

61ST CONGRESS }
2d Session }

SENATE

{ DOCUMENT
No. 458

WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF WOOL

EXTRACT FROM THE SPECIAL REPORT NO. 13,
MADE IN MAY, 1866, OF THE UNITED STATES
REVENUE COMMISSION ON WOOL AND MANU-
FACTURES OF WOOL ∴ ∴ ∴ ∴ ∴



PRESENTED BY MR. WARREN

MARCH 25, 1910.—Ordered to be printed

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1910

SPECIAL REPORT No. 13.

Report of Mr. Stephen Colwell of the United States Revenue Commission on wool and manufactures of wool.

PRELIMINARY.

OFFICE OF THE U. S. REVENUE COMMISSION, *May, 1866.*

No considerations pertaining to the revenue of the country are more important than those which relate to the employment and activity of its productive labor. The inquiry whether this labor is well or ill supported can never be amiss, when public wealth or revenue is in question; nor is it any less pertinent to examine whether any and what obstructions or disturbances lie in the path of labor and national production. The industry of a nation is an interest so vital as to be equalled only by its internal liberties and its independence of foreign control. These being secure, the highest national results can only be reached through that wide-spread and fully diversified industry which is applied under the advantages of increasing intelligence and the aptitude of growing skill and experience. As the tendency of full employment is to exclude crime, the benefits of that high integrity, the best cement of society, which accrue from the prevalence of religion and morality, may be expected to reward a nation in which occupation is most varied and labor best remunerated.

As it can scarcely be doubted, much less disputed, that the largest production of a well directed industry is that which will best enable our country to endure the heavy taxation to which it is now necessarily subjected, it becomes needful to notice the differing opinions which prevail upon the national policy best adapted to stimulate and uphold the industry upon which all production depends. These opinions, as one or the other class of them prevail, pass into legislation, and, according as they are well or ill founded, affect the ability of the people to provide the revenue indispensable to national credit and progress.

Such differences are of ancient date; centuries ago a large class of statesmen and writers upon national policy held that in a national point of view the special aim of public economy should be to secure a permanently favorable balance of trade with foreign countries. This opinion, which held large sway for nearly a century under the appellation of the mercantile theory, was fiercely attacked, with free use of argument and sarcasm, by a school of economists propounding a theory which they industriously and vigorously support to the present time. The industrial policy involved in their theory is that all that concerns the encouragement and support of national industry and the proper reward of labor should be left to the natural movement of foreign trade and its influences upon public welfare. This should properly be called the commercial theory. It is called free trade.

It will be seen that one characteristic is common to both these theories. They both regard the whole subject of labor, laborers, and national production from the side of trade. They both place that industry which produces the commodities necessary to civilization and comfort under the guardianship of foreign trade. The men who make the commodities which trade supplies for consumption are placed in the order of importance, after the merchants who are the chief agents of distribution.

The truth is, national production, national wealth and power, are not questions of trade, foreign or domestic; trade is one of the special incidents of national economical progress. No conclusions drawn from reasoning which begins by considering what concerns the distribution of commodities in advance of what concerns the interest of those who produce these commodities can be sound. Doctrines founded on this error may have a long life under the sustaining patronage and wealth of the *merchants* of the world; but this commercial theory is inevitably destined to share the fate of the mercantile theory. Both fail to take human welfare and the interests of human labor as their main elements. This fatal mistake has buried one, and will, ere long, bury the other, in the rubbish of sad experience and mistaken doctrines.

It should not be difficult to comprehend why the interests of the laboring masses of a country should be the highest objects of national policy. In these masses lie the wealth and power of the country. The products of their industry furnish the food and raiment and dwellings of the whole population—whatever is used at home and whatever is exported to pay for every commodity imported. These masses constitute two-thirds of the whole population, and upon every principle of sound national policy deserve the utmost care which national intelligence and power can give them. They hold claims upon national justice and power which should never be forgotten nor repudiated. Their interests cannot be left to the alteration of a business so fluctuating as foreign trade, nor should merchants shape or control public policy in what concerns creative industry and the well being of the working classes. A paternal care for all departments of labor belongs to the government, and its exercise demands vigilance as well as impartiality. Foreign trade would be impossible without a whole code of laws relating to ships and shipping, seamen and freights, and without the maintenance of navies to protect vessels in all parts of the world, and to drive piracy from the high seas and every lurking place in bay or river.

What public policy owes to foreign trade and to the class of men who have become the distributors of the products of industry, and what is thus accorded at such a large public expenditure, is not less due so far as it may be required by the classes who apply their capital and labor to the production of the commodities which enter the channels of trade. The truth is, that however important in point of national policy that the laws of trade and shipping should be well devised and fully enforced, still higher considerations than mere public policy claim the attention of government where the laboring classes are deeply concerned. Not only because the revenue and strength of the country depend upon productive labor, but because the highest condition of national welfare depends upon the highest condition of the masses of the people in point of morals, religion,

intelligence, social ease, and comfort. Every department of industry, and those by whose science, skill, capital, and labor it is conducted, have special claims upon government for whatever legislation is needful for its security and encouragement in harmony with other branches of industry. No other duty of government can be of higher concern than this.

Those who would confine public policy to national defence and the administration of justice would, in the name of justice deny what is in the strictest sense due as justice to all classes of the industrial community. Whatever theories of government may be entertained elsewhere, ours was not instituted for the mere purpose of adjusting differences, maintaining a police, and punishing crimes. The people with whom our Constitution originated had higher aims, and intended the "general welfare" to be regarded as a principal object.

Every nation has a platform for its own industry, because it must depend upon that industry for nine-tenths, if not ninety-nine hundredths, of its consumption; for every country has characteristics peculiar enough to demand specific treatment. It is no more possible to mingle these peculiarities, and no more proper, than it would be to abandon specific national legislation and attempt to cover the whole ground of national welfare by the law of nations. The special character of our industry, which it concerns us now to notice, is the higher rate of compensation awarded to labor. This has arisen from the popular nature of our political institutions, and the cheapness and abundance of land. Men who labor will not, and need not, accept the wages which rule in Asia and Europe, so long as they can become proprietors themselves. As all the prices of the country have become adjusted to the high rate of compensation which prevails here between employers and employed, a higher range of general prices must prevail than in any great civilized country. Our markets become, consequently, a great temptation to the traders of all the world, and a special mark for their industry and enterprise.

While our markets seem high to others, theirs appear cheap to us, and seem to those who fail to give the subject due consideration to offer the inducement of supplying abundantly whatever is cheaper in foreign countries than in our own. But abundant national or individual supplies are not to be realized by the fact of cheapness. The ability to purchase depends not on the cheapness of the commodity, but on the means of payment. It is well known that the countries where commodities are cheapest are not those where the inhabitants are most amply supplied; and it is equally notorious that the people of this country, where commodities are at higher prices than prevail elsewhere, are more fully supplied and in more full enjoyment of the comforts and luxuries of civilized life than any population in the world.

Our ability to purchase foreign commodities depends wholly not on the price, but upon what will be received in payment. It is near enough for our present purpose to say that the amount or value of our annual exports exhibits the extent of our annual ability to pay for imports; merchants promptly to export to foreign countries every article for which they can hope to find a proper market. Our exports of the products of our own country, including the precious metals, may range between three and four hundred millions of dollars in value. This will constitute the limit of our ability to pay for goods

imported, if payment in our national bonds be not taken into the account.

The consumption of our whole population is now not under three thousand millions of dollars in value. One-half of the commodities which are thus used or consumed are from fifty to one hundred per cent. higher here than they are in Europe or Asia. But this cheapness does not induce us, and cannot enable us, to import even a thousand millions in value of these cheaper commodities. Such an importation is a commercial impossibility; and necessity compels us to submit to that range of higher prices which the rate of wages and other special circumstances at home force upon us.

The result is, that we cannot purchase abroad any more than we can pay for. We must be the producers at home of a least nine-tenths of the commodities we consume or use, but it should be noted that the payment at home, in the productions of domestic industry, of two thousand five hundred millions, is far less difficult than the payment of five hundred millions in foreign countries for what is imported. It cannot be denied that much the largest proportion of the commodities we import are produced of better quality, and in any needed quantity, at home; the main recommendation of the foreign articles being their cheapness. One-tenth of what is required may be imported at say half the domestic price. A struggle has ensued in this country to determine what class shall have the benefit of these cheaper foreign commodities. This struggle has, by its operation on the domestic industry and trade of the country, produced a succession of fluctuations in prices during the last half century damaging the productive power of the country to an extent far exceeding the value of all the goods imported in that time.

On grounds of national policy and individual justice, it should not be difficult to decide what course is to be pursued in such cases. No class of individuals can have any special title to the exclusive enjoyment of these cheap goods; the advantage is necessarily confined to a few: chief among these is the foreign manufacturer, who obtains a decided advantage by admission to our markets. The government, therefore, intervenes, by means of import duties, and other needful regulations, to place the foreign manufacturer in strict competition, allowing him no advantage, not even that of selling below the cost of production, for the purpose of destroying the competition which keeps him out of so desirable a market. The full difference between the cost of producing the commodities we consume abroad and at home should go into the public treasury, becoming thus a public benefit, and affording some compensation for the disturbance of domestic production.

By this means, too, the fluctuations and revulsions of foreign trade and over-production should be controlled, if not wholly shut out, from deranging the more equable flow of domestic production and trade. The combination of capital, labor, skill, and science, which go to make up the productive power of the country, is not only a very costly but an exceedingly complicated organization, very liable to serious derangement from mismanagement or careless handling. The capital embarked in it expects compensation, the labor must have it, the interests of consumers demand adequate attention. The relations of the whole to public welfare and public authority present a problem which the most experienced statesmen may fear to touch without special care and preparation. Thus it presents itself in its domestic

aspects; but when the domestic organization of labor is brought into due contract with a foreign one radically different, no skill nor power can make them harmonize. Such differences may be compensated; they cannot work in harmony, nor without injurious friction.

In the light of such considerations, since our national expenditure has become five-fold greater than in 1860, it becomes needful to observe the double effect of foreign competition and of heavy taxation upon our most important branches of industry. It is well known that heretofore the struggle between foreign and domestic labor has been severe enough to demand the constant aid of favoring legislation; and this is now more necessary than ever, not merely as a revenue measure, but to insure that activity and progress in our domestic industry which alone can enable the people to pay annually internal taxes to an amount exceeding two hundred millions of dollars.

Common precaution dictates that in a matter so vital to national credit and prosperity nothing should be left to mere experiment or to chance results. Whatever can be, should be made safe. The main departments of domestic industry and consumption should be scrutinized with this view.

The production of food incurs little direct risk from foreign competition, though it may be injuriously affected by heavy taxation or unskilful adjustment of its burdens. The main dependence of agriculture for a market is upon those employed in manufactures, and of course upon that success which makes them large consumers, and saves them from being driven to the necessity of producing their own food.

All the chief branches of domestic production are so interlinked that any imposition of duties which injures or destroys one weakens or finally destroys others. The whole class of farmers on the one hand, and the whole class of those engaged in other pursuits on the other, are mutually customers of each other; and each of these principal classes are susceptible of many subdivisions, which are in like manner mutual customers. Their mutual interchange of commodities and services exceed in money value much more than five times the entire foreign trade of the country. They reach this vast amount because it is a virtual exchange of labor—an exchange in which the parties can purchase what they want with what they have. They literally work for each other, and exchange the products. They are only restricted in this process by the capacity of production and the needs of consumption.

When an hundred millions of dollars are invested in these transactions, adding so much to the quantity and value of the commodities forwarded to the channels of domestic trade, and so much to the rewards of labor, this advantage will continue to operate, passing indefinitely round the circles of industry and trade, until all in their turn, remotely or directly, share in the benefit. It is by such additions that production is not merely kept up, but grows, each increase begetting or promoting another, while individual and national wealth grows by feeding on its own gains.

