poverty and to bankruptcy by the laws of the United States," I am not so constituted that I can tell him not to occupy my time; that if the business is not profitable, to quit it; that the thing is obsolete; that their inheritance from their fathers is in a way to be totally destroyed; lock it up and quit and get into some other business. I am not so constituted. I would not do that until I had spent a good many days trying to find out what the man's real grievance was, and I think I have gotten down to this simple point.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator would not destroy another industry to save that one?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; and I have not found one of these men, although borne down with care and anxiety about their own business, who would consent to that. They want an arrangement which will equalize their relations, and not an advantage, such as the Senator from Wyoming will demand in the way of increases for the purpose of the protection of the woolgrowers of the United States in this tariff schedule.

Mr. WARREN. Let me say to the Senator that I should be glad, and I stand ready, to help the carded wool industry, if I can.

Mr. DOLLIVER. When?

Mr. WARREN. I will tell the Senator. The Senator talks about carded industry as though everyone interested in carded wool was here asking that a change be made in the tariff. Does the Senator think that was the case?

Mr. DOLLIVER. There have been so many of them and so many associations represented here——

Mr. WARREN. As a matter of fact there are some 50 or 75 out of 700 who are asking for a change. My judgment is that they will be perfectly satisfied, because this change in values and the changes in fashion will bring up the industry.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Either that or death, industrial death, will put all their fears at rest.

Mr. WARREN. When the Senator says that he is going to offer an amendment which will give us a higher tariff on wool, he proposes also to put on a product of wool so low a tariff that not a pound of raw wool would enter in, and we would have all the products from foreign countries coming in at only a fraction of the duty upon wool. When you rob it of all the surrounding superfluous things, in a sentence that is what it amounts to. I do not care what you put on a pound of wool, if you take enough wool and put it at 10 cents——

Mr. DOLLIVER. It will not be found that I have taken any product of wool and put it at 10 cents a pound. I hope that I may have the honor of a careful examination by the Senator from Wyoming of the amendments I propose to offer. I have not done an unkind thing to wool.

Mr. WARREN. But you have offered an amendment which confessedly is very much lower than the present duty on wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. What amendment does my friend refer to?

Mr. WARREN. On tops and on noils, both.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, when I offered the amendment which I have proposed on tops, I am amazed at the consideration I have shown to that historic by-product.

Mr. WARREN. The cloth in that case might as well be called a by-product. The top is not only not a by-product, but it is one of the stairs up which the wool ascends on its way to finished cloth.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I want the tops as they are going up the stairs from wool to cloth to stop before they get to cloth.

Mr. WARREN. How would you stop it?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Valued at not more than 40 cents, 30 cents a pound; valued at more than 40 cents a pound, 35 cents a pound, and in addition thereto the ad valorem of 20 per cent. Do you not think that sounds pretty good to a man who is trying to get tops protected as they ought to be?

Mr. WARREN. It sounds mighty good to a man who wants a lower tariff on wool; it looks good to the importer; it looks mighty good to the manufacturer who, under the guise of friendship for the woolman, will import it at less than the present rates on wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If I had not had at the hands of manufacturing experts, as interested as the Senator from Wyoming is in the maintenance of the wool industry, figures that prove it is for protective purposes fully adequate, I would not offer it.

But I was speaking about the grievance the carded-wool people have in the imposition. Here is a man engaged in the manufacture of worsted goods buying flocks in England and paying upon them here a duty equal to a second duty of 15 cents a pound. He takes it to his mill and combs it. It is exactly as a man would comb his hair. The long fiber straightens itself out and the short fibers fall away.

The long fibers constitute the tops and the short fibers constitute the noils. If you will look there at those samples you will find noils whiter than snow, but in point of fact, as I said in the combing of the wool, according to the best testimony I have ever been able to get, they do not apply harsher processes of scouring for fear of still further injuring the long fibers. Consequently the comb passes through the tops and you find burs and various kinds of dirt, so that before the carded woolen manufacturers can use a pound of it at least 25 per cent has passed away in scouring it and in getting it absolutely clean. But here upon these noils is fixed an adamantine duty of 20 cents a pound. It does not make any difference what kind of wools they are, even if they are the noils of camel's hair, as my friend from Utah said these noils are, whether costly or not, whether high grade or low, whether they are white as snow or black as that wool, whatever their condition, the duty is 20 cents a pound.

I undertake to say that the man who is making worsted cloth, turning out that by-product in the United States to-day, will get profit enough to pay and more than pay all the duty he ever paid at the custom-houses of the United States on the wool out of which those noils were produced.

Mr. WARREN. The carded-wool men do not have to have noils.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Then, there is not one of them who knows anything about the business.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is mistaken. Noils are but one product for them, and because they are cheaper they use them; but they can use instead every pound of wool that I might grow, or that people with whom I am interested grow, or that the Senator grows in Iowa. There is no trouble about that.

Mr. DOLLIVER. You would want to have this product thrown away?

Mr. WARREN. Not at all.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Why not have an act of Congress that once a year those things shall be burned up? Every woolgrower would be secure if that was in operation.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator seems to be going just a little away from the ordinary line. When I say it is not necessary to use the noils, I want to say that the carded-wool men are not such mendicants that they must depend upon them. If there is a product coming from the mills that is lower than other classes of wool, of course they use it, and if they can they will bear it down. It is a matter of fact that they have already borne the tariff upon it down from 30 per cent to 20 per cent. But now they are not satisfied. They have the privilege, I want to say to the Senator, of bringing in noils that are free from burs. They can bring in carbonized noils, and there are noils worth to-day 67 to 75 cents per pound. There is no trouble about that. It may be true that the more common noils can not be brought in with satisfaction. Why bring them in, then? Here is a sample of such noils as can be brought in under the tariff at 20 cents—absolutely pure, carbonized noils.

Mr. DOLLIVER. From where?

Mr. WARREN. This is from our American mills.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thought the Senator said it had been brought into the country.

Mr. WARREN. I say noils just like that could come in. It is a recombed noil, but the noil carbonized makes it even purer than that.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It has a bright and glistening look that I have never seen on the noils here.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator wants to know where those noils came from I can tell him, and I can tell him that I saw the cards working that made the noils. I saw them made, if that will be satisfactory to the Senator.

Now I want to return. The carded-wool men use almost everything in the shape of wool and cotton rags, and so forth, and if there were not a pound of noils from now to Christendom the carded-wool men would go on just the same.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I think the duties on all the by-products of worsted making are too high. They are prohibitory. They are unequal. The range of the prices of the articles is so great that when you set a specific duty on

one you are already necessarily creating inequalities. When you put the rate high enough for the highest, you make it ridiculously high for the low and the ordinary. Therefore, I propose to make some suggestions as to reducing these duties on all by-products of the worsted making and on all the waste incident to the wool market in the United States. So much for the material.

Mr. WARREN. Now, Mr. President, let the Senator remember that there is just one product of the worsted manufacturer—noils—that the carded-wool men seek, because the other products are used in the making of worsted yarns and in the construction of worsted cloth.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But the knitting people are giving me almost as much anxiety as the carded-wool people. I intend to put into the RECORD, into this speech——

Mr. WARREN. The knitters are buyers of yarn, unless they make their own yarn; but, as knitters only, they have no direct interest in the waste duties. Would the Senator like to know what the knitters put into their product?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not want to go into their product, but I want to put into the RECORD their complaint against this bill.

Mr. WARREN. I have here some of the material the knitting men use.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I hope the Senator is not meditating any suspicion of these good people.

Mr. WARREN. Not at all; I simply wish to show how unnecessary it is for these people to use slubbing waste in knitting stock.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Strangely, you stopped just a few inches ahead of the proposition that I am approaching in respect to our assessment of the compensatory duties upon woolen cloth.

Mr. WARREN. I am compensated if I have got ahead of the Senator in any way.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Just that little suggestion of yours to these woolen people—these yarn people claim certain privileges that they ought to have on account of wool, when in point of fact they do not patronize wool at all—has brought back to my mind the second thing that I have been struggling with during the past few weeks, and that is the old assessment, to which we have grown accustomed, of four times the duty on unwashed clothing wool of the first class to the pound of cloth; that is to say, 44 cents in some cases, and in the lower cases a less ratio is claimed necessary as a compensatory duty. Compensatory for what?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I always welcome the light thrown on this subject by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. It simply means to compensate for loss in the manufacture of the wool and the cloth. There is not a question in my mind, and I do not think there is in the Senator's, but that there is a loss of a pound out of four, because the testimony of Mr. Dale, spoken of so highly, says even more than that, because he estimates that it takes 154 pounds to make 100 pounds of cloth.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Here is a man who does not live in the United States. He is making cloth in some other country. He comes over here with his cloth. It has only a little wool in it, only a few threads. Possibly half of it is cotton and the rest of it mostly cotton. He approaches our custom-house, and this bill, following the custom for the last fifty years, assesses him four times the weight of his cloth for the purpose of compensating somebody for something. Will the Senator from Utah kindly state who is the person to be compensated, and for what he is being compensated in a case like that?

Mr. SMOOT. I will take great pleasure in doing so. It is for the reason that there is not a question but that the compensatory duty is at least 1 pound out of 4 in the manufacture of this wool.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. But the Senator refers to a piece of goods that comes in here with only a little. If we put the compensatory duty only to protect that little wool, then the whole system of manufacturing in this country would be placed upon the basis of a low-grade manufacture of woolens, and the whole door would be opened for the importation from foreign countries of the high-grade wool.

So, then, it becomes necessary absolutely to have this compensatory duty upon the very highest class of goods, and in doing it it keeps out of this country the goods made from mungo and waste of every kind. It is true that the Senator can figure upon a piece of cloth that is worth less than 40 cents a pound, and the ad valorem duty would be 150 per cent, perhaps.

But, Mr. President, if we did not have that compensatory duty of 4 pounds, as we reduce it so do we reduce the standard of our manufactures here of woolens and the protection that may be given to them. Therefore, in the hearings in 1867 that whole question was gone into, and every tariff bill that has been discussed upon this floor since has called attention to this very principle. It has been voted on in the Senate time and time again. If we followed out the counsel of the Senator from Iowa and reduced that compensatory duty, all our best goods would be imported from a foreign country, and we would only be protected upon the very lowest grades of goods.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator might have said that it is not always 4 to 1, but 3 to 1 and 2½ to 1. Furthermore, the ad valorem duty which is added to the compensatory is reckoned upon the value of the cloth. So what is lost in one class is made in the other.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Utah unconsciously exposes the real character of our situation.

Mr. SMOOT. Not unconsciously, because I want the Senate of the United States to understand exactly the position. If I were going to make a speech now, I would call attention to the very principle and the discussions that have been had in this Chamber time and time again upon this very point. I did not bring it out here unconsciously, because I wanted Senators to understand it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I did not mean that the Senator was making any unconscious exposure of his views, but he is simply repeating what has been thrust at me from a good many quarters from the beginning of this controversy. He says this is all right because if you will examine it closely you will find the date 1867 on it; this is all right because if you go back far enough into the history you will find it has been indorsed and approved.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say now that as far as shrinkage of wools is concerned, they shrink just as much to-day as they did in 1867.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is more than can be said for the rates in this bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. We were talking about the changes that may have taken place in the last fifty years as far as the shrinkage of wools is concerned and the scouring of them. They shrink more to-day than they did in 1867, and if the basis was fair in 1867 it is certainly fair to-day.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I do not intend to judge with harshness the method of reasoning by which the Senator from Utah has fastened these things upon his mind, for the reason I have been for many years in the same case with him. I had read many of those old speeches, and in 1888, I think, I heard the honored Senator from Rhode Island state it in very much more accurate terms than the Senator from Utah has just now stated it, because in a carefully prepared address, which has become a little classic in the wool-tariff literature from that day to this, he not only showed that this 4 to 1 ratio was necessary, whether the wool was there or not, but he showed that unless we preserved it these great harms and hardships to our market place would happen.

He said we must make the ratio as high as the highest possible shrinkage of wool, because our competitors have access to those low-shrinkage wools. That seemed to be a very conclusive thing to me at the time, and I stated it with a solemn countenance to everybody who was disposed to dispute the sanctity of this ratio. It never occurred to me to talk with somebody who had made a specialty not of defending things after they are done, but of doing things after finding out how they ought to be done. So I laid that question before Mr. Dale, of the Textile World Record, and he said what I shall read. I asked him the following question:

Q. I wish to talk with you a little about the framework of Schedule K as it relates to the specific duties applicable to the weight of cloths and dress goods manufactured here. Have you ever studied the question of whether the multiples of 3 and 4 by which this compensatory duty on cloth as related to the duties on wools of the first class has been calculated for so many years?—A. Yes; I have.

Curiously enough, he did not flash on me those old speeches, but he stated that he had studied it himself. I went over to the House of Representatives during the early stages of the tariff controversy; in fact, I stayed over there nearly all the time, because there was nothing going on here. I was anxious to get the atmosphere that always comes from a live discussion of tariff questions. I was very much pleased when a very bright man, I think from Ohio, got up with a box of samples very much like that which we see before us, and exhibiting the same kind of goods, he said:

I now propose to demonstrate that this ratio is correct. Mr. Chairman, I will read from a speech made by the Hon. John Sherman on the 15th day of May, 1867.

That is all the attention he gave to it, and he passed on.

So I was diving back into that literature—and I think I have perused it about as faithfully as any other man; certainly as any man who had other things to attend to—but here I ran across a man who said he had studied it himself.

Mr. SMOOT. He did not appear before the committee?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; he did not.

Mr. SMOOT. He was not before the committee?

Mr. DOLLIVER. He was not before the committee. I can not find anybody who was before the committee, except our good worsted friends and a few habitual witnesses who hang around the committee rooms of both Houses of Congress like professional jurymen around the court-house out in our section of the country.

Q. I would like to know what conclusions you have reached about that?—A. You will find my conclusions in this article, "How much wool to make a pound of cloth?" No tariff on wool goods should be based on a ratio between grease wool and finished cloth. As well might one attempt to fix a ratio between iron ore and watch springs. No wool manufacturer attempts to estimate the cost of his finished fabrics from the cost of the grease wool. Such a basis would result in gross errors and ultimate bankruptcy. In buying grease wool, the first considerations are the amount of scoured wool that the grease wool will yield, and the intrinsic worth of the scoured fiber. About twenty years ago I made an extensive test to determine the shrinkage in manufacturing all-wool cloth, and the result was that 1.54 pounds of scoured wool was required for 1 pound of cloth. The ratio between the grease wool and the finished cloth varies widely because of the difference in the shrinkage of wool in scouring. During the four years I was making the test referred to, I used many different lots of wool which varied widely in shrinkage. This variation of shrinkage is illustrated by 6 lots of grease wool, which in scouring shrunk 76, 69, 62, 47, 35, and 16 per cent, respectively. Calculating the ratio between these lots of grease wool and the finished cloth from the ratio of 1.54 between the scoured wool and the finished cloth, we find the following ratios between the grease wool and the finished cloth: 6¾, 5, 4, 3, 2⅝, and 1⅞. This shows plainly that no single ratio can be true of all kinds of wool.