Just the reverse of this process takes place when a hundred millions in value of the means employed in this industry or of the avails of this production are taken away from this use. The contraction to fill the void made by such a removal is felt in its continually narrowing

process until lost in its complication with other obstructions and troubles. But the effects of the abstraction of the avails of industry will continue to operate long after it is possible to trace distinctly its path. If we suppose that those engaged in productive industry were merely to increase their expense of living one-tenth, the abstraction would absorb so vast an amount of the capital employed as to give a severe check to the whole movements of industry and largely reduce its products, while many individuals would be wholly ruined.

The experiment is now being tried of taking over two hundred millions, in the shape of internal revenue, from the people of the United States; the diminishing and contracting process is already operating, in conjunction with other causes, with great severity upon labor in all its interests and ramifications. Its effects will be signally injurious in a short time, if not counteracted or compensated. It can, however, only be counteracted by a better adjustment of taxes—only compensated by a corresponding check upon foreign competition.

The consuming or rather destroying process of taxation, and foreign competition without corresponding care and favoring legislation on the part of government, is well illustrated in the case of Ireland, a country which has declined from one of wealth and varied industry, with a large production, to one affording the fewest indications of wealth, ease, and industrial progress of any in Europe.

The consumption of iron by a people is a fair indication of the extent to which the whole list of other metals are employed. It is worthy of attention that among the European people who consume the least quantity of iron in proportion to population are those of Ireland. Apparently Ireland is fortunate, in easy access to an unlimited supply of the cheapest iron to be found—iron and steel in England being at a much lower rate than in any other country in the world. It is obvious, however, that Ireland must be limited in her use of these metals to the value of the commodities England is willing to take in payment, and it is well known that, as Irish industry is little varied, it can furnish but a comparatively small amount for export to England, whence the supply of manufactures, iron and steel among the rest, for Irish consumption must come. The result is, that Ireland cannot purchase English iron, cheap as it is, because she cannot pay for it. It is easier for the people of the United States to make and consume one hundred and twenty pounds of iron per head, at the rate of eighty dollars per ton, than it is for the Irish people to purchase and consume thirty pounds per head at the rate of forty dollars per ton.

Under this English policy the progress of Ireland is downward. Ireland has a fine climate and soil, but the people are hurrying away from it; abundance of bituminous coal, but the people mine only the bogs; water-power, but it is unemployed; abundance of the best iron ore, with coal to smelt it, but makes now no iron, though she once made and sold iron in England; glass was formerly made there, but not now; the linen manufacture once flourished throughout Ireland, but it has nearly departed now, and survives only in the vicinity of Belfast. The Irish manufacturers have emigrated to England. Ireland has little to export to England except agricultural products, and these are never wanted to the extent that they

can be furnished. Not only manufactures have gone down, but land and labor have also fallen in price. Labor emigrates; the land cannot. Land in England is worth three to four times as much as it is in Ireland. Great Britain, with four times the population of Ireland, exports to other countries one hundred times the value exported by Ireland. The people of England pay annually, per head, taxes to the amount of sixty shillings; those of Ireland eighteen shillings. British policy discourages a varied industry in Ireland, and makes heavy taxation there impossible.

WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF WOOL.

In considering what should be our public policy in reference to domestic production, with a view also to national revenue, our attention has been especially directed to sheep husbandry, and manufactures of wool, as not only of great national importance, but as suitable to illustrate the whole subject of the relation of industry to revenue. The employments which pertain to the more indispensable articles of clothing are so essential to national independence and individual comfort and well-being, that they should not fail to enlist the attention and action of government in the beginning of our experience under heavy taxation.

The history of wool growing and wool manufacturing in many countries of Europe, and especially in Great Britain, is one of great and varied interest. In the long struggle maintained by tariffs and acts of navigation, whatever was cunning in diplomacy or bold or novel in commercial policy was, for two or three centuries, brought into play to secure permanent advantages in this important industry. The prolonged effort of these nations for pre-eminence in the manufacture of woollens had the result which can only be attained by national exertion, that of crowning them all with success. England, France, Germany, and the Low Countries all, soon or late, took high rank as manufacturers of woollen goods, which they have increased and maintained to the present time. If this success had been confined to one of these countries, can it be supposed that the others would have been as well clad as they are to-day? Certainly not; they are now well clad in woollens, enjoying the advantage of not being dependent for this article upon what other countries may please to take from them in payment. Their woollen goods are obtained not by sending abroad such articles as other countries may or may not want, but by the exchange of services, labor, and productions at home among those who labor for a living and must labor to live, and who, knowing each other's wants, can promptly adapt the supply to the demand.

The vast armies recently on foot have revealed some truths which cannot be overlooked for the future in adjusting our economical policy. Beef is the food for armies in active campaign, and the stock of the country has been seriously reduced. Not only the beef but the hides were required for military uses. The country was thrown by the high price of beef upon the consumption of mutton; but the wool was not less important than the mutton. It was soon ascertained that the supply of beef was not more than sufficient, and that the supply of wool and mutton was far from being adequate to

the national urgency. If doubled it would not have sufficed to clothe our armies, and furnish meat enough to keep down the price of beef, and prevent too great a reduction of the national herds of cattle.

It is quite apparent that this country has never had a full supply of such woollens as are needful for health and comfort. According to the range of consumption of our population, and the amount of comforts enjoyed, the consumption of woollen goods, per head, should not be less than double the present rate. To complete and adjust the entire circle of national production, sheep husbandry should be stimulated and promoted until our flocks shall be doubled, and our supplies of wool shall exceed 200,000,000 pounds, and our consumption of woollen goods, domestic and imported, shall be equal to ten dollars per head.

The attention of the writer, as one of the revenue commission, has been turned to this important branch of national industry since the commencement of his duties. Believing that the amount of internal revenue demanded by the state of our finances could not be realized without vigorous and proper action of the laboring classes, and that such continuous movement could not be maintained unless all the sources of domestic employment were opened and duly supported, the classes directly interested were invited to a full interchange of views. It is known that during the rise of the manufacture of wool in Great Britain a want of harmony existed between the wool-growers and woollen manufacturers which not a little retarded the progress of their industry, lessened their influence with the government, and damaged their interests in other respects. A similar want of harmony and good intelligence was exercising a like injurious influence here.

As nothing can be more certain than that the industrial interests of these two classes in the United States are substantially identical, it was a principal object to have the fullest possible interchange of opinion between them. Upon the first intimation of the wishes of the commission, the necessary conferences commenced, and continued for more than six months, without much pause, by conventions and separate and joint committees, in which the various interests of each class, and the united interests of both, were subjected to a scrutiny so patient, so intelligent, and so discriminating, that the utmost deference and weight is due, and should be awarded, to conclusions so carefully prepared.

Joint meetings were held in Syracuse, in the city of New York, in Philadelphia, and in Washington.

As the carefully prepared opinions and statements of these committees will form a portion of this report, it is not proper here to anticipate what is so well stated by them. It was assumed, as a point of departure, that growing wool and increasing flocks of sheep were of national importance with reference, to clothing, food, and the general interests of agriculture. The experience of many countries had verified this. But at the price of labor now ruling and certain to prevail here in time to come, wool cannot be exported hence to Europe or elsewhere with profit. That on this account, as well as upon the consideration that the use of mutton as food did not present a suffi-

cient inducement to sheep husbandry, it was evident that wool grown here must be manufactured here as a necessary encouragement to the increase of sheep. It was considered that, as a branch of national agriculture, few could be of more importance on account of the vast extent of public lands for which it would increase the demand, and because sheep husbandry tends constantly to the improvement of the soils where it is extensively pursued. It being admitted, on these public grounds, that wool should be one of the great staples of the country, it followed that the manufacture of wool should be one of the principal branches of domestic industry. These two employments would soon furnish for domestic consumption woollen fabrics to the value of not less than three hundred millions of dollars, an amount nearly equal to our foreign trade, involving necessarily a vast capital, and full occupation with a livelihood for a large population.

The revenue to be derived from such a mass of wealth and production cannot be overlooked in any estimate of the capacity of the country to carry its financial burdens.

In the conferences between the wool-growers and the manufacturers it was conceded by the former that their business could not flourish unless the latter were fully established and sustained; that capitalists would not invest adequate sums in buildings and machinery without good prospect of profit and permanency in the business; that without permanency the needful skill and experience in the operatives could not be maintained; that taking into view the price of labor in Europe and the price of labor and of wool here, the manufacture of woollens could not be established here in competition, unless some favor on public ground could be accorded to the manufacturer; and both parties insisted that the importance of the industry in every point of view besides its magnitude made the claim for favorable legislation valid. It was shown by ample proof that wool could not be grown here unless the manufacturers of wool could be permanently established, and that the consumption of woollens could never reach the adequate figure of ten dollars per head of the increasing population, unless wool-growing and the manufacture of wool both take their place among the established and successful industries of the country.

The manufacturers claimed that until similar wools shall be supplied at home a considerable proportion of the fine but inferior and very cheap wools of South America, Africa, and other countries, would be required to give variety, special qualities, and cheapness to certain descriptions of their woollen goods, but did not resist the claim of the wool-growers to have such a duty imposed on these wools as would encourage their growth, and in time supply their place, at least in part, by home-grown wool.

The manufacturers on their part claimed, as these cheap wools entered English ports free of duty, and as the cost of labor entering into the production of woollen goods in Europe was less than half the rates paid in this country, that such duties should be asked of our government as would place them in fair competition with foreign manufacturers in our own market.

The details of the statements to be made through the revenue commission to Congress were, as will be seen, carefully considered and

mutually approved in the hope of their being incorporated into the revenue laws.

Although harmony of views between parties whose interest so far as concerned the intervention of government appeared to be improbable, yet with patient and protracted efforts of those most interested, with much study and candid examination of facts, it was accomplished; and now it may be hoped that other interests, supposed to be conflicting, can with even less trouble be brought to full accord. Other differences, apparently as formidable and mischievous, will disappear before earnestness, intelligence, and patience. The duty of seeking such results rests with those whose minute knowledge of facts and details enables them, by comparison of views, to ascertain a basis on which their interests can be secured, while general advantage is promoted. Instead of wasting labor in opposing their respective views, let a well-directed effort be made in the various departments of industry to ascertain a common basis on which such an industrial policy could be gradually shaped, as time and experience would show to be at once wise as public policy and favorable to industrial enterprise. There is every reason why this attempt should be made among those specially concerned in the various departments of labor, by confronting those whose interests are regarded as adverse. It is enough for the public authorities, upon full consideration of what private parties have in this manner stated, conceded, proved, and suggested, to determine what should receive the sanction of legislation, and become a national policy to be relied upon as established and permanent.

It is just as important, if private capital is to be invited or encouraged to invest in productive industry, to make the terms favorable as it is if the invitation be to invest in national bonds. And if the ability of the country to pay heavy taxes is to be maintained and increased as a provision for future exigencies, every stimulant and security should be offered to capital and labor which the country can command. Whatever may be the adjustment of the burden of taxation, it will be found that the larger the amount in value of national production, the more diffused will be the burden, and the lighter will it bear upon those who carry it.

If the States be taken separately or in groups, their ability to bear taxation will be found to be in proportion to the magnitude and variety of their production. The value of the annual production per capita, according to the census of 1860, is stated as follows:

New England States.....	\$149.46
Middle States.....	96.31
Western States.....	37.53
Southern States.....	17.08

This striking result is the product of diversified industry, aided by a large use of machinery.

The statement becomes more definite and instructive when the States are compared separately. It is impossible not to see in the following table that the ability to endure taxation is in proportion to the power of production, and that the magnitude of production depends upon the extent to which it is diversified:

States.	Popula- tion.	Manufac- tures and produc- tions.	Per capita.	Internal taxes paid in 1864.	Taxation per capita.
Rhode Island.....	174,620	\$2,797,893	\$16.00	\$3,946,846	\$22.58
Massachusetts.....	1,231,066	15,541,792	12.61	23,250,866	18.83
Connecticut.....	460,147	4,359,979	9.45	6,009,998	13.04
New York.....	3,880,735	23,770,513	6.12	48,940,566	12.60
New Hampshire.....	326,072	2,007,061	6.15	3,424,917	10.47
New Jersey.....	672,035	4,423,210	6.58	7,157,012	10.64
Pennsylvania.....	2,906,215	16,868,411	5.79	27,811,537	9.55
Maryland.....	687,049	2,587,101	3.76	4,966,085	7.22
Ohio.....	2,330,511	8,896,407	3.82	15,296,123	6.56
Illinois.....	1,711,951	5,007,821	2.88	9,174,370	5.35
Missouri.....	1,182,012	2,720,592	2.29	5,243,540	4.43
Kentucky.....	1,155,684	2,412,431	2.08	4,591,346	3.97
Michigan.....	749,113	1,391,782	1.86	2,544,025	3.39
Indiana.....	1,350,428	2,627,356	1.92	4,571,521	3.38
Vermont.....	628,276	1,791,018	2.80	2,408,367	3.83
Maine.....	315,116	437,623	1.40	773,658	2.47
Wisconsin.....	775,881	868,263	1.11	1,175,200	1.50
Tennessee.....	1,109,801	1,055,829	.95	1,516,967	1.36

It is thus seen that each individual of the four manufacturing States of New England pays \$18 83, \$22 58, \$13 04, and \$10 47, or an average of \$16 23, whilst each person of the two agricultural States, Vermont and Maine, pays \$2 47 and \$3 83. The same result is apparent throughout all except the States producing the precious metals, evincing that a varied industry is the true basis of a large average revenue.

It is not difficult to see that a diversified industry can only flourish when founded on large domestic consumption, and this can only be permanent when the consumers are near enough and have needful facilities for exchanging with each other the whole products of their respective labor. The power of consumption does not depend, as is often erroneously asserted, on the power of production solely, but upon the willingness of the producing parties to exchange with each other what they can respectively produce. The labor and machinery, soil, and skill of the people in this country can produce commodities to the value of three thousand millions of dollars, but, of these commodities, less than to the value of four hundred millions of dollars find a market abroad. There is a similar restriction running throughout our whole domestic trade. People will take from others only what they can use or sell again. Yet, under this natural limitation, the domestic exchanges exceed the foreign in the proportion of nine or ten to one. The industry that is directed to the purpose of producing commodities designed for foreign markets must be confined to what is marketable abroad, and that is a very narrow range compared with the whole circle of domestic production. If the United States were wholly dependent upon Great Britain for iron and steel, copper, lead, and other metals, the consumption would be less than half what it now is—we could not pay for more. As remarked elsewhere, the people of Pennsylvania can pay her own manufacturers for 500,000 tons of iron, but they have no product which they could exchange yearly in England for 50,000 tons.

In every case, when it is desirable on public grounds that the consumption should be large, it can only be attained by domestic production and the processes of home trade and exchanges. But this

rule of domestic economy, always sound, becomes vastly more important when the demands of heavy taxation are taken into account. A production large enough to make a large consumption possible is only attainable when home industry is under the full stimulus of an ample home market for all that labor can accomplish. A full illustration of this can be found in every aspect of our foreign as well as our domestic trade. The people of New England direct their industry to the production of all that is needed in the United States; and while they are thus enabled, with the products of their labor, to purchase whatever the country can yield, they furnish a market of equal value for the products of the other States. The interchange of labor between the New England States and those further south and west far exceeds that of the whole country with Europe.

It is obvious that there is only one line of policy, in fact, which can fulfil at once the demands of revenue, the interests of individuals, and the requirements of true national policy. It is that which will diversify industry, thus inviting a large consumption, opening a steady market, rewarding private enterprise, increasing public wealth, and establishing a solid basis for permanent revenue.

There are certain classes of commodities the domestic manufacture of which are so essential to national self-respect, as well as to civilized comfort, to progress in all the arts of industry, that they recur at once to the mind as national productions. The efficiency of this production should be of the highest order possible, reaching not only to the utmost perfection in quality, but to the utmost limit in quantity and cheapness. These articles are such as manufactures of all the useful metals, but especially of iron, steel, copper, and lead, and of wool, cotton, flax, leather, paper, glass, soda ash, chemicals, medicines, household furniture, and earthenware.

We have the necessary skill, much the largest portion of the raw material, and other needful facilities for the production of a full supply of the commodities thus indicated. The nominal price to consumers would be higher, but the range of rates would be in proportion to the price of labor throughout, and the benefit of higher compensation would inure to every class and profession. The great struggle which has been going on in this country between foreign and domestic labor, owing to our want of a fixed industrial policy, has continually repressed manufacturing enterprise and checked the progress of consumption to such an extent that it is now far below what it would have been if domestic production had been adequately sustained. The hesitation to sustain manufacturing labor is a hesitation to favor general industry, to favor the employment of laboring men and women, to favor national independence, and to build upon the only sure source of adequate and permanent internal revenue. If manufacturing industry, properly supported, should raise up a wealthy class, the internal taxation will afford a ready means of obtaining a full contribution from this wealth to the public treasury. Without a vigorous manufacturing industry, with increasing capital from its savings, the productive power of the country must fall behind, and the sources of revenue be proportionably seriously diminished, if not dried up.

STEPHEN COLWELL,
Of the Revenue Commission.

Hon. HUGH McCULLOCH,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Paper on the production of American wool, by the president of the Ohio Wool-growers' Association.

SIR: The present annual production of wool in the United States is, in round numbers, 100,000,000 pounds. In addition to this, we imported, during the four years ending with 1865, 289,182,929 pounds of wool and shoddy, being an annual average of 72,295,722 pounds of both. During the same time we imported an amount of manufactured wool estimated to be equivalent to about 220,000,000 pounds of raw wool, or an annual average of 55,000,000, which together amounts to 127,000,000 per annum, without including fractions. The rate of import now prevailing largely exceeds that of any previous time.

As a portion of this 127,000,000 loses a large percentage in cleaning, it is estimated that in the production of cloth it is equal to about 75,000,000 of domestic wool. It hence appears that we are importing 75 per cent. as much wool as we produce. It is here proper to note, that from 1840 until the breaking out of the war our increase in the production of wool scarcely kept pace with the increase of our population, and has only exceeded it under the stimulus of higher prices consequent upon that event. But even with this stimulant production has not maintained its proportion to importation, as will be seen from the following table:

	1840.	1850.	1860.	Average of 1864 and 1865.
Population.....	17,000,000	23,000,000	31,000,000	36,000,000
Pounds of domestic wool.....	35,000,000	52,000,000	60,000,000	100,000,000
Pounds of imported wool.....	15,006,410	18,669,794	34,500,000	67,984,062
Pounds of imported shoddy.....				6,498,227
Value of imported woollens.....	\$12,000,000	\$17,151,509	\$37,936,945	\$26,243,449

From these figures it appears that since 1840 our population has about doubled—our production of wool has about trebled, and, including shoddy, nearly quintupled—and our importation of woollens has more than doubled.

It is true that we export a small quantity of these articles; but not enough to affect the truth that, comparing our production with our consumption, we are steadily falling more and more into the pitiable condition of dependence on foreigners for our supply of cloth.

The wool grown in the United States includes, in greater or less degree, all the principal known varieties, unless it be some of a peculiar and cheap character, and which may properly be designated carpet wool.

The kind principally grown is merino and its grades, which, for the manufacture of flannels, shawls, cassimeres, and cloths of ordinary fineness, and for ordinary use, is acknowledged to have no superior. There is, too, an amount very considerable in the aggregate, principally produced by smaller flocks, of a coarser wool, which, including the lower grades of merino, is peculiarly fitted to the manufacture of blankets, and which, during our late war, furnished us the best army cloths known in the world.

We have also a small quantity of very superior wool, admirably adapted to the manufacture of broadcloths; and we have the most conclusive testimony that broadcloth wools, equal to the best German wools, have been, and therefore can be, grown in our own country.

We possess, also, in limited quantity, fine specimens of combing wools, every way suited to that large and largely increasing class of fabrics known as worsteds. And it is superfluous to say that we can produce all these wools in any required quantity whenever the demand and the price will justify their growth.

From the testimony of many of the most intelligent flock-masters in all the principal wool-growing States, we know that the average cost of growing the wools the past year was about 70 cents per pound. It is a fact susceptible of proof that at no time during the season could these wools have been sold at a price equal to their cost, and that large amounts of them are still remaining in the hands of the producer, waiting for a market, at a price much below remuneration.

When we inquire the reason for this serious state of things, we are met with the answer based on the clearest and most undeniable truth: that South America and other countries of cheap land and cheap labor, are producing wool in large quantities, finer and softer than our own, but weaker and less valuable in service, and are underselling us in our own market.

Thus wool enough to produce a pound of cloth can be bought in Buenos Ayres, free on shipboard, for sixty cents, (gold). It can be transported to New York or Boston at a price scarcely or not at all exceeding the cost of commissions and transportation from our western States to the same market, and it is there admitted at a rate of duty per pound less than the tax imposed on American farmers for growing a pound of wool.

To confirm this statement that the tax on American wool exceeds the tariff on foreign wool: The duty paid on foreign wool during the six months last reported was 4.85c. per pound; previous to that time it was less.

As Ohio produces nearly or quite one-fifth of all the wool grown in the United States, we will take her as an example in estimating the tax on domestic wool.

Ohio land is taxed at \$20 per acre. The common estimate allows two-fifths of an acre, including some woodland, to a sheep. Value.....	\$3.00
Tax value of a sheep.....	3.75
On a farm carrying 300 sheep there is taxable value of team and agricultural implements, say, \$450. Value per sheep.....	1.50
Total tax.....	<u>13.25</u>

I have no means of ascertaining the rate of taxation covering State and all local taxes, but assuming it to be 2 per cent., we have 26½ cents, and, calling the weight of fleece 3½ pounds, the tax per pound is..... 7.57c.

It is reasonable to suppose that one-half the wool grown pays the 5 per cent. income tax. This would equal 2½ per cent. on the whole amount, and, at 60 cents per pound, the tax would be a cent and a half per pound..... 1.5

Which, added to the 7.57, makes the direct tax on wool, per pound..... 9.07c.

And if it is not sold, (as is the case with much this year,) it is taxed as wool on hand.

In addition to this, there is an indirect tax which bears at so many points and in so many ways that it is very difficult to estimate, but is none the less certain to be exacted.

There is the tax on the iron and steel of which the wagon, the "machines," and other implements are made; the tax on the leather in the harness; and the tax on the skill of their construction.

In the matter of clothing, there is first the tax on the raw material; then there is the six per cent. manufacturers' tax and the five per cent. income tax paid directly to the government, and charged over in the price of the goods to the jobber, who will increase the price enough to pay his license and revenue tax, and pass the goods over to the retail merchant, who repeats the process and hands the burden finally over to the consumer.

If the wool-grower raises his own grain and meat, and does not raise too much, he may escape taxation in this direction; but when he reaches that large class of supplies under the general designation of store goods, he finds the handwriting of the government in triplicate on most articles of consumption; and if he draws his check or note, it must bear a certificate on its face, to be duplicated on a receipt for payment. And if he chooses to relieve the monotony of home life by a visit among his friends, he finds in the rail car the restraining hand of the government on his recreation; and denying himself this gratification, and confining his travel to a journey to church in the *family carriage*, even this, his worship of his Maker, is made to pay tribute to the State that does not protect him against foreign competition.

I write this in no spirit of complaint, for the cause which rendered these taxes necessary was a sacred one: but I write it to ask that those who bear none of our burdens shall not despoil us of our means of payment, but shall enable us to bear our load by protecting our industry from invasion by the capitalists, manufacturers, and traders of Europe.

Foreign wool, enough to make a pound of cloth, can be laid down in the New York market for \$1 20 in currency, while American wool, enough to answer the same purpose, cannot be produced for less than \$1 50.

More than this: large quantities of the same kind of wool are imported into England duty free, and manufactured under their system of low wages and abundant capital, and then thrown upon our market, likewise to the detriment of American growers. Another portion is mixed with shoddy and manufactured into cheap cloth and dressed with flocks, and then forced upon us to the damage of our wool-growers and wool-manufacturers, and to the swindling of our consumers.