Q. What do you say, then, of the scheme of fixing these compensatory duties as this bill does, on the ratio of 4 to 1, and in the lower grades of 3 to 1? How does that work out?

Now, listen:

A. It causes great inequalities in the tariff especially, because the ratios named are applied not only to goods made of all wool, but to goods made of mixtures of wool and other materials.

Q. What reason is there for compensating the manufacturer of cloth on account of the wool duty, when in point of fact little or no wool appears in the cloth which he makes?—A. There is, of course, no reason for compensating a manufacturer for duties paid on wool that is not used in the manufacture of the cloth. The 4 to 1 ratio between grease wool and cloth is correct only for all-wool cloth made of wool shrinking 60 to 65 per cent. As a matter of fact, no wool shrinking as much as that is imported into the United States. The specific duty of 11 or 12 cents a pound on grease wool forces the manufacturers to confine their purchases of foreign wool to the light-shrinking lots. Consequently, the Dingley and Payne bills compensate the manufacturer for wool duties which he has never paid. The defenders of the 4 to 1 ratio sometimes seek to justify it by referring to or paraphrasing Senator ALDRICH'S defense of it twelve years ago. Thus one of them recently said to me: "We need compensation at the rate of 4 to 1 because our foreign competitors use these heavy wools."

That is exactly what my friend from Utah has just said. Mr. Dale adds:

The large amount of grease and dirt in the heavy-shrinking wools is no advantage to the foreign manufacturer. Wool cloth is made from the wool fiber, not from wool grease and dirt. There can be no justification for compensating for wool duties that have not been paid.

That is the objection I have to this proposed statute.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is making a very able speech from his standpoint. From the light of experience we know how easy it is to make faces and to find fault with wool schedules, both as to wool and its manufactures. We have heard it for years. It is nothing new. It is sometimes more difficult to propose a remedy. Now, this compensation that is given the manufacturer for the wool, as I understand it, is meant to place him in the same position finally as if he had free wool. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think that was the origin of the superstition.

Mr. WARREN. There has to be some basis upon which to start with the ratio.

Now, the Senator has just stated there that his correspondent, his expert, from whom he quotes, would require a ratio of 6¾ in one case and 1¾ in the other, an average of about 3 to 1, and 4 to 1, taking that consideration.

Mr. DOLLIVER. On last Friday night it was proved to us conclusively that averages are in the nature of an imposition on the understanding of man.

Mr. WARREN. Take the experiment he has quoted there and add them together and divide by 2, and you will find you have just what the present ratio is.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That has this advantage: One of those ratios is correct in some cases, but the average of them all is correct in no case.

Mr. WARREN. Very well. But I should like to ask the Senator, before he finishes, to state how he is going to make a ratio that will be all right and satisfactory to both the grower of the material and the manufacturer, for the individuality of the wool and the woolgrower is lost sight of when the wool goes into the factory. Wool may go up and wool may go down.

A man may buy his wool at a time when the clip is good. It may be 10 per cent higher, or it may be 10 per cent lower. If you undertake to fix a ratio ad valorem, where are you going to land? It is just like the ad valorem duty upon wool. You put the ad valorem duty upon wool, and the grower of sheep, at the time he can stand it the least, is going to be damaged the most. For instance, if wool is 20 cents to-day and an ad valorem of 50 per cent should be placed upon it, it would be 10 cents. If wool should go down to 10 cents, the ad valorem would be 2 cents, and the very time he needed protection most would be the time when he would be stripped of it. Again, wool goes up, and the time when he does not need them is just the time when you pile on duties and make them higher. Therefore, in manufacturing, where wool fluctuates as it has within a year and a half from 15 to 25 cents, how are you going to fix a compensatory ratio unless you can fix the average?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, so persuasive are considerations such as the Senator from Wyoming has just made that I have postponed any final effort to secure a ratio which would be in the nature of an equitable and proportionate assessment. I have consented, with very great reluctance in my own mind, to preserve the historic ratio, not of 16 to 1, but of 4 to 1.

Mr. WARREN. It is sometimes 3 to 1, or 3½ to 1.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not intend to try to disturb that ratio, because I am so satisfied that it is sunk into the moral nature of so many good people in Wyoming that I could not undertake to extract it, even with delicate machinery, without upsetting the composure of friends, even here in the Senate Chamber. So I do not propose to change the ratio; but I intend to do a thing which I have thought of a great many times, though I never before could make out whether it was entirely feasible or not. I intend, in laying this compensatory duty, to make it 4 or 3 times the weight, not of the cloth, but of the wool contained in the cloth.

The idea got into my head that if you were compensating these manufacturers on account of not having free wool, you were carrying it a little too far when you gave them a compensation based upon the theory that the cloth was entirely made of wool, when, in point of fact, it is only half made of wool, and very often even a less proportion than that was in it. So I intend to push along these little amendments making this compensatory duty, intended to reimburse the manufacturer on account of the loss that he sustains by reason of the wool duty. I intend to make that compensatory assessment applicable to the wool contents of the cloth and not to the weight of the cloth.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, again I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that it is absolutely impossible to say how much pure wool is in a piece of goods, or how much woolen noils, or how much slubbing waste, or how much ring waste, or how much roving waste it contains. It is true that we can tell how much cotton there may be in a piece of goods, but no one ever lived who could tell how much woolen waste is mixed with the pure wool in a piece of goods.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, my friend understood me to very poor purpose if he suspected me of trying to separate, in the weighing of the wool in a piece of cloth, the pure wool from those wools which differ chemically from the pure wool only in the fact that they have had a longer experience in a cold world.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that this amendment would be absolutely unfair, for the very people who are in England to-day manufacturing cheap woolen goods, which contain from 80 to 85 and 90 per cent of wool waste, would come in here and have to pay, perhaps, or should pay, the full amount, because you can not tell the difference.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Exactly.

Mr. SMOOT. But if the honest manufacturer in that country would put in 10 per cent of the very best cotton in the world, he is to be penalized because he has done so.

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; he is only deprived of the compensation based on the idea that that cotton is wool.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but there is cotton that is worth a great deal more than the mungo which is contained in that piece of goods, and that is not penalized. But the man who would, perhaps, get in here 10 per cent of cotton is——

Mr. DOLLIVER. We do not put a duty on cotton, you know.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not speaking of the duty on cotton, for

the cotton would be in the woolen goods then. It is to be taken out, according to the argument——

Mr. DOLLIVER. Let me show my friend from Utah how beautifully and how automatically my scheme works. He is anxious to keep out these low, cheap, vile, worthless cloths, is he not?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but the programme which the Senator offers is not going to keep that vile, low stuff out, for they can not tell how much there is of it by testing. If they attempt to eat wastes out with acids, it all goes out.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Do we not keep them out now?

Mr. SMOOT. We keep them out now by having a duty so high that they can not come in.

Mr. DOLLIVER. We have the duty so high because it is a fixed assessment upon the weight of the cloth. I propose to fix the assessment upon the weight of the wool as found in the cloth; but these cheap shoddy goods are all wool in the cloth, and nothing else. They would report upon analysis that the wool content of the cloth is all there. Therefore on these cheap shoddy goods, which we are so anxious to keep out and which we are now keeping out, my scheme would operate automatically to still keep them out, and at the same time take away from people, who are sending here goods upon which they get a compensation on account of the presence of wool in them which is not there, that unnecessary compensatory which is supposed to reimburse them, but which, in fact, really subsidizes them and enables them to gather newspaper facilities and put forward my friend from Wyoming and other good people to fight their battles before the bar of public opinion with the people of the United States.

I propose that the goods coming into the United States in which wool does not appear, except in small quantities, in which there are materials other than wool, I propose to take away from them this bogus compensation, which they now have, by which the weight of the cloth is weighed up as if it contained 4 pounds of clothing wool of the first class in its texture and its make-up.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not mean to intimate that an English manufacturer or a German manufacturer, if he was going to adulterate his goods, and if perchance there was cotton in them and it would not be counted in the value of the goods, he would still put cotton in them? No; of course he would not. He would put in them wool extracts and the lowest grade waste and mungo; and no one could tell it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If that is true, you have got four or five hundred per cent of this mungo waste, flocks, and other wool waste.

Mr. SMOOT. And, Mr. President, I wish, therefore, that much more to keep it out of this country.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, it seems to me that there appears to be a sort of practical contention between the duty on this wool waste and the statement just made by the Senator from Utah, that these goods are so cheap that it does not pay to adulterate them with cotton.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator, I presume, knows—of course he must know—that since a tariff on wools was first established, more than a century ago, in all the tariff bills there is not a single exception, save one, which does not put a tariff on a fabric of which wool forms any part, and that one, away back in the early part of the nineteenth century, put it upon that of which wool was the chief factor; but every other law, including the Wilson-Gorman law, has been in almost the same identical language and has put a duty on fabrics, whether containing a large or small quantity of wool. Perhaps they have all been wrong; perhaps for one hundred and twenty years we have been wrong; perhaps the Senator is right; but I think he will see that it takes a little longer generally and a little more time—I will not say any more persuasive argument than that furnished us by the Senator—to bring about a great reform, when all parties on both sides have said all the way along for one hundred and twenty years that a tariff should apply to a fabric of which wool composed any part.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I do not now intend to go any more particularly into the amendment which I intend to offer to the woolen-cloth paragraph or schedule, but I hasten to state another thing that I intend to do, unless I am persuaded by some unseen influence not to do it. I think these woolen rates by reason of these calculations are so high that, whether they are good, bad, or indifferent, they make the protective-tariff system look ugly and malevolent in its relations to the market place.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question there?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Theories, of course, may sound good or bad, but it comes down to a simple, practical business proposition—how much does the tariff add to a man's suit of clothes or the cloth from which it is made?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think I have heard that argument. That depends upon the suit of clothes.

Mr. WARREN. It is very small.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. And you talk about this malevolent tariff and this——

Mr. DOLLIVER. I did not say "malevolent tariff;" I said that a tariff so framed as to have a malevolent countenance, although the purpose of it was benevolent and helpful and it ought to present such an appearance to the community.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator, dressed as well as he is, probably has not 3 pounds of wool upon his person.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am very thankful for that. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. I thought so. If a possible $1.33 protective tariff is too much to be levied upon a suit of clothes in order that we may employ in this country, as we do, a million people—families and all—in the raising of wool and hundreds of thousands more in the manufacturing of wool, rather than import all our cloths, then the Senator's judgment and mine differ.

Speaking of cloth, the cloth in the suit of clothes which I have on now cost a trifle over $4, and I submit that the cloth is good enough to wear even in the august presence of this Senate. I ask the Senator if I am not right.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We will all testify to that.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Let it be said that the Senator does not require a very elaborate suit of clothes to present an impressive appearance in the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. The amount of wool in the suit of clothes I have on weighs less than 3 pounds. The cloth in it cost—and it is the best kind I could get; it is all wool, and there is no flock or mungo or waste in it—a little over $4. The making of the suit was $30, and the findings used cost $12.50; so that the suit of clothes as it hangs upon me now cost over $40, and yet the cloth, for which I paid the regular mill price, cost but a trifle over $4. When you talk about a malevolent tariff and talk about adding to the price for the workingman——

Mr. DOLLIVER. I hope my friend will not allow that to go into the RECORD. I have not said anything about a "malevolent tariff."

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator; if so, I withdraw it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I was talking about a tariff that had some disfigurement of its countenance.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator surely spoke of the enormity of the tariff on wool and woolens. He will not withdraw that.

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; I really intend to illustrate it——

Mr. WARREN. I am illustrating it in my way, and I hope the Senator will illustrate it in his. If the Senator will figure out just how much the suffering consumer, who wears a suit of clothes like the one to which I have referred, pays in order to employ all the men along the line, from the time the raw wool comes in here until the cloth is made into a garment, I think he will find that the tariff on wool is a very small factor.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, my friend presents the illustration to me exactly as I want it. He has got a good suit of clothes; he has got his American cloth cheap, everything smooth, our people as well dressed as anybody, cloth as cheap here as anywhere, the protective-tariff system is vindicated, and I agree with him.

Therefore I want him to vote for an amendment which I am going to offer, that in no paragraph of this bill referring to cloth shall the aggregate assessment of duties amount to more than 100 per cent. I am moved to propose that amendment because I know that that is enough. When a man comes into my office, as a poor fellow did who is manufacturing carriages out in our country, with an armful of cloth that he had been getting in England, shoddy and ordinary, cheap woolen cloth, for lining the interior of a buggy such as country boys and girls are accustomed to use on Sunday afternoon when the climate is propitious, and proved to me that if he brought that cloth in from England—they did not seem to be making that kind of cloth here anywhere—that he was paying a duty of 200 per cent on it, paying not twice, but twice over, what the valuation of the cloth was at the custom-house, it appeared to me that such a rate was not necessary and that it simply gave an ugly advertisement to our great protective-tariff system. That is the reason I am appealing to Republicans everywhere to make ready for the fight that is coming against the Repub-

lican party and our tariff system by taking out of the measure these unnecessary and extravagant rates of duty.

I hope I will have a good deal of cooperation here before I am through in reducing some of these rates, not to the point of exposing our industry to injury, but to the point when the ordinary man, with a good conscience, can stand up before the community and defend our policy and vindicate the policy which we have embodied in our laws.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN (continuing). The lowering of the duty upon shoddy, upon waste, and upon low-priced cloth has been tried. The Senator probably knows the result. When they put wool upon the free list they put shoddy and flocks and mungo and all of those materials on a lower duty than had theretofore prevailed. They followed exactly what the Senator proposes—to put a lower price upon cloth. Let us look at the practical result. As I said a moment ago, it is not a matter of theory about a tariff; it is a matter of result.

The Senator knows, surely, for he has communed with history, that during that time this country was flooded with a lot of cloth that for wearing purposes was hardly worth the paper upon which the bill was written. That was the result of lowering the tariff upon those cheap fabrics. For instance, take the one article of shoddy. Before the Wilson-Gorman bill passed we were importing an amount that had not equaled a million pounds in four years or so, and, if I remember correctly, the first year after that bill became a law we imported over 45,000,000 pounds of shoddy. That 45,000,000 pounds of shoddy displaced from 100,000,000 to 135,000,000 pounds of American wool. Cloths were made in this country from that shoddy and sold at the mill price of 18 cents a yard, single width; and a man made from the manufacture of that kind of cloth one of the largest fortunes upon the capital invested that perhaps has ever been made in the woolen manufacturing industry in so short a time. Of course, when those cloths went on the backs of the consumer they might last a few days, if the weather was fine; but if the weather was bad he was naked in a very few days, unless he had money enough left to go and buy an all-wool suit.