And we further say, that during the past four years, and until we reach specie payments, the duties on imports, at the present rates, although seeming to afford a considerable revenue, were and will be (on account of the difference between currency and gold) only adding to the burden of our debt.

So that, while we are patiently laboring for our own support, and struggling under oppressive taxation for the maintenance of our government, we are at the same time submitting to the folly of furnishing a substantially free market to those who bear none of our burdens, and to the meanness of picking up the rags of foreign nations under their audacious free-trade lie of furnishing cheap clothing to our industrial classes.

By the superiority of our flocks and the greater strength and excellence of our wool we can overcome any advantage foreigners may have in either their milder climate or their cheaper lands. But when we come to the question of the wages of labor and the burdens

of taxation, we need, and think we have a right to ask, for our industry protection from our government, which draws so largely on us for support, and whose drafts we so faithfully honor.

Finally: In this country, where the laboring man, alike with the capitalist, must bear the burdens and enjoy the benefits of a free government and of a civilized and cultivated state of society, and consequently must have corresponding compensation, the cost of the production of wool resolves itself very largely into a question of labor, and the alternates are presented of a better protection against foreign competition or lower wages to our own laboring population and less reward to domestic industry.

Believing that the best interests of our country lie in the direction of depending on our own resources and fostering our own industry, which shall give us rails from our own mines, engines from our own shops, guns from our own foundries, and monitors from our own yards, cloths from our own mills, and wool from our own sheep, bread from our own fields, and good markets at our own doors—thus placing us in a better position in time of peace, and rendering us less at the mercy of avowed enemies and less dependent on neutral neighbors in time of war—we ask Congress to impose such duties on foreign imports as will keep our laborers profitably at work, afford revenue to the government, and give us at least an equal chance with foreigners in the United States markets.

R. M. MONTGOMERY,

President of Ohio Wool-growers' Association.

Hon. STEPHEN COLWELL,

of the Revenue Commission.

Report of the proceedings of the convention of delegates from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, and from the several organizations of the wool-growers of the United States, at Syracuse, New York, December 13, 1865.

The following report of the proceedings of the convention of the wool-growers and wool manufacturers of the United States, prepared, under the supervision of the undersigned, from phonographic notes made with great fidelity by Mr. Yerrinton, of Boston, is commended to the attention of all interested in the two branches of industry represented. They will find the addresses and discussions replete with practical and original facts and suggestions; and, in the harmony of once distrustful, if not hostile interests, pledged by the resolutions and breathing through all the deliberations of the convention, will receive the most hopeful assurance of the future stability and prosperity of the woollen interest of the United States.

JOHN L. HAYES,

S. D. HARRIS,

Secretaries of the Convention.

In accordance with the terms of a call issued by the executive committee of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, a convention of wool-growers and wool manufacturers was held in the city of Syracuse, New York, on Wednesday, December 13, at which the two interests were represented by delegates, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS.

E. B. Bigelow, Massachusetts, president; J. L. Hayes, Massachusetts, secretary; Joshua Stetson, Massachusetts; Theodore Pomeroy, Massachusetts; A. C. Russell, Massachusetts; S. Blackinton, Massachusetts; Jesse Eddy, Massachusetts; George W. Bond, Massachusetts; John V. Barker, Massachusetts; T. S. Faxton, New York; C. H. Adams, New York; R. Middleton, New York; Charles Stott, New York; H. D. Telkamp, New York; R. G. Hazard, Rhode Island; N. Kingsbury, Connecticut; Homer Blanchard, Connecticut; George Kellogg, Connecticut; David Oakes, New Jersey; Alton Pope, Ohio.

WOOL-GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

New York.—Henry S. Randall, president; George Geddes, E. B. Pottle, William Kelly, James O. Sheldon, William Chamberlain, Samuel Thorne, D. D. T. Moore, James M. Ellis, A. F. Wilcox, E. E. Brown, Lionel Sherwood, Henry P. Randall, Wm. M. Holmes, Davis Cossit, James Geddes, Charles Tallman, Allen H. Avery, John R. Page, H. D. L. Sweet, Addison H. Clapp, Luther Baker, Spencer Beard, Charles H. Hibbard, William Plumb.

Vermont.—J. W. Colburn, president; Edwin Hammond, John H. Thomas, Henry Boynton, Hampden Cutts, William R. Sanford, John Gregory, George Campbell.

Ohio.—R. M. Montgomery, president; S. D. Harris, Wm. F. Greer.

Illinois.—A. M. Garland, president; John McConnell, Franklin Fassett, Samuel P. Boardman.

Wisconsin.—Eli Stillson, president; Thomas Goodhue.

New England Association.—George B. Loring, president; Victor Wright, Daniel Kimball, Thomas Sanders, E. S. Stowell, Henry Clark, Jeremiah Thornton.

The delegates assembled at the city hall in Syracuse, on the morning of the above-named day, and were called to order, shortly after 10 o'clock, by Erastus B. Bigelow, esq., president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, who read the call as follows:

“NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL-GROWERS,

“Office, 55 Summer Street, Boston, Mass., November 23, 1865.

“SIR: I am directed by the government of the ‘National Association of Wool Manufacturers’ to communicate to you the following copy of a resolve passed at their last meeting, and to respectfully invite your attendance at the meeting therein indicated:

“Resolved, That the executive committee of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers be instructed to invite the several organizations of wool-growers to meet at —, on — of —, for the purpose of consultation in relation to their mutual interests, especially as to the representations to be given respecting the wool-producing and wool-manufacturing interests before the United States tariff and revenue commission.’

“After consultation with representatives of the wool-growing interests present, the place and time of such meeting was fixed at Syracuse, New York, on the second Wednesday of December, 1865.

“Permit me to express the earnest desire of the government of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers that the wool-producing

interests of the United States may be fully represented at the proposed conference, at which a full representation of wool manufacturers will be present. It is hoped that, by a comparison of views at this meeting, the real identity of interests between the wool-growers and wool manufacturers may be fully recognized and firmly established, and that they may hereafter go hand in hand in promoting one of the most important sources of the agricultural and manufacturing prosperity of the nation.

"I have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"JOHN L. HAYES, *Secretary.*

"HON. HENRY S. RANDALL,
*"President of the Association of Wool-growers
 "of the State of New York, and others."*

Mr. Bigelow then said: "To carry out the objects of this meeting, it is necessary that it should be organized by the choice of the proper officers. With your permission, I will nominate, as the president of the convention, the Hon. Henry S. Randall, of New York."

This nomination was unanimously confirmed by the convention; and, on motion of General S. D. Harris, of Ohio, John L. Hayes, esq., of Massachusetts, was appointed secretary.

On motion of H. Blanchard, esq., of Connecticut, General Harris was elected an additional secretary.

The president then addressed the convention as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION: I thank you for the honor you have done me in calling me to preside over your deliberations. This convention, or conference, will, I trust, mark the introduction of a new era in some of the important relations subsisting between two great industrial interests. The American wool-producers and manufacturers have entertained differences of opinion on the subject of the respective duties which should be imposed on imported raw and manufactured wool. Those differences have led to repeated and severe contests in Congress, in nominating conventions, and even at the polls. The whole history of our tariff legislation on this subject has been a history of sudden, and, occasionally, violent changes in measures, and even in policy. Having elsewhere attempted to trace the effects of our different woollen tariffs on the two interests most directly involved, I will not repeat myself here. But I will call your attention to one great and significant fact which has been clearly established amidst all these struggles and changes. It is, that when the government has protected the manufacturer at the expense of the producer, or the producer at the expense of the manufacturer, the injurious consequences have fallen not alone on the branch of industry discriminated against, but upon both. This was inevitable; for, in reality, their interests are indissolubly connected. Neither could possibly flourish without the other, under any circumstances which have occurred in our country, or which can reasonably be expected to occur for generations to come.

The producer must have a remunerative home market. It is in vain to suppose that American farmers generally, on their comparatively small farms, and with their comparatively small capital, with the high duties of freemen and electors to discharge, with government to support, with public trusts to fill, with school-houses and churches to

maintain, with children to educate for the future statesmen of our country, with those comfortable and respectable homes and easy modes of life to keep up, which should be made attainable to all the industrious citizens of a free republic—it is in vain, I say, to suppose that such men can compete with the vastly cheaper labor and aggregated capital of various other countries in the production of any article the price of which is so large in proportion to the cost of transportation as wool. On the other hand, the American manufacturer, without the home production of the raw material, would find it in the end more expensive, and at all times more difficult, if not actually impracticable, to obtain his full supply. And the same principle of free trade which overthrew the producer would, as a matter of course, extend to him; for it is not, and never can be, the policy of the American government so to legislate as to protect the manufacturer of foreign staples to the exclusion of our own.

A United States revenue commission is now acting under the authority of Congress in collecting facts in respect to the operation of those laws under which all our government revenues are collected. This looks toward a change in those laws, and, among others, in our tariff on wools and woollens, if such a change is found to be needed. The United States revenue commission, to obtain the requisite information in regard to manufacturing, addressed inquiries to the National Association of Wool Manufacturers as the organ of that interest. To obtain the statistics of wool production, it purposed addressing inquiries to the several State wool-growers' associations, until it ascertained that this national convention of both interests was to be held. It then preferred to communicate with those State associations collectively, through their representatives here assembled.

I have the direct authority of the United States revenue commission for saying that it heard with pleasure that this convention was to assemble; and it expressed the hope that the wool-producers might have "a full representation both from the east and from the west." It would, no doubt, be highly gratified if the representatives of the two interests here assembled would concur in those representations which affect their common concerns—such, for example, as the proportionable rate of duties which should be levied on unmanufactured and manufactured wools. If such a concurrence can be obtained, and on a basis which is a just and fair one to the consumer, it is reasonable to suppose that our action will have a strong influence both on the recommendations of the revenue commission and on the action of Congress.

It will not do for us, gentlemen, to overlook the interests of the consumer in our deliberations. As long as duties on foreign imports shall be collected for revenue purposes, all will concede that they should be so adjusted as to give incidental protection to those important branches of American industry which cannot flourish without such aid. All civilized nations—not even excepting England under her so-called free-trade laws—acknowledge, and, to a greater or less extent, according to their several circumstances, practice upon this principle of political economy. But the amount of such protection should always be measured by the ultimate good of the whole, and not by that of the protected classes. No patriotic and intelligent people will complain of reasonable discriminations in those duties which they choose to raise for revenue purposes, which foster home

industry, and thus render them independent of foreign nations. But they have a right to complain of the establishment of any system which bestows a monopoly, or anything savoring of a monopoly, on a class or classes. And where such systems are imposed on a free people by their legislators, they are never slow to discover the fact, and to repeal such legislation.

Gentlemen, I have endeavored to state the preliminary object of this convention, though I take it for granted the occasion will not be lost to consider and take action on some other questions. I trust that our deliberations on all subjects will be characterized by a spirit of harmony, and by an earnest disposition to agree, though it should cost some concessions from both the interests here represented. By approaching every topic in this spirit, and with a willingness to listen to and weigh facts and arguments dispassionately and fairly before adopting conclusions, all differences may be happily adjusted, and at least they will be diminished and kept free from asperity.

We do not assemble as a convention under ordinary circumstances, where it would be proper to decide questions of importance by a majority of all the delegates present. The fact that we meet as the representatives of different interests, and without any limitation as to the number of delegates on either side, precludes that course. It has been agreed, therefore, that in cases where a divided vote is called for by delegates, the representatives of the producers and manufacturers shall vote separately, and it shall require a majority of each to make any action the action of the convention. In other respects, and until otherwise ordered, the ordinary parliamentary rules applicable to conventions will prevail.

At the request of the president, E. B. Bigelow, esq., the president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers took a place upon the platform, and addressed the convention as follows:

This is the first time the wool-producers and the wool manufacturers of the United States have ever assembled to consult in regard to matters affecting their common interests. Considering the interrelations of these two industries, it is not a little remarkable that such a movement should have been so long delayed.

The particular cause of our coming together at this time is an application of the United States revenue commission for such information as will enable them, in revising the revenue laws, to suitably adapt the customs duties and internal taxes to the woollen interest.

The war having ended, it seems not improbable that these questions will soon come again before the national legislature: indeed, we may infer this probability from the existence of the commission just mentioned.

Clearly it is a matter of vast importance, that whatever is done in this direction should be not only judicious in its character, but permanent in its action. If by well-considered co-operation we should be enabled to promote in any degree an object so desirable, the result must contribute to the best interests of the country.

As more than *seventy per centum* of the wool required for our vast and varied manufactures is of *home growth*, the interdependence of domestic wool-growing and wool manufacturing becomes apparent. Neither of these industries can long prosper, unless the other prospers also. Taken together, they constitute an interest scarcely second in importance to any of the great industries which promote the welfare of the people, and sustain the prosperity of the nation.

This great interest owes its present growth to national legislation, and is largely dependent on the same agency for its future success. Without the equalizing aid of discriminating customs duties, we can hold no successful competition with the accumulated capital and low wages of older countries. If the woollen interest of the United States is to continue to prosper, it must be maintained in a position to contend even-handed with the woollen interest of Germany, of France, and of Great Britain.

The only contest which can give success to our efforts lies, not between ourselves as wool-growers and wool manufacturers, but between us and the wool-growers and the wool manufacturers of other nations. This is a struggle that challenges our united forces, as between ourselves there is no real ground of antagonism. On the contrary, we are one in interest, and should be allied in purpose.

Scattered over the length and breadth of the land, as the wool-growers and wool manufacturers are, and without any organized modes of intercourse, it is not surprising that misapprehension should have arisen in regard to their actual relations, and the means necessary for their common prosperity.

The want of some organization capable of united and systematic action has long been felt among the wool manufacturers. To supply this deficiency they recently formed a national association, a leading object of which is the collection and diffusion of information on all those subjects in which they, as manufacturers, are particularly interested. Though this movement has thus far succeeded beyond their highest anticipations, they are not unmindful of the fact that all efforts to advance the interests of the wool manufacturers, which do not also embrace the interests of the wool-producers, will lack an essential element of success.

Influenced by these considerations, and aided by your own counsel and co-operation, Mr. President, the government of our association, at a recent meeting in New York city, instructed its executive committee to invite the several State organizations of wool-growers to meet them for consultation in relation to interests which belong to them in common, and especially to consider what answer shall be made to the inquiries of the United States revenue commission, as regards the great wool-producing and wool-manufacturing industries.

While these, Mr. President and gentlemen, are the immediate objects of our meeting, and demand our first attention, there are other matters of common concern which will doubtless come before us, and in regard to which it is highly important that we should think and act harmoniously. Let us hope that this occasion is to form the auspicious commencement of an intercourse between the growers and the manufacturers of wool, which shall not only be agreeable and advantageous to themselves, but beneficial to all.

To this very desirable result the formation of a national association among the wool-growers would greatly conduce, and I venture to express the hope that measures to that effect may soon be taken.

The "objects and plan" of our association are fully set forth in a pamphlet printed by order of its government soon after its organization. That our aims and motives may not be misunderstood, I beg to reproduce from the pamphlet just alluded to the following paragraphs:

"At the very outset, and with perfect sincerity, we disclaim the intention of assuming an attitude in any respect antagonistic to these

great interests. It is, indeed, one leading object of our combination that through it we may be enabled to work more understandingly, more harmoniously, more successfully with others, and especially with those whose pursuits are more or less connected with our own. We believe that there can be no greater mistake than to suppose that any of the great industries of the country are opposed to each other either in interest or policy. We trust that it will be an early, a constant, and a cherished object of the association to promote harmony and co-operation among the different classes of American producers."

"The opposition of interests, which has sometimes been thought to exist between men whose pursuits are different and yet allied—as between those, for instance, who grow a raw material and those who manipulate it—is, I believe, always imaginary, and cannot fail to disappear under a careful consideration of principles and facts."

"As our success in carrying out what is legitimate and practicable must depend somewhat on right understanding of what we can and what we cannot do, I may be permitted here to suggest that this association is not a combination among the manufacturers of a particular class to fix the prices of their fabrics, or to control the markets. Probably there are very few among us who have thought so little on the great laws of trade, or who know so little of human nature, as not to see that any such attempt would bring confusion into business, and, in addition to the odium which it would devolve on its authors, would be ultimately injurious to their interests. Let us not forget, however, that there is a way in which the operations of our society may have a natural and a wholesome influence on the course of trade. Just so far as it shall aid in ascertaining the exact condition of the demand and supply, and in keeping the producer constantly acquainted with the actual relations of those two important quantities, will it contribute to the normal and healthy adjustment of the same.

"These are the sentiments, Mr. President, which have animated our association from its commencement.

"The response to our invitation, which is made, gentlemen, by your presence here to-day, is of the most gratifying character. It gives assurance that, whatever may have been heretofore the attitude of those respectively engaged in the two industries here represented, they will henceforth move hand in hand in regard to all questions of practical interest and of national policy which affect their common prosperity."

Hon. R. G. HAZARD, of Rhode Island, moved the appointment of a business committee, to propose topics of discussion for the convention.

W. F. GREER, of Ohio. Before that committee is appointed, I think it would be highly proper, as there are several of the presiding officers of the State associations here, that we should afford them an opportunity to express their views upon this question. For the purpose of carrying out this wish, I move that Dr. George B. Loring, of Massachusetts, the president of the New England Association of Wool-growers, be invited to address the meeting upon the subject.

This motion was carried, and, in compliance with the invitation, Dr. Loring addressed the convention. He said:

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN: When I accepted the invitation to be present at this convention, it was intimated to me that a part of

my duty, as president of the New England Wool-growers' Association, would be to present certain views of the interests and wishes of the wool-growers generally, as I understand them, to the convention. I was also requested to prepare myself—always a safe request, and always a safe thing to be done by gentlemen who are placed in a prominent position over any body of their fellow-citizens, and especially in a time like this, when we are endeavoring to harmonize two great interests in this country. A careless word, dropped here accidentally in unwritten debate, might awake an ill-feeling which hours would hardly dispel. I have, therefore, prepared myself, at the request of the distinguished gentleman who asked me to appear here; and I am exceedingly obliged to my friend from Ohio, who has given me an opportunity to present these views; and, more than all, I feel under obligation to the president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers for the tone which he has given this convention. It must really be a source of infinite satisfaction to the great body of wool-growers in this country, who should be producing wool enough to supply all the spindles of the country, to know that the president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers desires that they should derive all their raw material from United States soil; and I therefore with the more pleasure address the convention. Perhaps I may travel over more ground than some of you older gentleman might deem necessary; but you must remember that some of us are yet young in this work, speakers as well as hearers.

I suppose this convention of wool manufacturers and wool-growers has been called together for the purpose of devising some plan of governmental protection, which shall be of equal advantage to both of these great branches of industry. That both are entitled to protection, I think no man will deny. That either should be protected at the expense of the other, I think no fair practical man will claim. In order that we may approach some definite understanding of our necessities as farmers and manufacturers, and of our relations to each other, I propose to review briefly the wool trade and wool tariffs in this country and elsewhere for the last few years.

If we will turn our eyes abroad we shall find that in every instance where wool manufactures have flourished, it has been under the protecting arm of the government, shielding its citizens against foreign competition. From the days of Edward III until now, England has pursued this policy; and has fed and clothed and enriched her people, by covering her hills with flocks and multiplying large manufacturing towns within her borders. For many centuries she made everything subservient to that handicraft upon whose success depended the development of the industrial power of her people, and the growth of her trade and commerce. France learned the same policy under the Great Napoleon. Austria, by duties almost prohibitory, has elevated herself into the front rank of manufacturing nations, supplying its own population, and exporting to every quarter of the globe, goods of the highest cost and most elaborate finish. Sweden owes almost her entire prosperity to her devotion to her manufacturing population. Russia has risen on the same policy, from a strictly agricultural nation, to a degree of manufacturing wealth and prosperity almost unparalleled, in the short period of half a century.

In our own country we have the remarkable spectacle of an active, intelligent, and industrious people struggling against repeated finan-

cial convulsions and every variety of tariff policy, to develop an industry upon which much of our prosperity depends.

We have had the tariff of 1832, in which wool valued at less than eight cents per pound was imported free of duty, and all wools of higher value were protected by a duty of forty per cent. and four cents per pound. At the same time, woollen manufactures, kerseys, &c., the value whereof shall not exceed thirty-five cents the square yard, cheap woollen goods, in short, required on the plantations of the south, for the manufacture of which our wools and labor were particularly adapted, were admitted at a duty of five per cent.; high cost woollen goods, at a duty of fifty per cent. It is not difficult to understand this policy now. We understand now what it meant; and we should have understood what it meant then.

The tariff of 1842, imposing a duty of five per cent. on all wool costing less than seven cents per pound, and thirty per cent. and three cents per pound on all wools costing over that sum, had hardly begun to manifest its beneficent influences, when a return to the old policy of sacrificing every interest to what were called the great producing sections of the country, when the destructive tariff of 1846 levelled wool and woollen goods alike, and reduced sheep and mills to a mere nominal value.

The tariff of 1857, which found our clip of wool, under the influence of those tariffs already mentioned, reduced from 52,500,000 pounds per year to less than 40,000,000 pounds, served to stimulate manufactures somewhat, and also found us very much at the mercy of foreign producers for our supply of raw material. From this tariff the American wool-grower could derive but little benefit, the foreign producer having almost the control of the market.

The tariff of 1861, with the addenda of 1862, 1863, 1864, and 1865, has somewhat established for the first time the true relations which should exist here between the producer and consumer, between the wool-grower and the wool manufacturer. Whatever may have been the cause of this manifest change in the policy of the government, the two great branches of industry represented in this convention should consider it as the commencement of a firm and even prosperity for both.

This, I am confident, must and should be the policy of our country for the future. A recognition of the true relations which exist between the manufacturer of the east and the wool-grower of the west and south can alone give firmness and prosperity to each. It needs no elaborate argument to prove that the domestic market for American wool should be the best market. The same prosperity which has attended the growth of manufactures in other countries must attend their growth here. The great system of free trade which exists between the States demands for the foundation of our domestic commerce an equal development of each section, and energy, activity, and success in each special branch of business. New York and Boston, the two great centers of manufactures, the two great wool markets of the country, offer facilities for trade which can be found by us in no foreign port. Lowell and Lawrence, and all the manufacturing villages of the north, afford the American wool-grower his most convenient market. And it is upon the growth and vigor of this section that the wool-producing sections of the United States must depend for their largest and most reliable, sure, and constant profits.

On the other hand, where can our mills look for the raw material, out of which to manufacture certain classes of goods, with more propriety and to better advantage than to our home production, so far as it goes? The styles of wool produced within the limits of the United States are adapted to those fabrics which we have succeeded thus far in manufacturing to the largest profit. And there is no reason why the American manufacturer should not patronize that territory included within the boundaries of his own government, by providing himself with the raw material from thence, and by availing himself, in return, of that market for his manufactured goods, which is good in proportion to the sale it meets with for its agricultural products.

When our great agricultural districts raise wool not for the domestic market, and our mills produce cloth not for home consumption, a blow will be struck at that great opportunity for even prosperity to all which is offered us by our free government, with its equalizing laws of trade between States and sections. One great source of our national strength consists in the diversity of our resources and the extent of our territory. Never before has a people been found able to live within themselves alike prosperous through the enjoyments of peace and the trials of war. And this power and strength we shall retain if we will but recognize the obligation which rests upon us to develop our various resources by mutual aid and dependence.