Mr. President, I do not think it is a matter of lowering the prices on low-priced goods if they are imitation or if they are nonwearable goods. It seems to me that we have got to protect the workingman in his clothing, as to whether it shall wear well or not, just as we ought to protect the returns for his labor.

If I were going to lower the duty, I would lower it on the pure wool. I would not lower the duty levied against this half-wool and half-shoddy or all-shoddy stuff, and in that I have the testimony of the correspondent from Minnesota which the Senator quoted. He wished we would make it prohibitory—the tariff on shoddy. We have all the rags and all the shoddy in this country that we ought to consume. We ought to keep out cheap cloths and counterfeit cloths. When I say "cheap clothing" I do not mean cheap, dollar for dollar, for what it is worth, but I mean cheaply constructed clothing, in which substitutes are used and upon which higher profits are made than upon the finer broadcloths and worsteds.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish the Senate now just to look at this one proposition to see how ridiculous conditions would be here in this country if the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, as last proposed, were adopted. Supposing wool in England, or in any part of this country, was 11 cents a pound in the grease, and our duty here was 11 cents—and, by the way, the Senator from Iowa says that he is not going to disturb that—that would be 100 per cent ad valorem duty. Where would there be any duty for the manufacturing of that wool?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not intend to disturb the 50 per cent. The duty of 100 per cent would be on the finished cloth, of which the wool constitutes but about half the cost.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the whole proposition is that we have to take into consideration not only the ad valorem duty that is upon wool, but the duty that is put upon the manufactured woolens. So that, if woolens in the markets of the world were 11 cents a pound and our duty upon grease wools was 11 cents, there is 100 per cent ad valorem duty, and nothing left to protect the manufacturing interests in this country in taking the wool and putting it into cloth. What would be the result? The result would be that every woolen manufacturing institution would have to cease. I would ask the Senator from Iowa if that is not the case?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would ask the Senator from Utah when it was that woolens were 11 cents?

Mr. SMOOT. In foreign lands. Oh, many times, Mr. President.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Then, what is the present duty on the woolens that come from abroad here?

Mr. SMOOT. The price on unwashed wools was 11 cents; on second class——

Mr. DOLLIVER. What is the equivalent duty ad valorem?

Mr. SMOOT. Second class, 12 cents a pound——

Mr. DOLLIVER. What is the equivalent ad valorem?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that may be in one year a certain amount and in another year it may be another amount.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Has it ever risen far above 50 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. Sometimes, Mr. President, it has been. It would have been in 1895, when we sold wool in our State for 4 and 5 cents a pound. I bought for the mill there nearly 1,000,000 pounds of wool, and it did not average over 5½ cents. If a condition like that should arise, where would our manufacturers be? Of course upon its face it looks as if the proposition that no duty should be over 100 per cent is a fair one; but suppose a condition should arise, as it did then, where would our manufacturers be? They would be absolutely stranded.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge me a moment?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. In extending the remarks that I made about the cheap clothing, I want to make this observation: It takes about the same labor to make a suit of clothing of very cheap goods that it takes to make a good suit; but, Mr. President, the poor suit of clothes made from shoddy, and so forth, may not give one-tenth of the wear that a good article gives.

I have here some samples of cloth. The mill price is on each one of them. They are about as handsome worsteds as you would care to see. They run from less than $1 to $1.12½ a yard. They are all wool; they are 56 inches wide; and it takes a little over 3 yards to make a single suit. If you buy a whole piece and take it to a tailor, it takes just about 3 yards to each suit if it is made up into ready-made clothing.

Mr. GALLINGER. Are they American cloths?

Mr. WARREN. These are American cloths. When you have got worsteds, about the best that are made and double-width, of which it takes 3 or 3½ yards to make a suit of clothes, a suit of clothes made from it will last a couple of seasons, perhaps. Is it to the interest of the poor man, we will say, to make up a fabric that will cost him a dollar or two less for the cloth, when its making costs the same? Will it pay to reduce the tariff upon the cheaper material, upon the substitutes, no matter what the percentage is? I am not afraid of putting 100 per cent upon something that is not desirable, upon something as to which we would have the thanks of every consumer if we should shut it out entirely.

Why talk about reducing the cost of cloth by reducing the tariff upon cheap articles, when cloth like this can be bought for a little over a dollar a yard? It only takes to-day about 3 yards to make up a suit. What is the use of bringing in a lot of cloth that may only be one-fifth wool and the balance cotton or shoddy or, for that matter, any other substitute? We are already protecting the workingman in this country who is making the cloth, and we are also protecting his back and body by so providing that, instead of being swindled with a lot of cheap cloth, which dissolves when he goes out in the rain, he may have a first-class fabric costing a little over $3 for cloth enough for a first-class suit of clothes.

During Mr. DOLLIVER'S speech,

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to send to the desk some amendments which I desire to offer to the bill, in order that they may be printed?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I ask to have printed as one document the series of amendments, and also that they may be printed in the RECORD without being read.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed as a document, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. BACON to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, relating to the provisions of said bill prescribing duties upon wools and hair, as follows:

Amend by striking out all of said bill from paragraph 356 to paragraph 372, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The duty upon all wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and upon shoddy, noils, wool extract, woolen rags, mungo, and flocks, yarn waste, thread waste, and all other waste composed wholly or in part of wool shall be 30 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 373, which is as follows:

"373. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be two and one-half times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 30 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three and one-half times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto, upon all the foregoing, 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 143.02 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"373. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool, 40 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 374, on page 130, which is as follows:

"374. On cloths, knit fabrics, and all manufactures of every description made wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this section, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on a pound of unwashed wool of the first class; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not above 70 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be four times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto, upon all the foregoing, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at over 70 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be four times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class and 55 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 141 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"374. On knit fabrics, and all fabrics made on knitting machines or frames, not including wearing apparel, and on shawls made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, 40 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 375, on page 130, which is as follows:

"375. On blankets, and flannels for underwear composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be the same as the duty imposed by this section on 2 pounds of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem. On blankets composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at more than 50 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem. Flannels composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at above 50 cents per pound, shall be classified and pay the same duty as women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character and description provided by this section: *Provided*, That on blankets over 3 yards in length the same duties shall be paid as on cloths." (In equivalent, maximum 165.42 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"375. On blankets, hats of wool, flannels for underwear, and felts for printing machines, composed wholly or in part of wool, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 30 and not more than 40 cents per pound, 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on blankets over 3 yards in length the same duties shall be paid as on woolen and worsted cloths."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 376, on page 131, and paragraph 377, on page 132, which are as follows:

"376. On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar description and character of which the warp consists wholly of cotton or other vegetable material, with the remainder of the fabric composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not exceeding 15 cents per square yard, the duty shall be 7 cents per square yard; valued at more than 15 cents per square yard, the duty shall be 8 cents per square yard; and in addition thereto on all the foregoing valued at not above 70 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued above 70 cents per pound, 55 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 115.53 per cent ad valorem.)

"377. On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, and goods of similar description or character composed wholly or in part of wool, and not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 11 cents per square yard; and in addition thereto on all the foregoing valued at not above 70 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued above 70 cents per pound, 55 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all the foregoing, weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, the duty shall be the same as imposed by this schedule on cloths." (In equivalent, maximum 118 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, or goods of similar description or character, and on all manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not over 50 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Amend further by striking out paragraph 378, on page 132, which is as follows:

"378. On clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, wool hats, shawls whether knitted or woven, and knitted articles of every description made up or manufactured wholly or in part, felts not woven, and not specially provided for in this section, composed wholly or in part of wool, the duty per pound shall be four times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 60 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 95.98 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"378. On clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, made up or manufactured wholly or in part, not specially provided for in this act, felts not specially provided for in this act, all the foregoing composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at above $1.50 per pound, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at less than $1.50 per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem. On cloaks, dolmans, jackets, talmas, ulsters, or other outside garments for ladies' and children's apparel, and goods of similar description or used for like purposes, and on knit wearing apparel, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part, 40 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 379, on page 132, which is as follows:

"379. Webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, bandings, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, edgings, insertings, flouncings, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, ribbons, ornaments, laces, trimmings, and articles made wholly or in part of lace, embroideries and all articles embroidered by hand or machinery, head nets, nettings, buttons, or barrel buttons, or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, and manufactures of wool ornamented with beads or spangles of whatever material composed, any of the foregoing made of wool or of which wool is a component material, whether containing india rubber or not, 50 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, maximum 80.83 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"379. On webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, dress trimmings, laces, embroideries, head nets, nettings and veilings, buttons or barrel buttons, or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, any of the foregoing which are elastic or nonelastic, made of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, or of which wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals is a component material, 45 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 380, on page 133, which is as follows:

"380. Aubusson, Axminster, moquette, and chenille carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 60 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 66.34 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"380. Aubusson, Axminster, moquette, and chenille carpets, figured or plain, carpets woven whole for rooms, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 381, on page 133, which is as follows:

"381. Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 60 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 72.67 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"381. Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 382, on page 133, which is as follows:

"382. Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 44 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 75.81 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"382. Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 383, on page 133, which is as follows:

"383. Velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on the warp or otherwise, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 58.86 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"383. Velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on the warp or otherwise, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 40 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 384, on page 133, which is as follows:

"384. Tapestry Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on the warp or otherwise, 28 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 60.73 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"384. Tapestry Brussels, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on the warp or otherwise, 40 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 385, on page 134, which is as follows:

"385. Treble ingrain, three-ply, and all chain Venetian carpets, 22 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 66.72 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"385. Treble ingrain, three-ply, and all chain Venetian carpets, 30 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 386, on page 134, which is as follows:

"386. Wool Dutch and two-ply ingrain carpets, 18 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 58.63 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"386. Wool Dutch and two-ply ingrain carpets, 30 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 387, on page 134, which is as follows:

"387. Carpets of every description, woven whole for rooms, and oriental, Berlin, Aubusson, Axminster, and similar rugs, 10 cents per square foot and 40 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That in the measurement of all mats, rugs, carpets, and similar articles, of whatever material composed, the selvage, if any, shall be included." (In equivalent, 60.01 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"387. Carpets of every description woven whole for rooms, and oriental, Berlin, and other similar rugs, 40 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 388, on page 134, which is as follows:

"388. Druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, 22 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem." (In equivalent, 70.86 per cent ad valorem.)

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"388. Druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, felt carpeting, figured or plain, 30 per cent ad valorem."

Amend further by striking out paragraph 389, on page 134, which is as follows:

"389. Carpets and carpeting of wool, flax, or cotton, or composed in part of any of them, not specially provided for in this section, and mats, matting, and rugs of cotton, 50 per cent ad valorem."

An insert the following in lieu thereof:

"389. Carpets and carpeting, of wool, flax, or cotton, composed in part of either, not specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem."

After the conclusion of Mr. DOLLIVER's speech,

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I do not know that I can add very much to the technical discussion affecting the manufacture of woolen goods, but there is a practical side to this question affecting the people that constitute a very considerable percentage of the consumers of this country as well as producers that should not be lost sight of. We are apt to lose the consideration of that question in the consideration of these mysterious figures affecting the classification of imports and the duties upon them.

Of course the value of our home product depends upon the quantity and the condition of the importations of wool. If the people can obtain all the wool they want from abroad upon better terms than they can obtain it at home, they will largely buy the foreign product; and the purpose of a protective tariff is to regulate the conditions under which foreign wool may come into this country, so that there will be a greater burden upon the foreign wool and its products than upon the domestic wool. That is the spirit of the legislation now under consideration.

Largely we must appeal first to the labor item. I find, from a reference to the report of the committee of the Senate, that there are $135,069,063 of wages involved in this controversy. Those are the figures given us by the committee, and they are no doubt correct. That sum of money represents more than the value of all the land, with the buildings and improvements upon it, in about 17 States. There are 17 States in this Union whose total valuation of lands and improvements falls below the wages item in this schedule. I state that in order that we may carry in our minds all along some comparison upon which to determine the equities of this question.

There is not an enterprise in this country in which the wage item enters more largely than into the question of the woolen schedule. The largest item in the woolen schedule is men's clothing. That, of course, includes the cloths to which the Senator from Wyoming referred, but that item includes the wages of the people who convert the wool into clothing. That is about one-third of the wage item.

A brief comparison of the figures will throw some light upon this question as it affects the men who produce the wool. At the time of the enactment of the Dingley bill it cost $1,479 to produce in bale the wool of 1,200 sheep. To-day it costs $2,840 to do the same thing. There is a difference in wages to the men producing that item of $1,365 between free wool and the Dingley Act.

That item is denominated as a flock. Sheep raisers divide their sheep into flocks for convenience of care and protection. So it will be seen that the increase is practically 100 per cent of the cost of raising a flock of sheep and producing the wool to-day, as against the cost at the time of the enactment of the Dingley bill. Why? Because men at that time were working for less wages; were compelled to submit to less profit. And these are the items: In 1897, 1 herder, at $35 per month, $420 for the year; 1 camp tender, at $25 a month, $300 per year; board for the two, $25 a month, $300 a year; shearing, at 7 cents each, $119; feeding hay, at 20 cents each, $340. That makes up the total of $1,479 for taking care of and taking the wool from a flock of sheep.

Compare those wages, and you will have a very fair idea of the differing conditions under free trade and a protective tariff. The man who received $35 a month in 1897 now receives $50 a month. The man who received $25 a month as camp tender now receives $40 a month. The man who boarded them for $25 a month under free trade now gets $50 per month. We now pay to the Government a grazing fee of 7 cents upon each of these sheep, and that is whether they are on forest reserves or on any other government land. The shearing which in 1897 cost 7 cents to-day costs 10 cents; that is, the men get 3 cents apiece more now for shearing the sheep than they did then. The hay in 1897 cost 20 cents for each sheep and to-day it costs 50 cents.

There is a statement, a business statement of account between free trade and the existing condition. I have that from the man who engaged the herder, raised the sheep, and paid for their care. It is not dependent upon any official statistics. It is the actual charge, and I think it is one of the most enlightening and important items from the standpoint of the raiser of sheep that can be produced.

Let us apply that; that is, for a flock of a limited number of sheep. Of course, the figures carried forward would demonstrate the difference in cost as applied to the entire sheep industry. I will take my own State as a text, because what is true there is true elsewhere. We are the third largest wool-producing State in the United States—Idaho. We have close to 5,000,000 sheep in the State, and they carry fleeces close to 25,000,000 pounds. Of course, the department says that the average fleece in Idaho is 7 pounds. That is the average fleece that is sheared by the large sheep owners, but there are a very large number of sheep in the State which do not produce 7 pounds. I take them into consideration when I state the product.