That the present system of protection is beneficial to the wool-grower and manufacturer, or has thus far been, is evident from the statistics of trade at the present time as compared with the past. In 1860 we produced 60,264,913 lbs. of wool. In 1864 we produced 80,000,000 lbs. And so far was this latter clip from supplying the manufacturers, that we imported 72,734,503 lbs.; nearly 70,000,000 lbs. of this were imported into Boston and New York alone, and a large portion for the manufacture of such goods as are suited to our common wants, the English and other long combing wools constituting the smallest portion of the importation.

This increase has taken place, I am aware, during a period of war, in which there was an unprecedented demand for woollen goods, especially for those adapted to army use. But when we remember the vast amount of new industry which is brought into existence, the great territory which has been opened, the increasing markets which have been developed by the advent of peace, we may be assured that our manufactures have a future before them as encouraging as any period of the past. That they may derive the full benefit of the present state of affairs, the wool interest is entitled to the most encouraging and careful legislation. Such duties on manufactured goods as will remove all competition from foreign manufacturers; such duties on foreign wools as will encourage wool-growing here—these we require from the fostering hand of our government. While I look forward to a supply of cotton from this country, which will not only furnish our own mills with raw material, but will also control the markets of Europe, and thus give America the command of the cotton trade, by the natural laws of production, I look to some protective measures to give our wool trade an equally powerful position in the commerce of the world. We can export cotton, for we are without a rival in its growth. We ought not to import wool; we cannot export it in competition with the cheap lands, cheap labor, and cheap living of our greatest foreign competitors. Our wool business is a home business, both as concerns its

growth and manufacture. And we must make the home trade a prosperous one.

I am aware that there are those who will point to the policy of England, in her persistent and successful attempt to develop her wool industry, and remind me that she has protected her manufactures alone, and left her wool-growers to use the market thus created for them. I have not forgotten she has forbidden the exportation of wool, and has thus thrown the wool-grower entirely into the hands of the manufacturer. The export of sheep, even, was prohibited. Her own cloths were prescribed as the material adapted to the costume of many public occasions. She encouraged her manufactures in every possible way—thus leading on and developing wool-growing, until her product reached nearly two hundred and fifty million pounds. When we remember the small extent of territory in which this large amount of wool is raised, we must admire the policy which has produced this wonderful result.

But England is not America. Her agricultural population, especially the laboring portion of it, constitutes by no means an influential part of the community. They expect a small reward for their toil, and they get it. They are not the largest consumers of the goods manufactured out of the raw material which they themselves produce. England possesses within herself but little diversity of climate, no great extent of territory, no domestic commerce sufficient to support any large class of people or to vitalize a great controlling interest. She draws her life from abroad; she returns to foreign markets the fruits of her labors, and she finds in them her chief means of subsistence. To establish in an empire like this a great patronizing and ruling class, the lords of the mill, the directors of one great branch of agriculture, the patrons upon whose decrees the success of a large class of dependents hangs, is a work comparatively easy in England. Not so here. The prosperity of the wool-grower should be built upon as firm a foundation as that of the manufacturer; and both should be as sure of a liberal reward for their labor, and a constant one too, as the chances and changes of business will allow.

In considering the claims of wool for protection in this country, and at this time, we should not forget the effect which our financial condition has upon it, and upon manufactured goods. Our domestic industry is largely stimulated by an inflated and redundant currency. The prices of all commodities, whose value is controlled wholly by a home market, are unusually high. The price of gold as a recognized standard, the high price of labor, the prevailing spirit of speculation, all combine to give a market value to our domestic manufactures, almost unprecedented. A high protective tariff, which secures to these manufacturers the full benefit of the home market, also enables the manufacturer to establish his own prices, free from the influence of exchange or the fluctuations of gold.

None of these advantages does wool enjoy. The price of our domestic wools is established by the foreign market. Like all other articles of export and import, it has followed the price of gold, and has never reached a point corresponding to the rise of manufactured goods, or to the greatest inflations of the war. With Donskoi wool at twelve cents per pound, and Buenos Ayres at nine, and Cape, washed, at seventeen and a half in the English market, the American farmer stands a poor chance, even after reckoning the rates of ex-

change, and the small duty of three and six cents per pound which is laid upon such foreign wools. The American wool-grower, therefore, finds himself in the hands of the Philistines, not even raised to the dignity of fair competition with his own people, in the management of his portion of the wealth of the nation. It is a striking fact, that while, under the tariff of 1842, wool averaged forty-six cents per pound, under the tariff of 1861 it reached in 1863 only an average of seventy-four three-quarters, with all the pressure of gold, an active market for manufactured goods, and not a superfluous clip. The duties fixed on wool in 1864 were needed to give the wool-grower a proper remuneration at that time.

In addition to these difficulties, the wool-grower and the manufacturer are both laboring under that burden which always attends a disturbance of the currency. In a business like the wool business of this country, which in neither branch finds any outlet through the demands of a foreign market, or through our own power to export at a profit, it is exceedingly important to check importations, and to keep the market healthy and level. At present, however, the rates maintained by gold and currency offer every inducement to the importer, and neutralize that very tariff of fifty per cent. which was laid upon imported woollen goods as a protection to the American manufacturer. At the same time that gold, as an article of merchandise, holds a position just fifty per cent. in advance of the gold standard, almost all other merchandise finds another level, and is, in most instances, one hundred or two hundred per cent. in advance of the same standard. All our manufactured goods, so far as my experience goes as a small consumer, and so far as I remember, are in this condition—inflated by the currency, labor, the tariff, and speculation, to these high rates.

Mark the temptation which this state of affairs presents to the importer. He brings his goods into our inflated markets; sells them at the advances fixed here by our currency, one hundred or two hundred per cent. higher than before the war; converts his currency received for his goods into gold, another article of merchandise, at fifty per cent. advance only—making a profit of fifty per cent., or one hundred and fifty per cent. He counts up his profits, examines his invoices, adds his expenses and the duties, and, with his gold in his pocket, returns to his work. And well he may return; for he finds that he has, by converting American currency into gold, wiped out the tariff of fifty per cent. on manufactured woollen goods, and perhaps secured a profit of one hundred per cent. on top of this.

While this state of things exists, the export of all articles raised in this country, (with the exception of cotton and tobacco, which are in an abnormal condition on account of the war,) such as corn, flour, wheat, provisions, is entirely prevented; for while these articles must be raised at currency prices, one hundred or one hundred and fifty per cent. advance, they must be sold for gold abroad, convertible into currency at only fifty per cent. advance. All this class of articles, productions of our agricultural industry, costing us one hundred and fifty per cent. advance when sold for gold and reconverted into currency, brings us but fifty per cent. advance. Hence it is that flour, corn, wheat, and wool are relatively so low in the market. We produce gold as well as wheat and wool, and in the long run the same law of trade applies to all productions.

I can conceive of a state of affairs in this country in which "duties on wool should be entirely abolished," with the certainty that our manufactures would thereby be so increased that a great demand would be created for American wools for the specific purposes to which they are adapted. But that state of affairs does not now exist. Before a paying demand for American wools can be created on such a basis as this, our currency must be restored to a sound basis, and the markets of the world must be opened to our manufactured goods. Until that time arrives, let us hope that all will join in demanding a tariff of equal protection to the wool-grower and the manufacturer.

But it is not from the fluctuations of trade, and the irregular effects of tariffs alone, that the wool-grower has suffered. A sharp and somewhat bitter controversy has been carried on as to the breed of sheep best adapted to his wants, and the wool which he has produced has met with violent opposition. So far as breeds are concerned, the experience of a large portion of our farmers has taught them that, in almost every section of the Union, both for mutton and wool, the merino is the most valuable animal of this class, especially in the improved form to which he has been brought by the American breeder.

There is no doubt that a pound of the wool grown upon this animal is more cheaply produced than any other wool that can be grown here. Of its quality, I have only to quote the testimony of John L. Hayes, esq., the efficient and accomplished secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers. In his elaborate and learned address to that society, in September last, he says: "American merino wool is fitted for fancy cassimeres, in which we excel; for fine shawls, in which we have attained great perfection; for mousselines de laine, which we have of great excellence, and which we owe to our American fleeces. The true value of the fleece of the American merino is for combing purposes, for which it has remarkable analogy with that of France. This country will never know the inestimable treasure which it has in its fleeces until American manufacturers appropriate them to fabricate the soft tissues of merinoes, thibets, and cashmeres, to which France owes the splendor of the industries of combing-wool at Paris, Rheims, and Roubaix."

The process by which this wool has been developed is one of those remarkable and sagacious efforts which man has often made to secure the largest benefit from the domestic animal, accordant with the soil and climate to whose influences he is subjected. The production of the improved short-horn, the New Leicester, Cotswold, and South-Down sheep, in England, and of the improved American merino on this continent, is a work of human skill worthy of being classed with those great inventions by which mechanical forces have been brought to perfect submission and usefulness. The Spanish merino, on his arrival here, was an inferior animal, as regards size, shape of carcase, style of wool, and weight of fleece, when compared with that animal now known in this country and in Europe as the improved American merino, a name as appropriate to him, notwithstanding his ancestry, as our national cognomen is to us who trace our descent from almost every "kindred, nation, and tongue under heaven." While the mutton sheep of England are unsuited to our climate and soil, and are neither adapted to the extensive grazing

lands where flocks are fed, which are counted by the thousand, nor to the small farm which cannot furnish any luxuriance of food, the merino, as at present developed, seems to answer the want of all American farmers, large and small. In the size and shape of his carcase, it would be difficult to find his superior. Of that medium size which is best adapted to most of our pastures, and to our winter feeding, his form presents all those points of conformation which indicate a hardy, robust constitution, and great thrift. I have seen prize merino rams and ewes exhibited in New York and the New England States, whose swelling outline on each side, from the ear to the tail, could not be surpassed in beauty by the finest ship that floats. In liveliness and elegance of expression, in strength of neck, in depth through the heart, in spring and swell of the rib, in straightness of back and width of hip, and depth of loin, and structure of limb, they are excelled by no existing breed of sheep. They are acknowledged by the most prudent and successful feeders to be the most profitable sheep for the stall, and they produce a quality of mutton which has been mistaken by the best judges for the far-famed South-Down. What a picture this, gentlemen, of that "little dirty runt of an animal neither fit to raise wool nor fit to eat!" as we have been told over and over again.

I have already alluded to the style of wool which these animals produce. From the fine, short clothing-wool produced by the original Spanish merinoes, with their light fleeces, there has been developed a long-staple combing-wool, measuring from two and a half to three and a half inches in length, devoid of the lustre of some English combing-wools, it is true, but strong, firm, lively to the very ends, and wasting in the card probably less than any wool known. This is the wool adapted to the fabrics enumerated by Mr. Hayes in the passage which I have quoted. It is readily grown from the hills of Vermont to the plains of Texas. It is kept up to the standard of the best quality with comparative ease. The weight of actual wool in each fleece of a flock is easily increased by judicious breeding, and without that excessive feeding which is required for an increase of long wools; and, when properly grown, it surpasses all other wools in the amount produced by each square inch of the animal upon which it is raised. It is profitable wool for the farmer to raise, and profitable for the manufacturer to work, if he will only establish a standard of quality, and purchase in relative proportion, as concerns prices.

We hear this wool abused on account of its weight. The wool which I have described is the highest quality of merino combing-wool, grown in heavy fleeces, in which yolk and oil are properly distributed, and which are protected on the ends by a sufficient supply of gum to keep it from being injured by the weather. These fleeces weigh from twelve to fifteen pounds from the ewes, and from twenty onward from the rams. Such fleeces are not raised without care, but they are indicative of the capacity of the American merino as a wool-growing animal, and they are, when cleansed, the best wool of their kind to be found in the market.

There are heavy wools, so called, which shrink excessively, and which, when cleansed, furnish but little really good working material. But the wools to which I refer shrink to something upon which the manufacturer can depend.

The true value of this wool is becoming more and more acknowledged. Disappointed breeders, and too many buyers, still continue to decry it, and the disparaging phrases, "grease and tar and dirt," are the common weapons now employed by those who flippantly abuse the millions of merinoes which are owned in the United States, and the system of breeding by which the profits of these flocks have been increased threefold.