I saw wool—2,000,000 pounds of it—in October, 1896, piled up in the warehouses and on the railroad platforms that could find no market. The freight to Boston—the wool market of this country at that time—was about 6 cents a pound, and the price of wool in Boston was about 6 cents a pound. So the wool stayed there, and this followed: The millions of sheep that had been running upon the grazing fields of Idaho necessarily disappeared. Men sold them; men gave them away. I saw a flock of 1,000 sheep, for which a man paid 10 cents apiece, being driven into Montana, in the hope of finding some pasture for them. I saw the flocks of Idaho disappear, practically, and that condition continued until the Dingley bill gave us a protective tariff upon the product of the sheep; and then I saw the industry grow again. Many of the men who had been formerly engaged in that business had gone into bankruptcy and had gone out into other fields of business occupation. Practically a new set of men came into the field to build up the sheep industry.

Now, sheep can not be produced in a day. They must grow, and necessarily they had to wait until they could regrow these flocks. The result was that wool went from 6 cents to 13 and 14 cents a pound in Idaho, and it has gone up as high as 20 and 21 and 22. It is worth about 18 to 20 cents there now because of the protective-tariff policy under the Dingley Act and for no other reason. You remove that duty or you tamper with it and you immediately hold a threat over that great industry which will result in men pulling in, so to speak, in this enterprise; and if you reduce the duties so as to reduce the profits upon sheep raising, they will go out of business. What will take its place? These great stretches of pasture lands will be idle. They will be nonproductive, because, as a rule, there are not other men to step in, even though the conditions were favorable to other classes of business, and take the places of the men who go out. We would lose that income.

In addition to the value of the wool, which is an annual product, there is the value of the sheep. I should say the sheep will average $4 a head in Idaho; and we have 3,000,000 of the class of sheep which would be worth $4 a head. There is $12,000,000 of property belonging to the sheep raisers in Idaho which would pass out of existence, which would go into the market at a depreciated price, if they could find a market at all. In 1896 they could find no market for them, so that they were disseminated throughout the fields of bankruptcy and low prices, and we had nothing to take their place.

That is the business situation. And can you wonder that we are here to oppose a reduction, or anything that may amount to a reduction, of the duty to be placed upon the product of our competitors? We compete within our own country, in the markets of the people, in the sale of these products. Are we to be brought into competition now, not with our own people, because the rule of destruction will apply to the entire product wherever it is in this country, but with the producers of other countries?

As I suggested once before, are we, because evils exist in our country, now to call in the Hessians to punish the people and compel them to submit to these conditions of depreciated value and trade? That is the spirit which appeals to me in this matter, and I do not feel that this question should be left to rest upon a discussion of the technical principles of trade in the custom-house. I do not intend to speak of the trade in the custom-house. I intend to speak of the trade on the plains—the conditions of those people. Any industry that contributes fifteen or twenty million dollars every year to a part of the people of this country is entitled to receive our consideration in legislating on that subject.

I am not content to risk the experiment whether or not some new theory might work as well. This great industry has been builded up and maintained under the existing condition, with which we are content, and we protest against any change in it. If conditions were unsatisfactory, if clothing was beyond the reach of the poor or the rich, if evils had grown up out of this industry, there might be some reason for reaching out and grasping new theories and for experimenting with new methods of government. But when it is admitted that the prices are reasonable, and further demonstrated that the people have money to pay the prices, which is the most important of all, why tamper with it? Why propose any change either of the method or of the basic value?

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says he has another theory that is just as good. I have met these just-as-good men all along the road in my life. They are the unsuccessful peo-

ple, the people who always think they have something better than that which you have and are trying to tempt you to substitute their wares for yours. That is not a safe basis for government or a safe basis on which to enact a tariff law.

Mr. President, up well into my years of life the majority of this product was east of the Mississippi River. In 1877 only 25 per cent of the wool of this country was produced west of the Mississippi River. To-day 78 per cent of it is produced west of the Mississippi River. The interest, the selfish interest—and I charge it against no man personally—has shifted. To-day there is less interest in the East in protecting the product of the flocks of sheep than there was thirty years ago. To-day it is a western industry.

Mr. President, under the free-trade policy and practice of the Democratic party the importations of wool from foreign countries almost doubled—some years more than doubled—and the exportations of wool fell off proportionately. That meant that we were sending our money abroad to get clothes, the product of wool. If we had it, we were sending it abroad to buy the products of other nations.

Immediately upon the enactment of the Dingley bill and the restoration of a duty upon wool the tables turned and we began to produce wool in this country, and the importations decreased, notwithstanding that our necessities were enhanced by our prosperity and the balance of trade has been in our favor on this product ever since, to the extent of a great many million dollars.

There has been $900,000,000 of wool produced in this country since the Dingley bill was enacted, which would not have been produced under the free-trade Wilson-Gorman bill. I take that from the figures showing the exports and the imports and the production and the use of this article. Those figures represent good government in the interest of the people.

I care not for the prosperity of the woolgrowers of other countries. We have no responsibility for them. Our first duty lies toward our own people, and the enactment of laws should be in the interest of our own people, regardless of the effect upon other nations. The presumption is that the other nations could exist without us, and I know we can exist without them, in so far as the necessities of life are concerned.

It occurred to me, when I heard Senators speaking for an income tax, that we might reach one phase of that question here by placing duties upon the things used as luxuries by those from whom the income tax would be collected. You can raise revenue enough, by placing the tariff high enough upon the luxuries of life that would be used by the class of people who would pay an income tax, to make it unnecessary to resort to an income tax.

This talk of being under obligations to revise the tariff downward came from somewhere; I do not know from where; from some political, I was going to say swamp, like a miasma. No man dared to mention it in the national platform. It was a concession, a sop, thrown by those lacking in confidence to the voters whose support they thought they had to have. Four years ago, with similar conditions, without any such pretense, we cast the largest majority for the leader of the Republican party that had ever been cast. Have conditions changed so in four years that we must add some promise? There is nothing in the platform of the Republican party which requires us, as suggested by the Senator from Iowa, to make any concession, because some one or many may have promised a revision downward. They seem to think that the Republican party never had a platform until the last Chicago convention.

The platform of the Republican party includes every declaration which has been made since its organization, and the declarations of 1860 and 1864, and in every other campaign, are still a part of it.

The man who denies it had better review and revise his Republicanism. There is not a plank in its history, in any campaign, that any Republican would to-day strike out. If we do not repeat them all every time, it is because we have written them into the laws of the country, for which the Republican party stands, and it is no longer necessary to repeat them. But they have not been dropped out. We post our ledger every four years and include conditions that have arisen as a basis of a declaration to the people, but we do not unwrite the words of the Republican platforms of the past.

We have heard Senators reading from speeches—the speeches of candidates, the speeches of men who spoke on behalf of the Republican party—to prove that the Republican party has changed its doctrine. None of them whose remarks are entitled to our consideration ever dreamed that such a use would be made of the expressions they gave forth. There was a party in the last campaign that had a platform which was in conformity with the declarations and the demands of some Senators. But the people repudiated it. They did not elect anybody who stood upon that platform, which declared in favor of a reduction of the tariff.

The Senator from Iowa stated correctly to-day the meaning of the word "revision" or "revise." It was merely a promise to the people that we would look again at the tariff laws of the country. Look again, for what purpose? That we might inspect, as a man inspects the home in which he lives or his business system, to see whether or not there is need of repairs. When the people gave their sanction at the polls to the Republican party and continued it in power, it was a declaration that the conditions then existing were satisfactory to the people, and the mere promise that we look was unnecessary, because the Republican party is always looking to the wisdom and the effect of its action.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator will concede that the Republican platform at Chicago did prescribe a revision of the tariff, and did provide for it. Now, what was the purpose of that? What was the purpose of putting any plank about the revision of the tariff in the platform? What was it for?

Mr. HEYBURN. Because there was an inquiry abroad in the land as to whether or not the tariff rested upon a sound basis.

Mr. NELSON. Was that all?

Mr. HEYBURN. That was all there was in the Republican convention. Outside of the Republican convention, and outside of the Republican party, there was denunciation and a demand for a transfer of power to another party, but within the Republican party no one on the day of that convention would have dared to confess inadequacy on the part of the Republican party in the management of the affairs of this country.

Mr. NELSON. What was the purpose of revision contemplated in the platform? What was the revision that the platform had in view?

Mr. HEYBURN. The purpose I have already stated. The insertion of that plank was an assurance to those who were in doubt, and in doubt because of their want of knowledge. It was an assurance that the Republican party would see to it.

Mr. NELSON. Then, as I understand the Senator, the only object was as to those who began to doubt whether some features of the protective tariff were too high, and it was simply a declaration in the platform to give us an opportunity to convert them to the efficacy of the tariff.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; it was a reply to their expression of uncertainty that the great Republican party would look into the matter. It was equivalent to a declaration that when they inspected that foundation of the Republican party if they found it sound they would stand by it, and if they found the conditions had changed and made it wise to reform some schedules in certain ways they would raise them or lower them. It was also an assurance that if there were any products that needed greater protection they would advance the duties.

Mr. NELSON. If the statement of the Senator from Idaho is correct, and all the object of the revision was to assure the people that the existing tariff was correct, why are we here to pass a tariff bill? What is the purpose of it? Ought we not to adhere to the Dingley law?

Mr. HEYBURN. I will refer the inquiry to the Senator from Minnesota as to why we are here. We are not here because the Republican party had proven incompetent to manage the affairs of this Government. We are not here because we did not have prosperity under Republican rule. We are not here because we intended to repudiate the lifelong principles of the Republican party. We are not here for any of those reasons.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator misconstrues me. When I used the expression "What are we here for?" I meant why are we here pretending to revise the tariff.

Mr. HEYBURN. We are here looking it over. We are here inspecting the great building occupied by the people of this country, to see whether or not it is in good working order. It was in good working order at the time of the Chicago convention. It has been in good working order always when the Republican party has controlled the destinies of this country; and it will be in good working order only so long as the Republican party controls its destinies along the lines upon which that party has always rested.

That is the answer I make to the Senator. He has been a lifelong member of the Republican party, if I am correctly advised, and he knows that the foundation stone upon which it rests is a protective tariff that will give the people of this country the markets of the country without any close competition

with the producers of other countries. This thing of trying to scale the wool protection down to a hairbreadth and then drawing fine lines and indulging in close analysis to see whether or not it is possible for our business opponent to slip over the line in a night and invade our ground is not my kind of revision or Republicanism.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Idaho talks about hairbreadth discriminations or distinctions. What does he think of a tariff of 165 per cent ad valorem upon woolen blankets? Is that a foundation stone of the Republican party?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, if it was necessary to enact such a tariff in order to give the American people the markets for the products upon which the duty was laid, I would not care if it was a thousand per cent. I would shut that foreign competitor out of our markets, and I would have those who are able to disregard the American product pay a price and put it into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield still further to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. Where would the Senator get his revenue if we shut everything out?

Mr. HEYBURN. There are always enough people whose vanity tempts them to buy anything because it has a foreign brand or a foreign coat of arms upon it. You can rest safely upon the vanity of the people to pay the duty.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to his colleague?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that he could get it from an income tax.

Mr. HEYBURN. Well, Mr. President, I think I will not take up the income tax at this time. I may possibly do so later. I am speaking in favor of the kind of income tax that appeals to me now, an income tax under the provisions and within the contemplation of the Constitution of the United States, which provided that the first resource of this Government to maintain itself should be duties upon imports to this country. That was the intention of the founders, and until that is exhausted or proven to be inadequate I would go no further; I would not even feel it necessary to consider whether or not we might resort to another class of taxation.

What do you propose to do in this country? You propose to run the American labor engaged in this industry, the average weekly wages of which is $8.31 per week, against the Italian labor, which is $3.77 a week, and I speak from official figures, the identical labor, the same number of hours.

Mr. NELSON. I do not understand that the Italians are raising sheep or sending any wool over here.

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator would be astonished to know how many of them are engaged in the manufacture of articles within this schedule. I have it, but I want to finish the statement from the comparative tables. You would be running the American labor, that receives American wages and lives like an American, up against the corresponding labor of France at $5.03 per week. You would be running the American labor, with the attributes of the American citizen behind it, against English labor at $5.72 per week.

Why would we who are here to represent these American laborers trade off their prosperity in a vain attempt to follow after some untried theories of government, when we have, and know that we have, conditions here, the result of the republican system of government, that leaves us a margin which represents the profit to the American people?

Mr. President, I have heard some suggestions here as to the basis of a protective tariff that have not accorded with my idea. All these comparisons have been between great enterprises in America and like enterprises abroad. Senators have been comparing how possible it was for the well equipped and great American factories to compete with those abroad. Where, in their minds, were the small enterprises of this country? The true basis of a protective tariff is not with the great enterprises that might compete because of the volume of their business. It begins with the smaller concerns. The question in my mind is not whether the Amoskeag Mills might compete with the foreigner, but it is whether the little mill down in the valley that represents all that men of smaller means have shall compete with him. That is protection. The protective tariff was to protect those who need it, and those who need it most are not the great enterprises with vast capital and great buildings.

All through this discussion, as I have heard it on both sides of the Chamber, my mind has criticised that comparison and has been making inquiries all the time. The figures I have been making all the time have been applied to the small manufacturer, the small merchant, the small producer, because, when you come to the last analysis, they are the subjects in the contemplation of the fathers of the Republic when they established this doctrine of protection.

I think we might dispense very much with the elaboration of figures that we have listened to here for the last week on the cotton schedule, because they do not affect the legitimate object of protection. The question is as to the little woolen mill down in the valley that has not the most modern appliances and can not have them. How shall we protect that mill owner? Is he to become a mere satellite of the larger manufacturers, and be made to depend entirely upon their prosperity? I think not. The very first inquiry in my mind is, How will this affect the men who have not elaborate machinery or great buildings and large capital?

When we were discussing the lumber schedule I looked at the statistics and saw that out of 1,300 mills in one section of the country there are less than 400 of them that have band saws, and that 900 of them are equipped with less expensive machinery, but sufficient for the purpose of their trade. Yet everything was discussed from the standpoint of the great enterprises, and the only question that was asked was, Can these great enterprises live? They can live if they make 2 or 3 per cent on their investment, but the individual with the little industry or concern would starve to death on 2 or 3 per cent on an investment with only a handful of money.

Yet he is entitled to engage in that occupation. He is entitled to his share in the prosperity that comes from furnishing his neighbors with their stack of flour or their jag of lumber. He is entitled to flourish if he only wants to do so in his own neighborhood.