Let not the wool-grower nor the manufacturer be alarmed by this talk. The American farmer, with his heavy taxation, his proper personal necessities, his care for the education of his family, and the maintenance of good institutions, to which you have already alluded, sir, and with the prices of labor and feeding generally, cannot afford to raise light fleeces; I mean, by this, fleeces cleansing to two and a half and three pounds of wool. This may be done by nomads, by serfs, or by those who live on the confines of civilization, and in latitudes where sheep require but little shelter, but it cannot be profitably done in most sections of the United States. It is heavy fleeces, then, which our wool-growers want, and which will most benefit our manufacturers. To produce these fleeces the wool-grower must also produce a certain proportion of oil, and, up to a given point, the increase of wool may be measured by the increase of oil. It is not just, therefore, to charge upon the wool-growing community that they are dealing in "tar and dirt," while they can demonstrate that their growth of clean wool is increased by a proper attention to grease and yolk, and that the quality of the wool may be improved by this attention.

The skilful breeder knows this. If he has a flock of light-sheering sheep, he may not select a dry ram with any hope of increasing the clip of his future flock. It is only by using a greasy ram that he can accomplish his object, and this is owing, not to the grease alone, but to the fact, that with a proper secretion of oil and yolk usually go those other points which make a ram valuable, such as firmness and thickness of fleece, uniformity of style over the whole body, complete covering of the whole surface, and that most attractive feature of a good sheep, a well-wooled head, and a clean, strong, expressive face. A dry-fleeced ram may possess these points, but is it seldom; and, if he does possess them, he can seldom transmit them.

The wool-grower must not be discouraged, then, in his production of heavy fleeces, for in this way, and in this only, can he increase his production of clean wool, and multiply the profits of his husbandry. This is known now throughout the United States.

I consider, therefore, that—

1. The American improved merino is capable of producing more clean wool on a given surface of body, and with a given amount of food, than any other breed of sheep.

2. That American merino wool is peculiarly adapted to those fabrics which constitute the most profitable American manufactures.

3. That, to bring this wool to its highest degree of perfection, that system of breeding which has been adopted in developing the best of these sheep should be pursued by wool-growers generally.

4. That shrinkage is no loss to the wool-grower, inasmuch as with light fleeces he is engaged in raising the most expensive wool.

One word, now, with regard to the purchase and sale of American wool. Manufacturers must be aware that this business has been pursued without proper discrimination. The rule, that washed wool is

washed wool, and unwashed wool is unwashed wool, has been followed with too little judgment. To shrink unwashed wool one-third in purchasing is considered a wise and proper precaution by purchasers generally, knowing, as they must, that it is often the washed wool upon which there is the greatest loss in manufacturing, and that unwashed wools do not shrink alike. The injustice arising from this custom is a mere incentive to fraud on the part of the wool-grower, who resorts to every expedient by which he can sell the heaviest-washed fleeces.

May we not, then, abandon the system of sheep-washing altogether? It is injurious to the sheep, fails to secure clean wool to the manufacturer, and complicates the business of buying and selling. An intelligent purchaser can judge, or ought to be able to judge, of the quality of the wool he is buying. If wool is presented to him uniformly as it was shorn without washing, he can exercise his judgment, and make his comparisons fairly. I believe that in this way the market for American wools can be equalized, and the comparative merits of Vermont, New York, Ohio, and Texas wools would be thoroughly ascertained and fixed. I trust this convention will take some combined and definite action on this point.

In the views which I have presented with regard to the relations which exist between the wool-grower and the manufacturer—between the producing and manufacturing sections of our country—I have endeavored to ascertain what is for our highest mutual interest. The wool business, in all its branches, should be a domestic trade. The market for woollen goods in this country is ample—so ample that the foreign manufacturer finds many temptations here presented to him at the hands of the importer. Our interest should confine us at home, especially in a branch of trade in which we produce nothing to export, but are constantly compelled to supply ourselves by importation. Is it too much to expect that our great wool-growing districts will one day furnish us with an abundant supply of the raw material, and that our mills will fill our market with manufactured goods? I think not.

But not by controversy, and contention, and rivalry can this be done. We cannot bite and devour one another, and bring success to this great national industry, which is represented in all its branches in this convention. Can it be expected that the west, smarting under the impoverishment which follows a hard wool market for her, a market glutted with foreign wool, will be ready to protect the manufactures of the east from the competition of the importer? Can the east, whose mills are silenced by low tariffs, and the financial troubles to which I have alluded, bend her energies with good will to the protection of American wools? Oh, no! whatever may be the necessities of other branches of business, ours requires entire harmony of feeling and reciprocal effort between those two great sections where are found the producer and consumer.

And more than all, may we not create through our business that bond of union which has once been broken by rivalry and bitterness of feeling, engendered by striving interests? That pestilent theory, that one section of our country was flourishing at the expense of the other—what folly of nullification did it inflame? In what horrors of civil war did it end? I trust we shall not forget this. For we may, if we will, establish a policy of mutual benefit, whose prosperity shall be even and permanent, and which shall make manifest the social and civil elevation which may grow out of a just and fair distribu-

tion of the protection of government, and of the commercial energy of a people whose domestic trade is free and untrammelled.

The question was then put on the motion for the appointment of a business committee, and carried.

The Chair announced the committee as follows: Rowland G. Hazard, of Rhode Island; Henry Clark, of Vermont; N. Kingsbury, of Connecticut; Samuel P. Boardman, of Illinois; J. M. McConnell, of Illinois; Theodore Pomeroy, of Massachusetts.

On motion of Mr. E. B. Pottle, of New York, a committee on resolutions was appointed by the chair, consisting of one member from the New England Society, one from each State Wool-growers' Association, and an equal number from the Manufacturers' Association, as follows: E. B. Pottle, of New York; E. B. Bigelow, of Massachusetts; Edwin Hammond, of Vermont; T. S. Faxton, of New York; George Kellogg, of Connecticut; George B. Loring, of Massachusetts; A. Pope, of Ohio; R. M. Montgomery, of Ohio; J. Eddy, of Massachusetts; E. Stetson, of Wisconsin; David Oakes, of New Jersey; A. M. Garland, of Illinois.

The convention then adjourned to two o'clock p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The convention met pursuant to adjournment, the president in the chair. Mr. R. G. Hazard, of Rhode Island, from the committee on business, reported the following subjects for discussion:

First. The tariff and internal revenue.

Second. The reciprocal and mutual interests of wool-growers and wool manufacturers.

Third. The marketable condition of wool best suited to promote the mutual interests of wool-producers and manufacturers, including the one-third shrinkage rule.

Fourth. The wool best adapted to the various manufactures, especially that of worsted.

On motion of Mr. W. F. Greer, of Ohio, the report of the committee was accepted.

Mr. J. W. COLBURN, of Vermont. I would inquire if there is a copy of the present tariff bill here. If so, I would like to have that part of the bill which relates to wool and woollens read, so that we may understand what the tariff now is.

Mr. GEORGE GEDDES, of New York. It seems to me that the first subject proposed by the committee is rather one to be referred to a committee to report upon. It would take, I have no doubt, all the time this convention would be willing to devote to this whole business to discuss that matter. A committee might make a report upon it, but I cannot believe it is a very good topic for discussion here. I would suggest, therefore, that the president read the second proposition of the business committee.

The PRESIDENT. I would remark, that when the committee on resolutions report, they will probably present something tangible on the subject. These topics were laid before the meeting for general discussion, without particular action, merely to call out the views of the members present. It was supposed that perhaps it could be done a little better after the resolutions were brought in by the committee; but still there is nothing to prevent any remarks that any member sees fit to make.

The second subject for discussion was then taken up, to wit, the reciprocal and mutual interests of wool-growers and wool manufacturers.

Mr. H. CUTTS, of Vermont. I would like, sir, to make a few remarks, and perhaps I may as well make them upon that question as upon any other. I have not come here prepared with any written speech, nor have I been requested by any person to prepare myself; but still I hope, unprepared as I am, that I shall be able so to tame and temper my remarks, that they shall not tend to disturb that harmony which I am very much pleased to see so far exists between the two interests, the wool-producers and the wool manufacturers. I think that such harmony is very important. Their interests seem to me to be mutual, and, in some respects, dependent on each other. It is certain that it is necessary to the wool-grower that he should have a sure and permanent market for his product in his own country; and, in order to do that, it is necessary that the manufacturer should have success in his business, and be able to carry it on successfully and profitably. It is also for the interest of the manufacturer to be able to depend upon his own country for the raw material which he manufactures; that he shall not be at the mercy of foreigners in regard to his supply, but shall be sure to have it produced in his own country, if it can be. Anything that should tend to make it unprofitable or unsafe for the wool-grower to raise wool would be ultimately against the interest of the wool manufacturer; for that would tend to make wool scarce in this country, and consequently raise the price, and he would be obliged to pay the foreigner whatever he might ask for it. Now, I apprehend that the present state of things tends a little that way. I would like to have a free discussion of that subject, and everything relating to it.

It seems to me that the price of fine wool, as compared with the price of cloths manufactured from fine wool, is at present extremely low, and hardly remunerative to the producer. When we take into consideration the very high price of labor, and the increased tax which the wool-grower has to pay, it is certainly doubtful whether, with the present encouragement he has in its sale, he can go on and produce it in the quantity he has done. I think he cannot.

Now, sir, let us inquire to what this is owing. What is the cause of the present low price of wool? I do not pretend to be able to tell all the causes which have produced this effect, but I think I can point to some of them. One is the defective operation of the tariff. That, I believe, as has been suggested here, can be improved by avoiding certain frauds that are now perpetrated at the custom-house; and an excellent suggestion has been made, that we should have a committee to go to the custom-houses, and see how that tariff is carried out; and see whether the views of the government are carried out or its laws evaded. It is my opinion that those laws are evaded. All *ad valorem* duties are extremely liable to be evaded. I am aware, and it is doubtless well known to all gentlemen here, that the British government, who have been remarkable for protecting their own industry, never succeeded in doing so until they took particular pains to have their views carried out at the custom-house, to prevent frauds there. To prevent these frauds, it is of great importance that we have specific duties rather than *ad valorem* duties. These *ad valorem* duties are easily evaded, because the foreign ship-

pers can make such a valuation as they choose; and it is well known that they have two invoices, one giving the real cost, and the other made up (and sworn to, too) to be presented at the custom-house, for it is well known to the foreigner that a custom-house oath is to be bought very cheap. Therefore these duties amount to nothing; and, though we have specific duties, they are so low, that they amount to nothing. What is a duty of three cents a pound on wool, when we consider the price of labor here as compared with that abroad? It is a mere nothing. It is necessary, then, I think, that we should have a more efficient protection on wool than we now have—higher duties, and those duties thoroughly and efficiently enforced.

Then the unsettled state of the currency of the country is another reason why wool is depressed. There is a feeling that the attempt may be made to resume specie payments; and this makes the manufacturer, as he should be, cautious in buying large quantities of the raw material. In consequence of that, I understand that it is now the fact, that instead of supplying himself with a year's stock, or six months', or even three months' stock, he buys from day to day, or from week to week. That leaves large amounts in the hands of the wool dealer, and, of course, has the effect to depress the price.

Well, sir, there is another thing that operates against the producer; for I think this should be a free discussion, and we should not hesitate to say everything we think is true in regard to the matter. I think there is another thing which has tended, and does now tend, to keep down the price of wool, and Vermont wool especially, and that is the impression that Vermont wool shrinks more than any other wool. Now, I intend to put the blame of this where it belongs, if I can, and nowhere else. I believe the manufacturers are a great deal to blame in this matter. I believe they have not made sufficient discrimination in their purchases of wool, and that they must take the blame for encouraging the production of wool that shrinks very much, because they have paid as much, or nearly as much, for that as they would for wool that shrunk but very little.

At this point Mr. Cutts gave way for the report of the committee on resolutions.