When I was a boy we raised our own sheep and our own wool. The sheep were sheared on the place, and I used to ride with my father to the Bancroft and other mills and take that wool and then go back there when we were notified that it was ready and bring home the cloth and the blankets. Some of those mills are in existence to-day; some of them have developed into great concerns; and some of them have advanced only a little beyond the condition of that day. Are they not entitled to consideration in making an estimate in this matter? Is not the farmer with a dozen sheep or a hundred entitled to consideration in making up a schedule here? The Senator from Minnesota gives a negative shake of his head. What shall he do? Cease to raise sheep? Cease to have a sawmill and a flour mill? What is he to do? Is he to be crushed between the wheels of these great enterprises and be ground out of existence? I think not.

When I speak for that class of the American people, I speak for 90 per cent of them. So far as I am concerned, I am here to legislate for that class of people as well as for the merchant princes and the great mill owners; and I am only impelled to speak on this occasion that I may, if I can, cause men to hesitate and cause them to get away from the intricate calculations into which we have been drawn and to which we have listened for the last ten days or two weeks, calculations that dealt only with millions.

Let us deal with the individual, not with his pocketbook. It is worth more to the individual to have a field for his labor than anything else. The opportunity is the thing that is valuable; the man will do the rest. But if he has no opportunity, if he has no protection except to become a part of the tail of a great kite that sails and carries him through the air, you will soon find this Nation degenerating so that the great mass of people will be mere accessories to those who are largely engaged in business.

Mr. President, I expect to vote for this bill. I expect also to leave in the records of the Senate of the United States my protest against basing our consideration and our action here on this or any other schedule upon the top notch of trade. I am not here to consider how possible it would be to live under certain circumstances. I am here to consider how great and grand it would be to share in the prosperity and the productiveness of this great country of ours.

Sometimes we all reach the same point by traveling over different roads, and if I arrive at my conclusions upon this question by those routes that seem to me the ones proper to travel over, we will arrive at the same ultimate result, even though all Senators do not come to it by that way.

I do not propose, if my vote or my voice can help it, to see the great sheep industry of our western country destroyed or frittered away in elaborate arguments or reasoning. I am more interested in the people whose lives and whose happiness and comfort depend upon the opportunity that grows out of and be-

longs to this enterprise than I am in any of the great mills. The mills will follow. They will exist and prosper on the American product better than they will upon the foreign product. I would rather see every pound of American wool go into the American mill and be used to clothe and cover the American people, and if we have a surplus we will sell it in the markets of the world.

But I would buy not one dollar of the surplus of other nations if I could avoid it. I would only do it when the home product was insufficient. I would rather trust the comfort and the destiny and the prosperity of the American people to competition within our own Nation and between our own citizens than to have it at the mercy of competition with foreign countries and foreign conditions. I would make it very difficult for the foreign producer to enter our household and take a seat at the table of Republican prosperity.

There is no people in the United States more interested in this question than the people whom I represent in this body. There was a time, when 78 per cent of the wool was produced this side of the Mississippi River, when you would have heard the voices of many men in States producing that commodity raised up in support of the principles for which I speak. They did, and they wrote the tariff upon wool in no uncertain letters. They did not make it subject to the vicissitudes of an ad valorem duty. An ad valorem duty on wool at 20 cents or at 10 cents, as was very well suggested by the Senator from Wyoming, not only affects the woolgrower, but it affects the Treasury of the United States. When we pass a tariff law here we want to be able, with some degree of certainty, to know what revenue it is going to produce; and if you put it on an ad valorem basis you will never know what the revenue to-morrow or next week or next year will be.

I saw wool not very long ago drop from 21 cents to 12 cents. Contemplate for a moment the effect of that upon the United States Treasury. Instead of taking in duties——

Mr. McLAURIN. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. McLAURIN. Was that caused by the Wilson law?

Mr. HEYBURN. We did not have any duty on wool under the Wilson law.

Mr. McLAURIN. But the drop of which the Senator speaks?

Mr. HEYBURN. We did not have any revenue.

Mr. McLAURIN. Was the drop of which the Senator speaks, from 21 to 12 cents the other day, caused by the Wilson tariff law?

Mr. HEYBURN. It was caused by the scare of the people. Somebody conjured up a ghost and scared the people, and they took to the woods.

Mr. McLAURIN. What were the people scared at?

Mr. HEYBURN. They were scared for the moment—the element that controlled it—at the financial condition in the country. They did not know that the Republican party, by the magic wand of wisdom, could correct any existing or temporary discomfort in the financial world.

Mr. McLAURIN. Were they scared at the Republican Congress?

Mr. HEYBURN. The Republican Congress applied the remedy in a very few moments.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator made an inquiry as to why the price of wool fell—what was the figure?

Mr. HEYBURN. From 21 to 12 cents.

Mr. McLAURIN. The Senator is mistaken about that. I made no such inquiry. I made inquiry whether it was attributable to the Wilson law.

Mr. WARREN. I presume the Senator would like to know something about the price of wool during the administration of the Wilson law or the effect of that law on wool.

Mr. McLAURIN. The Senator can not turn the question by any such way as that. That is not relevant to the question I asked.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it is very relevant.

Mr. WARREN. Admitting that it is not relevant, I will say to the Senator from Idaho that the price of wool in my State and in the State the Senator so well represents was somewhere from 4¼ to 6 cents. That was what it was worth during the Wilson law.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes, Mr. President; the railroad companies required you to either prepay the freight or give a bond for it before they would receive it for shipment, because the wool was not worth the freight.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, that may be the best answer the Senator from Idaho or the Senator from Wyoming may be able to give to my question, but the question I propounded was whether the drop that the Senator saw the other day, from 21 to 12 cents, was attributable to the Wilson law.

Mr. HEYBURN. No. I have answered the Senator. I have already attempted to tell the Senator to what it was attributable. It was attributable to one of those temporary disturbances that will arise at all times to the great party. The party that is able to manage the affairs of this Government is the party that knows what to do when the question comes, and the other party that is not competent is the one that uses it only as a taunt.

Mr. McLAURIN. With the Senator's permission, I will say that it is customary on the part of the Senators both from Idaho and Wyoming, and other Senators on the Republican side, to lay everything to the charge of the Wilson law, and when the Senator said there was a drop a little while ago of from 21 to 12 cents, it occurred to me that probably it might be very pertinent to ask whether that was attributable to the Wilson law.

That was evaded, or attempted to be evaded, by stating the price of wool under the régime of the Wilson law and as to the ability of the Republican party to always manage the Government so that there will be no trouble in the revenues and no trouble in the affairs of the country, and the inability of the Democratic party to do that. I wish to say that the Republican party did not manage the finances of the country in the year 1907 in such a way that we were denied the benefit the Republican party gave us of the money panic.

Mr. HEYBURN. If I had the time or the inclination to go into an analysis of the financial panic I might do so for the entertainment of the Senator from Mississippi, but not to his profit, nor, I think, to the profit of anyone. I will call his attention to figures, however, which have been handed to me. In 1896, 38,298,183 sheep sold for $65,167,735; that is, they were averaged at that; and in the year of grace 1907, 53,240,282 sheep had a value of $204,210,129. A mere inspection of the figures is sufficient.

Mr. McLAURIN. The Senator will do another favor to me if he will show how that has any relevancy to the question I propounded to him.

Mr. HEYBURN. I am almost inclined to ask the Senator to what he attributes it; whether he attributes it to the great benefit and success of Democratic government, or whether he will concede some slight part of it to the character of the Government under which the conditions have arisen.

Mr. McLAURIN. I will just say in reference to that that there is one thing certain about it; the drop in the price of wool that has just occurred, from 21 cents to 12 cents, to which the Senator alluded, was not caused by any Democratic legislation.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I think that is hardly relevant. The price of wool to-day, because of the Government and because of its quality and character, is back to 21 cents. A man may be sick overnight, but if he has a good physician or is a man of intelligence he may be recovered in the morning.

Mr. McLAURIN. Yes, Mr. President; and if he takes good care of his health he is not likely to be sick overnight.

Mr. HEYBURN. I hardly think the Senator will want that to stand as a complete answer.

It is, however, not my intention to prolong my remarks. I was inadvertently thinking that we adjourn at 5 o'clock, but I shall not prolong my remarks because of my error.

Mr. President, I have attempted to present this question from the practical side of the woolgrower, and that means the market that the woolgrower makes. Where do you suppose the $135,000,000, in wages paid in this country in this industry is distributed? It buys your cotton from the South; it buys your wheat from the North and your barley from Minnesota. Those wages are distributed throughout the entire business world in this country. They do not go abroad to purchase foreign articles. Suppose the industry was destroyed. To what field would this labor go for employment? Would you wipe it out? Would you wipe out the $15,000,000 worth of sheep product in Idaho? If you reduce the duty on wool, you will wipe it out to some extent, if not entirely.

I am speaking for the consumers who consume your wheat while they are raising our sheep. I am speaking of the consumers who consume the product of every State in the Union while they are thus engaged. I am speaking of the merchant and the manufacturer who because of the employment of these men have a market that they would not otherwise have. You take a cent a day from them and you lose a cent a day out of the volume of your business. You take 11 cents, or any other number of cents, off the duty on wool, and you lower the fence of protection and

increase the danger of competition at the expense of American labor.

There is invested in the sheep industry of the United States more than a hundred million dollars. Where would that capital find investment—in what field? It would be withdrawn or lost in either event at the expense of the business and commerce of the world. What income would take the place of this? What field of industry would offer employment to these men? I am appalled when I find any number of American people willing even to contemplate the withdrawal of opportunity from any other number of the people. The prosperity of this country is because of the opportunity offered to them. That is the only function or purpose of government as applied to the individual. It is opportunity. It is the Republican party that has given the American people the opportunity to engage in profitable enterprise; it is the Republican party, by the exclusion of the outside world, that has given the people of the United States the opportunity to build up the great riches and the great enterprises of this country.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator from Idaho correctly, I think he misquoted the amount invested in the sheep industry. He spoke of it as being $100,000,000.

Mr. HEYBURN. I said more than $100,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. It is about $750,000,000. A hundred million dollars would be less than $2 a head for the sheep, without allowing anything for the ranches and other property.

Mr. HEYBURN. I did not intend to include those things. I was merely referring to the sheep industry. That represents an investment between ninety and one hundred million dollars. Of course, that does not include the capital invested in the great enterprises that grow out of it and are connected with it.

Mr. WARREN. The sheep alone, if sold on the market to-day, would bring considerably more than the amount stated.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; I suppose they would, if they were all marketed. I did not intend to include the cost of the land, the buildings, the factories, and the tonnage that is paid to build and maintain railroads. Those figures would soar into almost unbelievable sums.

Why should anyone, regardless of his politics, seek to take a chance of striking down even the protection of a cent? I hope that the existing law in regard to the tariff upon these subjects will not be disturbed one iota, because I believe you will have to pay dollar for dollar for every dollar that you take from it.

Mr. President, a system or a theory that has been tried in government and found successful in its application should never be disturbed, even because a very large number of people think they could do better. There is always some one who thinks he could improve on existing conditions; there are people ever ready to criticise others; but I have observed in life that, if they get an opportunity to substitute their ideas, conditions are rarely, if ever, improved.

A word in closing. There has been at times a spirit of resentment—it has amounted to that—toward those outside of the Finance Committee who felt impelled to express their views at such length as in their judgment might seem appropriate. It is not becoming in the consideration of a question like this to attempt to exclude anyone from participating in it within the limits of his own judgment. Because the Committee on Finance, in its wisdom, has struck the right measure in this bill is no reason why other Senators should be content merely to sit in silence and vote upon it. There should be a record—a public record—accompanying every measure that is enacted in this body that should tell not only why the particular committee recommended it, but why Senators supported it. I am impelled to make this statement because of the spirit of impatience that seems to pervade certain circles at those who exercise their right and perform their duty upon this floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I shall take only a very few minutes in the discussion of this particular amendment, and will give plenty of time to vote upon the subject before the recess if anyone desires a vote before that time.

Mr. President, I know something about the conditions in the sheep industry for the four years prior to 1897. I am not going to take up any time in elucidating this subject, but will give one concrete incident. About the year 1895 or 1896 I know of a flock of sheep of some 4,000 in number sold for a dollar and a quarter a head. They were all full-grown sheep. Those sheep to-day would bring a price of $5 a head, or nearly five times as much. During the four years preceding 1897 I have seen the warehouses in the western part of my State loaded with wool that was not worth the price of the freight to the eastern market. That represented the general condition during those four years.

Mr. President, the people of the State of North Dakota and all of the western section lost enormously during those years. They have been making up those losses in the last ten years, but I do not think with all of the profits they have made that they have entirely recouped the losses for that particular period.

I am not going into the subject of what constituted the real cause. It may be that we were frightened; it may be that the Wilson-Gorman law had nothing to do with it, that it was just lack of confidence; but I can give another concrete incident in relation to how that lack of confidence worked with some of us. In 1892 I, with some other people, organized a sheep company. We incorporated along toward the fall of that year. We then thought that we had better wait until after the election before we either purchased the sheep or the lands that we had in contemplation. We waited until after the election. It did not go as we expected and hoped it would go; and that corporation was dissolved. We dropped the project. That is one instance in my life when my foresight of conditions that would ensue was absolutely correct. So nothing ever came of that organization.

Now I want to show whether or not we have been benefited by our tariff since that time; whether or not the wonderful prosperity of this country for the last ten years has manifested itself in the rapid and steady increase of the value of wool and the value of sheep in this country. I call attention to page 878 of the volume Imports and Duties from 1894 to 1907, inclusive; and I am going to ask that the three tables showing the imports, the rate of duty, the Dingley duty collected, the value per unit, and the ad valorem duty shall be placed in the RECORD. They are tables of the unwashed wool not on the skin, the washed wool not on the skin, and the scoured wool. They are the three grand subdivisions of wool imports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the tables referred to by the Senator from North Dakota will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears none.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Wool imports.

UNWASHED WOOL, NOT ON THE SKIN.

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Rate of duty.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty collected.	Average. Value per unit of quantity.	Average. Ad valorem rate of duty.
		Pounds.				*Per ct.*
1898	11 cents per pound	4,593,007	$790,508.00	$505,230.77	$0.170	63.91
1899	do	9,384,260	1,549,131.00	1,032,268.57	.165	66.64
1900	do	[a] 27,728	[a] 3,953.00		.143	
		19,132,005	3,734,807.42	2,104,520.55	.195	56.35
1901	do	35,504,730.25	6,821,103.00	3,905,520.31	.192	57.26
1902	do	54,858,063.22	8,118,371.40	6,034,452.96	.148	74.33
1903	do	46,326,229.54	7,123,287.00	5,095,885.26	.154	71.54
1904	do	39,793,896.19	7,229,714.00	4,377,328.63	.182	60.55
1905	do	73,834,454	15,751,480.00	8,121,789.99	.213	51.57
1906	do	91,027,193.10	21,359,479.00	10,012,991.25	.235	46.88
1907	do	90,045,325.75	22,249,572.25	9,904,985.85	.247	44.52

WASHED WOOL, NOT ON THE SKIN.

1898	22 cents per pound	45,269	$8,741.00	$9,959.15	$0.190	113.94
1899	do	964	168.00	212.08	.174	126.24
1900	do	12,398.50	2,839.40	2,727.72	.229	96.07
1901	do	806	122.00	177.32	.151	145.09
1902	do	569	113.00	125.18	.199	110.62
1903	do	24,824	11,557.00	5,461.28	.466	47.26
1904	do	12,169	6,500.00	2,677.18	.534	41.19
1905	do	29,356.19	8,682.00	6,458.36	.295	74.39
1906	do	9,172.75	3,135.75	2,018.00	.342	64.35
1907	do	1,675.25	601.00	368.56	.359	61.32

SCOURED WOOL.

1898	33 cents per pound	28,175	$332.00	$9,297.75	$0.290	111.50
1901	do	18,163	6,783.00	5,993.79	.373	88.36
1902	do	5	5.00	1.65	1.00	33.00
1903	do	3,618.70	1,777.00	1,192.52	.492	67.11
1904	do	6,681	4,821.00	2,204.73	.722	45.73
1905	do	3,141	1,751.00	1,036.53	.557	59.19
1906	do	4,136	2,476.00	1,364.88	.599	55.12
1907	do	8,119.50	7,148.00	2,679.44	.88	37.50

[a] Damaged, duty remitted by Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the value of these wools in each succeeding year; and I will take the wool that the farmer sells, the unwashed wool, not on the skin. I find that in 1898, with 11 cents a pound duty, that the value per unit or pound in New York, probably, where it was imported, was 17 cents. Three years afterwards it was 19½ cents; then it was down to 14 5/16, then to 15, then it went to 18 cents, then to 21, then to 23, and in 1907 it was 24 cents.

If I follow along in the same line, I find that the washed wool not on the skin was 19 cents in 1898, and that there was a gradual increase until it was 35 cents in 1907. I find that the scoured wool was 29 cents in 1898, and that it was 88 cents in 1907; in other words, the value of wool has considerably more than doubled during that period. This was under the Dingley rate. The House of Representatives this year report a bill in which they propose to cut down the Dingley rates on certain classes of wool, and I am now asked to vote for a reduction of the wool schedule that has given us this prosperity during these years and has helped us to recoup our losses during the preceding years. Remembering what those losses were, I for one refuse to do it. I do not think that the rates are at all excessive.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like to finish what I have to say, and have my argument appear in a logical way; but if the Senator insists, I will yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will ask the question when the Senator concludes his remarks.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senate Committee on Finance put back the Dingley rates, the rates under which there has been a phenomenal increase in the value of sheep and the value of the wool that is raised upon those sheep.

The next question, then, that appeals to me is: Are those rates excessive? I know something about the care that is required and the labor that is expended in caring for lambs from the time they are born, and during their growth, in shearing the sheep, and in caring for and marketing the wool. Knowing the value of that labor, I am absolutely certain that the value of the farmer's wool product is not excessive. Mr. President, if they are not excessive, then I want to ask whether or not the American people have asked us indiscriminately to lower them, notwithstanding the fact that they are reasonable. There has been considerable talk about this matter of revision. I hardly agree with Senators on either side of this proposition. I will say, once and for all, that I believe the American people understood generally that the greater portion of the tariff rates were higher than necessary; and, therefore, if there were a revision, that it would be a revision downward, so that those rates would not be greater than necessary for honest and fair protection; but, Mr. President, they never have instructed us, either by a Republican platform or by popular expression, to lower a duty that is not excessive.

The House Committee on Ways and Means found that the iron schedule was considerably higher than was necessary; that it was excessive; and they cut it down considerably. The Senate Committee on Finance went over the same schedule and found that, in their opinion, it was still too high, and they very materially reduced it, even below the standard that was fixed by the House committee. The American public had read a great deal about the enormous fortunes of Carnegie and Frick and Schwab and that class of steel magnates, and they felt that the duties that had enabled them to amass such enormous fortunes were excessive. I believe that the American people were for the most part right in their opinion upon that proposition; and because they were right, those duties have been reduced.

I know Senators will say "Oh, yes; you made the cut, but then you did not hurt them any; you only cut where it would not hurt." Mr. President, we were not instructed to hurt any business in the United States, but to bring every duty down to a reasonable basis.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] just now asked the Senator from Idaho his opinion as to a duty of about 150 per cent upon woolen blankets. The Senator from Idaho answered in substance that if that duty was necessary he was in favor of it. A duty of 15 per cent ad valorem may be excessive in some instances, while 150 per cent might not be in other cases. I want to show whether or not a duty of 150 per cent even in the wool schedule is necessarily excessive. I am not admitting there is any such rate. We have been instructed by our platform and by every utterance that has been made by Republican speakers that the measure of the duty should be the measure of the difference between the cost at home and the cost abroad, including a reasonable profit upon the investment. I am perfectly willing to measure the wool schedule by that standard, because I believe that is the proper standard.

When we were discussing the cotton schedule I telephoned to the Department of Commerce and Labor and asked them to give me in the form of a table or otherwise such information as they might have at hand showing the labor cost in the cotton textile trade in England, in the United States, in Germany, and in France. The day afterwards they sent up such a table, but before I present it I want to call attention to another table of the comparative labor cost in the woolen manufacturing industry that was introduced before the Ways and Means Committee. Here is the table, giving the wage scale of worsted mills, based on the same number of hours per week, in Bradford, England, and in Philadelphia. I will just enumerate a few of them. I find that head wool sorters in Bradford receive $9.52 a week; in Philadelphia, $25 a week, or two and one-fourth times as much; wool sorters, $8.96 in Bradford and $18 in Philadelphia; card-room overlooker, $7.50 in Bradford and $20 in Philadelphia. I will get down to the laborers. The common laborer receives $5.75 in Bradford and $10 in Philadelphia. The average in all lines necessary to produce a woolen fabric shows the American wage to be about two and one-fourth times as much as the British wage; in other words, it is an advance of 125 per cent over the average wage in Great Britain in this industry. I ask that this table be inserted in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

Wage list of worsted mills based on same number of hours per week.

	In Bradford.	Philadelphia.
Head wool sorter	$9.52	$25.00
Wool sorters	8.96	18.00
Washhouse overlooker	6.00	20.00
Card-room overlooker	7.50	20.00
Combing-room overlooker	8.50	25.00
Drawing-room overlooker	8.50	25.00
Spinning-room overlooker	8.00	20.00
Twisting-room overlooker	8.00	20.00
Reeling-room overlooker	8.00	18.00
Back washers	3.12	6.00
Gill boxes	3.12	5.50
Combs (2)	3.37	8.80
Gill boxes (4)	3.00	8.80
Wool washers	5.25	10.00
Card strippers	6.00	12.00
Card feeders	4.25	5.50
Drawing gills	2.75	5.50
Drawing frames	2.75	6.60
Roving frames	2.50	5.50
Spinners, 256 spindle	2.50	6.00
Spinners, 332 spindle	2.62	7.00
Overlookers' assistants	2.12	12.00
Doffers	1.87	4.40
Twisters	2.87	6.60
Winders	2.62	4.40
Reelers	3.00	7.50
Engineers	6.50	20.00
Firemen	6.00	12.00
Laborers	5.75	10.00

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from North Dakota permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McCUMBER. Just for a question; yes.

Mr. BACON. I ask for information as to the Senator's position. The Senator contends that, as the price of labor increases, according to the reasoning of the contention which he is now making, the rate of the tariff ought to be correspondingly increased to cover that increase?

Mr. McCUMBER. In so far, Mr. President, as the cost of labor adds to the value of the product. I take both the cost of labor and the cost of the material together. Of course I can only deal with one of them at a time.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I would ask the Senator to allow me to get through before half past 5, as I must necessarily do or divide these few remarks into two sections.

Mr. BACON. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, in addition I have a table showing the difference in wages in the cotton industry in Germany, the United States, France, and England. The table I received from the Department of Commerce and Labor. I will read just a few of the items. Take the dyers. Male dyers in the United States receive $7.88 a week; in Germany, $3.65 a week. Weavers receive $10.84 in the United States, and in Germany $5.11. I ask that this table may be also in-

serted, with the explanatory remarks from the Department of Commerce and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF LABOR,
Washington, June 4, 1909.

The accompanying tables give the only available data concerning wages and hours in certain occupations in the cotton and woolen industries in the United States, England, Germany, and France.

The figures for the United States are taken from the bulletins of the Bureau of Labor. The figures for England, Germany, and France are taken from the reports just issued by the British Government, giving the results of an investigation made by that Government in the countries named.

Unfortunately, the figures can not be reduced to any basis that would admit of satisfactory comparison. The figures for the United States give averages for both wages and hours. The figures in the British reports merely give the range of wages, and nothing is given to indicate where an average would fall between the two extremes.

The foreign figures are thus not only not comparable with the American figures, but the form in which the foreign figures are presented in the British reports does not even admit of satisfactory comparison between England, Germany, and France. Thus, the figures for England differentiate between males and females, whilst the figures for Germany in most instances do not indicate the sex of the workers at all; again, the figures for England, under both male and female, include alike adult workers and young persons, while the figures for France are for adult male workers alone. In the case of Germany and France the hours per week are given, but no hours are given for England.

In any comparison of wages as reflecting relative cost of production, wages per hour would be the only proper basis for comparison; and any accurate comparison would, of course, involve relative efficiency as well as relative wages, but the available reports not only do not deal with efficiency at all, but do not even furnish a basis for a comparison of hourly wages.

Rates of wages and hours of labor in the United States, England and Wales, Germany, and France in the cotton industry in 1905.

Occupation.	Sex.	Wages per week.				Hours per week.			
		United States.	England and Wales.	Germany.	France.	United States.	England and Wales.	Germany.	France.
Carders	Male	$6.60		$4.01-$5.11		60.7		66	
Do	Male adults				$3.85-$6.12				60
Dyers	Male	7.82		3.65- 6.33		60.6		60-63	
Do	Male adults				4.10- 4.66				60
Spinners, frame	Male	5.07				63.1			
Do	Female	5.53				60.7			
Spinners, mule	Male	11.34				59.4			
Spinners	do		$8.52-$12.17						
Do	Male adults				5.09- 7.58				60
Do	(a)			5.84- 7.30				62.5-66	
Weavers	Male	8.58	5.35- 7.06	4.01- 4.74		60.8		66	
Do	Male adults				3.75- 5.43				60
Do	Female	7.85	3.65- 6.81			60			

[a] Not reported.

Rates of wages and hours of labor in the United States, England and Wales, Germany, and France in the woolen industry in 1905.

Occupation.	Sex.	Wages per week.				Hours per week.			
		United States.	England and Wales.	Germany.	France.	United States.	England and Wales.	Germany.	France.
Card strippers	Male	$7.66				58.3			
Do	(a)			$3.89-$4.38				64.5	
Combers	Male	7.22	$4.87-$5.60			58.9			
Do	Male adults				$4.70				72
Do	Female	5.25	2.68- 3.41			57.0			
Do	(a)			4.38- 4.83				60-66	
Dyers	Male	7.88	5.84			59.3			
Do	Male adults				3.51				60
Do	(a)			3.65- 5.60				60-65	
Spinners, frame	Female	6.03				58.3			
Spinners, mule	Male	11.07				58.5			
Spinners	Male adults				4.32- 7.91				60-69
Do	Female		1.95- 2.92						
Do	(a)			4.87- 7.79				60-65	
Weavers	Male	10.84		5.11- 5.84		58.8		60.0	
Do	Male adults				4.66- 5.84				60
Do	Female	9.12	2.43- 5.11			58.2			
Do	(a)			5.56				62.5	

[a] Not reported.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I understand that in the woolen industry, as well as in the cotton industry, labor represents about 80 per cent of the cost, and the material represents about 20 per cent of the cost of production. I want to make a mathematical calculation as to what would be the duty, taking those percentages. We will say that for the production of a given number of yards in Great Britain the labor cost is 80 cents and the material cost is 20 cents. That makes $1. In looking over the table from which I have just quoted I find that the average ad valorem on the wool itself that goes into these cloths is about 60 per cent; so I must add 60 per cent to start with upon the raw material, which would be 12 cents. Add this to the $1 and you have $1.12. Then take the 125 per cent upon the labor cost. You would have $1 more to add, making $2.12, or 112 ad valorem, without taking into consideration reasonable profits and many other incidents that might still further add to the cost in this country.

Mr. NELSON. If those figures are correct and the difference in the labor cost is as great as the Senator states, ought there not to be an increase in the duty to give the manufacturer a profit?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the tariff will probably measure on the average very nearly the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. Sometimes they may be a little less and sometimes a little more, as must be the case when the duties are specific. We have to get a general average. The figures are as I have obtained them from the Department of Commerce and Labor, and I am not going to quarrel with the Department of Commerce and Labor as to whether their figures are correct. I am quite certain they are, as they are taken from reports from our consular service, carefully tabulated.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, if the tariff is only 112 per cent ad valorem and the difference in the labor cost is $1.12, what provision does the Senator from North Dakota make for "a reasonable profit?"

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have given the Senator that explanation as clearly as I could give it in a very short address.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask the Senator if it will be convenient for him to finish his remarks to-morrow morning?

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator want a vote on this question this afternoon?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; I desire to move to adjourn.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is not quite half past 5. I will conclude in a moment.

In addition, Mr. President, to what I have said, I wish also to have printed in the RECORD a further explanation of the difference in the wages of labor in the textile trades in Germany, France, and Great Britain, as prepared by our consular service and given me by the Department of Commerce and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Special Agent W. A. Graham Clark, of the Department of Commerce and Labor, spent a considerable time in the investigation of the manufacture of cotton goods in Europe and elsewhere, and visited the mills and secured his information at first hand. In his report on "Cotton fabrics in middle Europe," printed as Document No. 1270, of the House of Representatives, he gives a report of wages paid at various leading mills, from which report extracts are herewith made.

The most important cotton mill in Germany, also the best paying, according to Mr. Clark, is the Augsburg Mechanische Baumwoll Spinnerei und Weberei at Augsburg, in Bavaria. This mill has 126,940 spindles. Speaking on the labor question, Mr. Clark reports:

"Until 1906 this mill ran an eleven-hour day, but it then changed to ten hours. This 9.1 per cent decrease in time was allowed by a 7.85 per cent decrease in production. In regard to wages at this mill, the picker-room hands and the carders get 50 to 70 cents a day; on two 900 self-actor mules the spinner averages about 90 cents a day, the piecer 71 cents, and each of the two creelers 35 cents a day. Weavers, on an average, run three looms apiece, and make about 80 cents a day; 170 of the looms have the Northrop attachment. At this mill a man is supposed to serve a two-years' apprenticeship before he can do as simple work as that of running three looms on plain goods. He has to sign a two-years' contract to this effect. He first works as extra assistant to a weaver for six months, then he is given one loom, which is run under the supervision of the regular weaver, who receives a certain percentage on the wages made. Then he is given two looms under the same conditions, and it is not until the new weaver has been working for two years that he is considered a full-fledged weaver and allowed to enjoy the fruits of his labor without division. During the first six months the mill usually pays the apprentice 24 cents a day. After all this elaborate apprenticeship system it is doubtful if the weaver is as good as the young American weaver who comes in from the farm and in a few months at most is getting off the required production along with the others."

Mr. Clark says that the wages paid in cotton mills in different parts of Germany vary, as also does the number of operators required for a given number of machines or for a given production. For mills on similar goods, and similarly located, wages are lowest in Saxony and highest in Rhine. The mills around Augsburg seem to afford a fair average of the German industry as a whole.

In Germany there is no law limiting the hours that may be worked by men, but there are numerous detail provisions in regard to the employment of women and children. It is forbidden to employ children under 13 years of age. Women must not be employed in the factory at night between 8.30 and 5.30 o'clock.

In giving the wages paid at Barmen, in western Germany, for braided work, Mr. Clark reports: "For ordinary work at Barmen 1 operator, either man or women, makes 4 marks a day, or 24 marks a week (4 marks equal 95 cents; 24 marks equal $5.71). The time is usually 57 hours a week." Speaking of the work at Plauen, from which district in 1907 $4,479,021 in value of goods were exported to the United States, Mr. Clark reports that a skilled operator receives 23.8 cents for the same quantity of work that the Swiss worker at St. Gall receives 19.3 cents for. The best stitchers were paid at the rate of 18 pfennigs (pfennig equal about one-fourth of a cent) for 1,000 stitches, and on the supposition that he made 240,000 stitches a week he would make 43.23 marks, or $10.28. The average stitcher gets probably 30 to 35 marks per week ($7.14 to $8.33). Other factory employees receive lower pay. Two girls on a machine, one to watch the work and the other to keep the small shuttles filled, are paid, respectively, 18 and 14 marks per week ($4.28 and $3.33). The card punchers that punch the holes in the Jacquard cards for use on the automatic machines get higher wages, as the work requires quick and careful and well-trained men.

The most expert men made from 240 marks ($57) a month, to 300 marks ($71). The weekly wages of those engaged in "general scissor and needle work" were about 12 marks a week ($2.85). The man who owns a machine and is called the "lohnesticker," is paid at a fixed price per 1,000 stitches, and he has to provide all the cost of manufacture, including yarn, wages, power, etc. Mr. Clark states that at the time he was in Plauen the "lohnesticker" made a profit of only $2 on his machine for the week's work. Speaking of ribbon weaving, of which, including trimmings, etc., $1,500,000 worth was shipped from Barmen to the United States in 1907; Special Agent Clark reported that working three hundred days in the year the average earnings was 80 cents a day. Wages in Barmen and the surrounding section are higher than in most other textile centers of Germany. Ordinary weavers, Special Agent Clark says, will average 60 to 80 cents a day, and weavers on special work will get as high as $1.63.

The importation of knit goods from Germany increased in value to $8,384,830 in 1907. At Chemnitz, where hosiery is a great speciality, there are 88 American houses represented. The hours of work are either 61, 60, or 59 per week. There is, as Special Agent Clark reports, not the slightest uniformity in regard to the wages paid, each manufacturer getting his help as cheaply as he can. Special Agent Clark transmitted the wages paid in a hosiery factory where the operations were as follows: Spooling yarn, knitting leg, running on foot, knitting foot, heeling and toeing, seaming and mending. The dyeing and finishing were done outside. The prices are all given in pfennigs, owing to the difficulty of giving the equivalents in cents without too many decimals. (To change pfennigs into cents multiply by 0.238.)

The tables sent by Mr. Clark follow.

Spooling.

[Wages in pfennigs, per pound English.]

Yarn numbers (English)	8-15	16-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	98	112
Cotton cops:											
Spooler	2	2¼	2¼	2½	2¾	3¼	3½	3¾	4¼	--	--
Rewinder	1½	1¾	2	2¼	2½	2¾	3	3¼	3½	--	--
On patent winder	2½	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wool cops:											
Spooler	1¾	2	2	2¼	2½	3	3½	4	5½	8	12
Rewinder	1¼	1½	1¾	2	2¼	2½	2¾	3	3¼	--	--
On patent winder	--	--	3	3½	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Skein yarn, spooler on:											
Single gray cotton	3¼	5	6¾	7½	9	10½	11½	13	--	--	--
Two-ply gray cotton	2½	3½	4½	5½	6	7	8	9	--	--	--
Single colored cotton	10	12	14	16	28	30	32	34	36	--	--
Two-ply colored cotton	4½	5½	6½	7½	8½	9½	10½	11½	--	--	--
Single colored wool	--	10	17	19	21	--	--	--	--	--	--
Two-ply colored wool	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	--	--	--
Skein yarn, rewinder on:											
Single colored cotton	2½	3½	4	5	5½	6	6½	7	--	--	--
Two-ply colored cotton	1¼	1½	2½	3½	4	4½	5	5½	--	--	--
Single colored wool	--	2½	3	4	5	6	7	--	--	--	--
Two-ply colored wool	--	--	1½	2½	3½	4	4½	--	--	--	--

Thread numbers	2/35	2/40	2/50	2/60	2/70	2/75	2/80	2/85	2/90	2/100	2/140
Thread:											
Spooling gray skein thread	7	8	9	10	13	16	18	20	21	23	27
Spooling colored skein thread	11	12	13	14	25	27	29	30	32	35	43
Rewinding gray thread onto cheeses	1¼	1½	2	2½	3	3½	3½	3¾	4	4½	5½
Rewinding colored thread	3	3½	4	4¼	4½	4¾	5	5¼	5½	6	7
Rewinding lisle skeins onto cheeses	--	8½	9½	10½	11½	12¼	12½	13	13½	14½	16½
Spooling silk	--	--	12	13	14	--	15	--	16	17	18

Leg machine.

[Wages in pfennigs, per dozen pairs.]

Gauge	30		33			36				39		42	48	2/1 rib	1/1 rib
Divisions	8	12	12	16	18	8	12	16	18	8	12	18	8	12	12
Women's gray cotton hose:															
With extra loose instep	55	37	45	37	32	76	56	45	40	95	73	55	137	65	76
Extra close knit	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Children's hose, all sizes less than women's	--	5	5	--	--	--	5	--	--	10	--	--	--	10	10
Short-leg stockings	10	5	5	5	5	10	5	5	5	10	5	--	--	5	5
Extra for long tops:															
In cotton	--	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
In wool	--	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
In lisle thread	--	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
With kneecap	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gray and natural wool and gray thread over cotton lache	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	10	5	5
Extra compensation for very fine numbers	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	10	10	--	50	10	10
Clerical wool and colored feet and rows, extra	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	80	12	12
Extra marking:															
When with striped apparatus	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	--	--
Without apparatus	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	--	--
Heel and toe cap of wool and colored, extra	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Under 2 dozen, extra	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	--	--
2 dozen or more	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	--	--
Kneecap, extra	--	5	5	--	--	--	5	5	--	5	--	--	--	--	--
Reenforced seam, extra	--	--	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	--	--
15 to 1 drop stitch, extra	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	--	--
Group drop stitch, extra	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	--	--
Extra wide	--	--	--	--	--	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	--	--
Opera lengths	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	20	20	20	20	20	20	--	--
Size marks with the hand, per row, extra	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lot of 4 dozen or less, extra	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	8

Running on French foot.

[Wages in pfennigs, per dozen pairs.]

Gauge	30	33	36	36	36	39	48
Divisions	12	12	12	16	18	18	8
Gray, cotton foot:							
8 to 12 inches	10	11	12	15½	15½	16	50
4 to 7½ inches or less	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gray and natural wool and gray thread over cotton	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Woven with merino, extra	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Clerical wool (dark-gray mixture) and colored over gray	2	2	2	2	2	2	11
Woven with split, extra	2	2	2	2	2	2	--
Striped over plain	2	2	2	2	2	2	--
Woven with drop stitch, extra	2	2	2	2	2	2	--

French foot maker.

[Wages in pfennigs, per dozen pairs.]

Gauge	30	33	36	36	36	39	48
Divisions	12	12	12	16	18	18	8
Gray cotton sock, foot 9 to 12 inches	22	24	27	18	16	18	23
Gray cotton, woman's, foot 8 to 10½ inches	18	20	23	14	12	14	23
Gray cotton, child's, foot 4 to 9 inches:							
With 1 assistant	15	19	20	----	----	----	----
With 2 assistants	----	16	----	----	----	----	----
Foot with long border, extra, with 1 assistant	----	7	7	----	----	----	----
Gray and natural wool and gray thread over cotton	2	2	2	2	2	2	9
39-gauge to 36-gauge goods, extra	----	----	2	2	2	----	----
Extra compensation for very fine numbers	----	----	10	6	5	----	----
Clerical wool and colored, extra	4	4	4	3	3	3	13
1/30 and 1/36 clerical wool, extra	----	5	----	----	----	----	----
Heel and toe cap from wool and colored, extra	3	3	3	3	3	3	----
Striped over plain	10	10	10	----	----	----	----
Half sole, extra	3	3	3	2	2	2	3
Split sole, including heel and toe cap, extra	6	6	6	6	6	6	----
15 by 1 drop stitch, extra	8	8	8	----	----	----	----
Group drop stitches, over plain	16	16	16	----	----	----	----
Size marks, extra	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lot of 4 dozen or less, extra	5	5	5	5	5	5	----

Heeler.

[Wages in pfennigs, per dozen pairs.]

Gauge	24	30	33	36	39	42	48	Ribbed.	
								2/1	2/1
Heel and toe, either gray or white	8½	9½	10	11½	13	14	18	7	7
Silk thread over gray	----	----	1	1	1	1	----	----	----
Colored over gray, also gray with colored toe	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

Seaming.

[Wages in pfennigs, per dozen pairs.]

Gauge	30	33	36	39	42	48
Gray cotton and stocking thread:						
French foot, 00-0	10½	11½	12½	13½	----	----
French foot, 1-2	12½	13½	14½	15½	----	----
French foot, 3-4	14	15	16	17	----	----
French foot, 5-6	15	16	17	18	----	----
8-10 inches	17	18	19	20	----	30
Silk thread over gray	1	1	1	1	----	1
Wool thread over gray	2	2	2	2	----	2
Colored thread over gray	6½	6½	6½	6½	----	6½
Goods with heel and toe cap, extra	2	2	2	2	----	2
Striped over plain	5	5	5	5	----	5
Opera lengths long knitted stockings	5	5	5	5	----	5
Gray cotton and loose thread:						
French foot, 4½-5½ inches	9	10	11	----	----	----
French foot, 6-7 inches	10	11	12	----	----	----
French foot, 7½-8½ inches	11	12	13	----	----	----
French foot, 9-12 inches	11	12	13	14	----	19
Wool over gray	1	1	1	1	----	1
Colored over gray	2	2	2	2	----	2
Goods with heel and toe, extra	2	2	2	2	----	2
Striped over plain	3	3	3	3	----	3

Some of the Saxon knit-goods manufacturers are very advanced in their plans for ameliorating the condition of their help, and besides giving the boys time off to attend technical instruction, as required by law, they also have courses of instruction for the girls and women in household duties, including cooking and sewing classes, and besides night classes some factories give the girls a few hours off each week to attend such classes in the daytime, the teachers also being paid by the factory. Most of the factories provide a lunch room, with tables and chairs, where the employees can eat their lunch, and many furnish food at cost in such places.

[Several photographs showing a typical Chemnitz knitting mill, groups of operatives, and some of the hosiery machines used accompanied Mr. Clark's report and are on file in the Bureau of Manufactures.]

Consul Pendleton King, in a report from the consular district of Aix-la-Chapelle, in Rhenish Prussia, furnishes the following information relative to wages in the textile industry in that district:

"The foreman of the spinning department in a woolen mill receives from $9 to $14 per week, the operatives from $5 to $6, and the other help from $4 to $5. In a weaving department the foreman, or weaving master, receives from $9 to $14, and the regulators, or setters, from $7 to $10.50. Weavers are paid by the piece, and if capable and diligent can make $9 a week. They earn on an average from $1 to $1.40 a day. The mistress of the darning department receives from $8 to $10 and her assistant from $5 to $7 per week. The working hours are generally ten and one-half a day. The cost of living is very high in the city and towns of that consular district. The family generally pays for two rooms from $4 to $6 per month; the lowest price of beef is 20 to 25 cents a pound and the highest 30 cents. Ham is from 40 to 55 cents a pound, and pork 20 to 25 cents. Horse meat, which is used by many workmen's families, is from 10 to 12 cents a pound."

Consul William Bardel, in a report from Bamberg, states that wages paid to foremen vary from $47 to $83 a month, workmen under 16 years of age receive from $2.18 to $2.86 a week, and those over 16 from $4.28 to $7.14 weekly. Women over 16 years old earn from $2.15 to $3.15, while those under that age receive from $1.71 to $2.15 a week. Sixty-one hours constitute a working week.

Consul Herman L. Spahr, of Breslau, sends the following information concerning the textile mills of Silesia:

"There are about a dozen large establishments engaged in the linen industry and a number of smaller ones. The average wages paid per week of ten hours per day are as follows: Overseers, 24 marks ($5.71); male operatives, 15 marks ($3.57); female operatives, 9 to 10 marks ($2.14 to $2.38). Cotton mills in Silesia number about a dozen for spinning and a score for weaving. The spinners ordinarily work ten hours a day and the weavers ten and one-half hours; overseers get from $5.36 to $7.38 weekly, male operatives average 55 cents daily, and female operatives 48 cents."

Consul Joseph E. Haven, in a report from Crefeld, says: "The wages in this district in the silk and velvet mills vary greatly. In the weaving department overseers receive from $5.95 to $7.14 a week, while laborers are paid from $5.71 to $6.18. Overseers in the winding and warping departments receive from $5.95 to $7.14 weekly, the laborers from $3.57 to $4.96. The overseers in the finishing department receive from $8.33 to $9.52 and the laborers from $4.76 to $6.18."

Consul Peter Leiber, writing from Dusseldorf, reports that in spinning mills where only women are employed the average daily wage is 71.4 to 83.3 cents. Young girls earn from 35.7 cents to 47.6 cents a day. In weaving mills the salary undergoes many fluctuations, reaching as high as $1.19 per day.

Consul William C. Teichmann, of Eibenstock, reports that the most important textile industry in his district is the manufacture of cotton hosiery and underwear. "A strike revealed the wage scale so that a description of wage conditions, otherwise difficult to obtain, can be given. The five firms originally affected by the strike paid an average wage of $4.92 a week. Of the men, 65 per cent earned more than $4.76 per week, 55.6 per cent more than $5.36, and the remainder more than $5.95. The highest wages paid ranged from $8.64 to $10.13 to the men. The longest number of hours per week was fifty-eight." On the whole, the consul reports these wages high for the average Saxon factory.

Consul E. T. Liefeld reports from Freiburg that the hours of labor in mills there average about ten per day. Ordinary laborers in the mills are paid from 48 to 71 cents per day, their overseers from 71 cents to $1.20, while skilled laborers are paid as high as 95 cents, and their overseers $1.67.

Consul Robert J. Thompson reported from Hanover, where there are cotton spinning and weaving and other mills, that in one wool-washing and dressing factory with 1,800 employees, working ten hours a day, the wages paid men varied from 2.25 marks to 3.25 marks per day; and to females from 1.90 marks to 2.20 marks (1 mark equals 23.8 cents). The wages of foremen working in the principal corduroy and velvet factory vary from $7.14 to $9.52 per week. The male and female workers in the weave room and in the shearing establishment earn from $3.57 to $6.66 weekly. The men and women in other branches earn on an average about 79 cents a day. The wages for spinners in the leading cotton spinning and weaving factory are from $4.76 to $6.66 per week, and for helpers from 50 to 75 per cent of that amount. The self-acting spinning mill and water spinning mill employ women only, paying from $2.38 to $3.57 per week. Wages for making rugs, etc., vary from 71 to 83 cents per day for dyers, and from $1.43 to $3.09 per week for women and girl workers tending machines.

Consul S. P. Warner, of Leipzig, an important textile center of Saxony, sends extracts from a publication by the imperial insurance office giving work wages paid in each of the 6 districts of the German Empire, so far as the average is concerned. According to this publication the average German wages paid in the textile industry in 1886 was $128.44 per year, and in 1905 the average was $163.66. In 1905 the average in Silesia was $126.62, and in southern Germany $153.75, running up to $176.60 in northern Germany. This only includes operatives in the mills, and not those engaged in the so-called "home industries."

Consul F. S. Hannah reports from the Magdeburg consular district that the average wages earned in the cotton mills by piecework are as follows: For overseers, $8.57 to $11.90 per week; male mill operatives, $7.14 to $8.57; women workers, $2.86 to $4.28. The average hours of labor are fifty-nine per week.

Consul-General Thomas W. Peters, writing from Munich, Bavaria, says that the wages paid to the overseers and weavers in the large cotton and linen mills at Augsburg range from $1 to $2.25 per day, while the unskilled workmen receive 75 cents.

Consul Car Bailey Hurst, of Plauen, reports that the wages paid in the lace and embroidery industry to overseers vary from $5.71 to $9.62 a week, and, on an average, to operatives, $3.81 a week. The consul says: "The families of the working people are rarely small, and it is not infrequent to find a man and his wife and several children subsisting on $3.81 a week. In many instances the wife is also a wage-earner, and the children go to work as soon as possible. Such families usually live in a kitchen and one other room. The rent for such an apartment is rarely less than $2.38 a month, and the general price is about $3.57. The principal nourishment of the weavers consists of potatoes and salt bread and the so-called 'pepper soup,' made of water, bread, a little fat, and plenty of pepper. Meat is seldom eaten, and then only in the form of soup meat or sausage."

Consul Edward Higgins reports from Stuttgart that the largest firm in the district informed him that the wages paid overseers vary from $28.56 to $47.60 per month. A female operative earns 47½ to 66½ cents a day and a male operative from 77 cents to $1.02. Eleven hours constitute a day's work.

Special Agent Clark, reporting on the labor conditions in Austria, after a personal investigation, says: "From wage lists obtained at various mills it would seem that 50 cents per day might be taken as the average cotton-mill wage throughout Austria. As a fair example of an average mill I give the following detail list of a 40,000-spindle, 900-loom Bohemian mill near Richenberg: icker room, per day, men, 48.7 cents; women, 34.5; cards, one card grinder to every 20 cards, $4.06 a week; can girl, 34.5 cents a day; lapman, 48.7 cents to every 12 yards; cleaner, 48.7 cents for every 24 cards; slubbers make $3.25 to $4.46 a week; intermediates, so called, make $2.84 to $3.85 a week; the fine frame tenders make $2.48 and $5.28 a week; for ring spinning, each girl runs one frame of 450 spindles and does her own doffing. The spinners are paid per hank, varying from 3.41 cents for Nos. 10 to 22's to 4.30 cents for No. 46's. For mule spinning one spinner, one apprentice spinner, and one creeler run two mules (1,136 spindles) and the spinners' wages are 63 cents a day; reelers, warpers, spoolers, and winders are paid by the kilo, and earn from 41 to 49 cents a day. Weavers as a rule run 2 to 3 looms, and make 61 to 81 cents a day. At Potsdorf, near Vienna, in a large mill having 52,000 mule spindles, and 8,000 ring spindles, I found that two spinners got $1.02 per day, one piecer 61 cents, and one boy creeler 41 cents per day. Each girl

ran one ring frame and did her own doffing and got 21 cents a day. One carder, at 49 cents, and one boy, at 41 cents per day, attended to each 12 cards. On the fine frame one woman and two girls ran two machines of 180 spindles each, and their wages averaged $2.94 each per week.

From a table prepared from unpublished statistics given to Mr. Clark by the president of the Austrian Cotton Spinners as being actual figures recently compiled by a member of his association, and from statistics obtained personally by Mr. Clark, the following daily wages are given as paid in typical Austrian mills: Blow room, headman, 67 to 88 cents in lower Austria, 75 cents to $1.02 in Vorarlberg, and 71 cents to $1.02 in Bohemia. The operative received from 40 to 45 cents in lower Austria, from 41 to 65 cents in Vorarlberg, and from 41 to 57 cents in Bohemia. A card grinder in these three districts varied in wages from 49 cents to 71 cents; a draw-frame tender, from 38 cents to 50 cents; an operative on fly frames, from 38 cents to 57 cents; a spinner in ring spinning, from 31 cents to 49 cents; a spinner in mule spinning, from 61 cents to $1.09; a twisting operative, from 41 to 61 cents; a reeler, from 36 cents to 62 cents; a machinist, from 59 to 89 cents; and an engineer, from 51 to 86 cents. The average wages, in cents, was from $0.416 to $0.586. The legal limit of time in Austria is eleven hours.

Consul J. S. Twells, in a report from Carlsbad, reports that children get 8 cents a day and adults from 25 to 40 cents a day in summer in working in the fields, and one of the lace exporters of Neubek said that "of course we can not afford to pay such high wages to lace makers." Speaking of work in Bohemia, the consul says: "Wages are extremely low. In the Adler Hills weekly wages of $1 to $1.20 are paid, but as there are many weeks during the year when no work can be had, the average weekly earnings are not larger than 80 cents. In good times husband and wife work alternately eighteen hours a day. Linen shirt buttons are made, at which wages of 60 to 80 cents a week are earned. Weavers working at home earn $1.40 to $4 a week. The straw and baste matters earn from 20 to 40 cents a day, but after the so-called 'season' is over the wages are lower. Wood carvers earn $1.80 to $2.80 a week and the brush makers at Gabel from $1.60 to $2 a week. The wood carvers at the Wittigtal earn $1.60 to $3.60 a week and the wood and mat makers at Niemes from $1.20 to $1.60 a week. The artificial-flower makers earn $1 to $2.40 a week. Many women are employed in glove making who earn from $1.20 to $1.60 a week.

Vice-Consul Arnold Weissberger, of Prague, gives the wages of all cotton-mill operatives who are paid by contract as follows, on the average per day: Spinner, 80 cents; placer, 50 cents; drawing-frame attendant, 45 cents; weaver, 40 cents; warper, 44 cents; bobbing-machine attendant, 40 cents; overseers, $1.

Consul Charles B. Harris furnishes the following information of the weekly wages paid in the leading textile industries of Reichenberg: Cotton and woolen knitting, men, $2.40 to $3 a week; women, $1.80 to $2.40; linen department, men, $2.04 to $3.60; women, $2.16 to $2.40; woolen blankets and carpets, male operatives, $2.23 to $6.29; women, $2.23 to $4.06; spinner's assistant, men, $2.03 to $5.98; women, $1.82 to $3.65.

Special Agent Clark gives a report on the wages paid in Hungary, taking a leading mill of Budapest as a good type: Picker hands, men, receive 40 cents a day, and women 24 cents. Slubbers receive 40 cents on an average. Mule spinners on No. 20's receive $1, and piecers 35 cents and boys 30 cents. In ring spinning, girls receive from 22 cents to 28 cents a day. Reelers paid by piecework make from 24 to 40 cents a day. Weavers are paid by the piece, receiving 40 cents for 100 meters (meter equals 39.37 inches) of 15-pick (per quarter inch) goods, and other cloth in proportion.

Special Agent Clark, reporting on cotton-goods production in Switzerland, says that the hours of labor are eleven per day, with nine on Saturday; and the average daily wages paid in the largest cotton manufacturing company in Switzerland, which he obtained from their books, was as follows:

Operatives:	Wages.
Weavers	$1.06
Picker hands	.74
On cards	.58
On draw frames	.62
On combers	.62
On fly frames	.62
Mule spinners	.85
Ring spinners	.55
Twisters	.51
On gassing frames	.64
On reels	.55
Outside laborers	.77
Wood workers	.97
Iron workers	1.06

Special Agent Clark gives the actual daily wages and cost of food at 4 mills in different parts of Switzerland in the first part of 1907, from which it appears that the head man in the blow room received in one mill 74 cents a day, and in another mill $1.06. The wages of a workman varied from 53 to 60 cents a day, and of a waste man from 55 to 61 cents. The head man on "cards" received from 85 cents to $1.42, while a card grinder got from 62 to 77 cents. Speeders received from 45 to 65 cents, and creelers from 35 to 39 cents. A ring spinner received from 44 to 67 cents, and a doffer from 31 to 33 cents. A mule spinner received from 65 to 91 cents, and a piecer from 44 to 66 cents. Reelers got from 41 to 56 cents, and a machinist from 73 cents to $1.12. A cabinetmaker from 69 cents to $1.02, and a carpenter from 83 cents to 97. The prices of the necessaries of life for the operatives in the 4 mills varied slightly, but 2½ pounds of bread of average quality cost 6.9 cents, the same amount of meat 36.5 cents, and of flour 9.7 cents, sugar 17.8 cents, and of coffee 62.9 cents.

Writing of the Swiss embroidery and lace industry, Special Agent Clark says that the great advantage of the Swiss manufacturer is cheap labor. For instance, the operators employed on the actual work of embroidering, or "stitching," as it is technically known, receive in St. Gall from $8 to $12 a week, while in New Jersey from $18 to $30 a week is paid for the same work. The girl overseer in St. Gall is paid from 38 to 50 cents a day, and in New Jersey from 85 cents to $1.35. The shuttle filler in St. Gall gets 38 cents a day, and in New Jersey 75 cents.

Consul-General Watts reports from Belgium that the majority of the lace makers earn from 10 to 17 cents a day, while an exceptionally good worker will earn about 20 cents; and the most expert workers, of whom there are only 10 or 12 out of 15,000, earn 38 cents a day.

Consul-General Michael, reporting from Calcutta, India, says that most of the embroidering on silk there is done by men. America takes two-thirds of all shipped from Calcutta. Patterns in 4 or 5 breadths, 27 inches wide, are made and sold in Calcutta at 15 to 20 rupees (rupee, 32.34 cents). The same kind of work on mull of suitable fineness and strength is done by men and women for 9 to 12 rupees. Handkerchiefs for ladies sell for 34 cents a dozen, and the highest priced ones, of chikon work, sell for less than $2 per dozen. An article that requires six days to make, the operatives working from ten to twelve hours a day, sells for $1, and out of this the man or woman whose toil produced the article receives less than 33 cents.

Special Agent William Whitham, jr., who spent considerable time in Great Britain investigating the cotton industry, reported that the average weekly wages per operative in 1882 were $4.08; and in 1893, $4.56; and in 1907, $4.68. Taking the same data for weaving mills, the hours being the same, the average weekly wages rose from $3.60 in 1882 to $3.96 in 1893, and again to $4.32 in 1895.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, one moment. Does that mean to come back in the morning or to come back to-night?

Mr. ALDRICH. To-morrow morning. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] desires to address the Senate, and he prefers to do so to-morrow rather than to-night.

Mr. CLAY. It does strike me that there ought to be some other schedule that we might be able to take up in the absence of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think that we are practically through with the bill, except——

Mr. CLAY. The Senator is mistaken; there are several paragraphs in this bill that have not been considered yet. The question of hides has not been considered; the agricultural-implements paragraph has not been disposed of; the oil paragraph has not been considered.

Mr. ALDRICH. The paragraph in regard to agricultural implements has been agreed to.

Mr. CLAY. The Senator is mistaken, because we were on that paragraph when we adjourned.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; I think the Senator was probably not here when that paragraph was agreed to.

Mr. CLAY. I think I am correct, for I marked it, and I am sure that it has not been agreed to. We were on that paragraph when we adjourned, and we then turned to another paragraph the next day. Now, the Senator is fully aware——

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I hope my motion will not be lost sight of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The discussion is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. ALDRICH. Inasmuch as it is almost half past 5, I shall have to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that I made a motion to adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. CLAY. Well, I say this——

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall have to insist on my motion before half past 5.

Mr. CLAY. The Senator from Rhode Island has stated to the Senate time and again that he was anxious to get through with this bill and to have it passed. The Senator is fully aware of the fact that many of us on this side of the Chamber have come here night after night to attend the night sessions with a view of getting through with this bill. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall have to ask that my motion be put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to adjourn is not debatable.

Mr. CLAY. I rise to a question of order. The Senate has heretofore fixed the hour of half after 5 o'clock to take a recess and to reconvene at 8 o'clock, and then to sit not later than 11 o'clock.

Mr. ALDRICH. A motion to adjourn is always in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CLAY. I rise to a question of order; and I ask to be heard on that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to adjourn is not debatable.

Mr. CLAY. Oh; there is no parliamentary law, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CLAY. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CLAY. I make the point that there is no quorum here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those in favor of the motion will say "aye" and those opposed "no."

Mr. CLAY. I call for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ayes have it; and the Senate stands adjourned until to-morrow (Wednesday, June 9, 1909) at 10.30 o'clock a. m.