Mr. E. B. POTTLE, of New York, chairman of the committee, said:

It gives me great pleasure to say, that the series of resolutions which we shall report to this body have been agreed upon unanimously. Perfect harmony and unanimity have marked the proceedings of the committee from beginning to end. The committee report the following resolutions for the consideration of the convention:

Resolved, That, of the great industries with which the people of the United States can occupy themselves to advantage, the woollen interest is especially commended for combining and developing in the highest degree the agricultural and mechanical resources of the nation.

Resolved, That the mutuality of the interests of the wool producers and wool manufacturers of the United States is established by the closest of commercial bonds—that of demand and supply; it having been demonstrated that the American grower supplies more than seventy per cent. of all the wool consumed by American mills, and, with equal encouragement, would soon supply all which is properly adapted to production here; and further, it is confirmed by the experience of half a century, that the periods of prosperity and

depression in the two branches of woollen industry have been identical in time, and induced by the same general causes.

Resolved, That as the two branches of agricultural and manufacturing industry represented by the woollen interest involve largely the labor of the country, whose productiveness is the basis of national prosperity, sound policy requires such legislative action as shall place them on an equal footing, and give them equal encouragement and protection in competing with the accumulated capital and low wages of other countries.

Resolved, That the benefits of a truly national system, as applied to American industry, will be found in developing manufacturing and agricultural enterprise in *all* the States, thus furnishing markets at home for the products of both interests.

Resolved, That it shall be the duty of the respective executive committees of the National Manufacturers' and National Wool-growers' Associations to lay before the Revenue Commission and the appropriate committee in Congress these resolutions, together with such facts and statistics as shall be necessary to procure the legislation needed to put in practical operation the propositions therein set forth."

The report of the committee was accepted.

Mr. CURTIS then continued his remarks as follows:

When the committee came in, Mr. President, I was remarking upon the necessity of the wool manufacturers making more appropriate discrimination in their purchases of wool than they have hitherto done. It is well known that they have not been very discriminating, but have paid as much, or nearly as much, for wool that shrunk excessively as for that which shrunk very little. It seems to me that this must be against their interests. Many people for a long time stood out, and attempted to raise the best kinds of wool, and with the least shrinkage, but the manufacturers did not second their efforts, and many men undoubtedly have been driven into raising the very heaviest gross weight fleeces from this very action on the part of the woollen manufacturers; and but for that, perhaps, those sheep that now sell at such high prices in Vermont would not be considered the best. That is to say, but for that, sheep that would raise the most actual wool, at the least expense, might be considered the most valuable, and might sell at the highest price. Such is not the case, I imagine. But, whether it is or not, that matter will be tested by the practical test which is now coming into operation; and that is, the public shearings, in which the fleeces are weighed unwashed and unshrunk, and then the actual amount of wool is weighed, so that we shall know the quantity of wool raised from them.

Now, sir, I would suggest to the manufacturers, in all fairness, and respectfully, that perhaps they have been a little remiss in this particular, and that it will tend greatly to the promotion of harmony and good feeling between the producers and manufacturers, if henceforth they will make more discrimination, and pay for wool more nearly what it is actually worth. It is in the power of the manufacturer to encourage the wool producer in this way as much as by the imposition of a tariff on foreign wool.

This morning, Mr. President, we heard some remarks upon the good feeling that should exist, from their community of interest, between the manufacturer and the producer, and I must say that I coincide

with most of them, but there were some few things that I could not well subscribe to. I have been engaged in the raising of Spanish merino sheep some thirty years, and from that experience I suppose I would have a right to give an opinion; but, sir, it would be far from me to undertake to set up any particular method of breeding, and say that no one must attempt any other. It would be my mind that every breeder should consult his own judgment and his own free will. In regard to breeding from Spanish merinoes, I have my own opinions, and with due deference to all others, I would express them. But I do not undertake to put down any other man's opinion. I do not come here at the request of any man, or any set of men, to be champion of any particular kind of breed; and I would not undertake to cast any aspersions upon those who think differently from me. I was rather sorry at the tone with which my friend (Dr. Loring) spoke of this matter this morning. He spoke of what he called "the improved American merino." I understand, from the tone of his remarks, that he means by "American merinoes" those sheep that produce what I will call the heaviest fleeces. Now, the question is, what is the heaviest fleece? Because, when you talk of a fleece, you should mean a fleece of wool. If you do mean wool, then that is the heaviest fleece that has the most wool in it; but if you mean that that is the heaviest fleece that contains the most weight, no matter what it consists of, that is another thing. The gentleman, as I understood him, described that class of sheep whose fleeces weigh the most in gross weight, and, of course, shrink the most, and have the smallest amount of actual wool in them, in proportion to their gross weight. Now, sir, I am not prepared to say that no one shall attempt to make an improvement on these sheep. I am willing to accord to the gentlemen who have raised this kind of sheep all the merit they deserve, and they certainly deserve a great deal. If their object was to raise sheep that would sell for more money than any others—and that was their object, I suppose—they have succeeded. If it was their object to raise sheep that would yield the most wool in proportion to the cost, I am not sure that some one else may not be as successful in another mode. I think every one is at perfect liberty to make the attempt. If any man should think fit to undertake to improve still further upon these American merinoes, by raising the weight of actual wool produced by them, he has a right to do so, without being subjected to any aspersions, and without being told that he ought not to raise light fleeces, and that he is a lighter man than those who raise heavy fleeces. I don't think it is becoming to make such remarks. I believe the heaviest fleeces from these American merinoes are, in gross weight, from rams, twenty-five to thirty pounds; from ewes, ten to fifteen pounds. Well, out of those rams' fleeces that weigh from twenty-five to thirty pounds, the most cleansed wool that has been got has been some seven or eight pounds. Now, suppose some one else should take it into his head—wisely or unwisely, I don't care—to raise sheep that, instead of yielding fleeces weighing twenty-five or thirty pounds, won't go up above fifteen or twenty pounds, and yet, when cleansed, will yield a little more actual wool than the other; which would be the best sheep?

Mr. D. B. POTTLE, of New York. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I call for the reading of the subject under discussion. There must be a limit to this kind of debate. We are not sitting here for the

purpose of deciding the merits of the different breeds of sheep raised in Vermont. We have come here for a specific purpose; and, however much I should be gratified in listening to the remarks of the gentleman from Vermont on another occasion—and I certainly should be very much gratified—I cannot think they are pertinent to the object of this convention. If there is anything in the questions submitted by the committee which justifies the debate, I have no objection to its going on; but, if not, I raise the point of order.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman had commenced speaking on the report of the Business Committee, before the other committee entered the room. I confess I am not particularly acquainted with parliamentary rules, and I am not prepared instantaneously to decide whether their bringing in that report cuts him off or not from finishing the remarks which he commenced to make on the report of the Business Committee, when he was undoubtedly in order. I would prefer, myself, to waive the question, and allow the gentleman to proceed; leaving it to his magnanimity and sense of propriety how far he shall carry the debate outside of the resolutions. Please to proceed, sir.

Mr. CUTTS. It is far from me, sir, to attempt to carry the debate outside of the limits of legitimate discussion. I have had no idea of doing so, and it does not seem to me that I have; and I certainly shall try to avoid it.

I was remarking, I think, that we should, in my opinion, have liberty as breeders to breed very much as we think judicious; and I would say, in addition to that, that it seems to me that if such a breed of sheep as that to which I have alluded should be raised, it would have a good effect, not only on the interests of the wool-grower, but on the manufacturer, inasmuch as he would not have to purchase so much that is of no advantage to him.

There is another remark that I was going to make, which I hope no gentleman will think is without the legitimate pale of discussion; and that is, that it is my opinion, as a breeder of some thirty years' experience, that no species of merino ram ever produced more than twenty pounds gross weight of fleece, without excessive feeding or excessive housing; and ewes not over ten or twelve pounds, without unnecessary feeding or unnecessary housing. That being the case, sir—and I express it as my opinion; I don't wish any other man to be converted to it; I say so because I think so—it seems to me more advisable to raise such sheep as can be raised without any unnecessary treatment of that sort. They would yield more wool, and be of more benefit to the manufacturer, and more benefit to the wool-grower, if wool-growing is the legitimate business of the wool-grower; and I take it to be so, and nothing else.

I think, therefore, there may be something still better than the American merino; and while I would give unbounded credit to the man who has made any improvement upon the Spanish merino sheep, as it came to this country, I am not sure that a man might not to-day, if he could find what he was sure was a full-blooded merino, put the improvements upon that sheep himself at much less expense than it would cost to procure one that has been already improved.

I make these remarks from my impressions after thirty years' experience. The gentleman who spoke this morning has not had so much; and yet his superior subtlety and ability to penetrate into the

causes of things may enable him to have more information upon the subject than I have, and yet I think I have a right to this opinion. If, sir, I have gone, in these remarks, one step beyond the line of legitimate debate, I hope I shall not be treated as our poor prisoners were when they crossed the "dead line."

Dr. GEORGE B. LORING, of Massachusetts. I do not wish to take up the time of the convention, except in a proper and legitimate way. I can conceive that the remarks of the gentleman from Vermont, as applied to the question as to the relation which exists between the wool-grower and the wool manufacturer, were appropriate on his side of that question; and when it comes again before the convention—as I understand it is now upon the table, pending action upon the resolutions—I should like to have an opportunity to reply.

The PRESIDENT. The question is now upon the resolutions. We will dispose of them first.

Mr. COLBURN, of Vermont. I move their adoption.

Mr. GEORGE GEDDES, of New York. Mr. President: It is said in these resolutions that we furnish seventy per cent. of the wool manufactured in this country. Now, the fact that we do not furnish all that is manufactured proves that there is some lack of inducement to do it; because, if there had been sufficient inducement we should have furnished all along all the manufacturer desired. Now, sir, let me call the attention of this body to the present state of things. Before the war which has lately closed wool was higher in gold than it is now. I speak from my own personal knowledge. I, and my son after me, sold our wools steadily, for eight years in succession previous to the war, for never less than fifty cents a pound; and at no time since the repression of specie payments have we been able to get fifty cents in gold, although I am quite sure our wool has improved very much in quality and condition. Now, sir, the manufacturer of cheese has been able to get a great deal more gold for his product; the raiser of grain in general has been able to get more. The consequence is inevitable, that there is less encouragement for the production of wool than for the production of other farm produce. Farmers are a long-enduring people. It is a fact that women made butter for a shilling a pound for generations, and thought it was a pretty fair price; but there sits a man at the head of that table [X. A. Willard, esq.,] who has proved that the milk to make a pound of butter must have cost all these women got for the butter. I mention this to show how cheap farmers are willing to work. And now, if it was true that we could not make more money, or could not live better by the production of other things than by growing wool, we should grow more wool. The price of meat is inordinately high. Ordinary beef is selling in this market for \$11 a hundred by the side. That is more in gold, a great deal, than we got for beef before the war. Now, sir, we shall surely cut our sheep's throats unless we can get more money for the wool. I say this to these manufacturers. I feel that somebody should say it. I have on my farm—or, rather, my son has—a flock of sheep that are pets of mine. All my active life has been devoted to their improvement. I have held on tenaciously to those sheep. But, sir, it is demonstrable that if my son had, last fall, cut the throats of every one of them and flung them into the manure heap, his hay and straw and corn-stalks would have brought more money in the market than their wool and carcasses would bring to-day.

Now, sir, what is the remedy of the farmer when he finds himself in this condition? It is to give his sheep a bushel of corn apiece, and in sixty days they are fit for the butcher's knife. That is his remedy. It would be most disastrous to the great economical interests of this country if this should be done, for you cannot afford to strike out of existence these fine flocks. I lay it down as a principle, Mr. Chairman, that fine sheep are to be produced in all the country east of the Mississippi river in connexion with the raising of grain. They fit in exceedingly well with a crop of grain. They consume the straw, the corn-stalks; and the refuse fodder that come from the grain crop. They work in exceedingly well with it; but if they work in at a loss, as present prices show, then they won't work in a great while.

Now, I don't say that the manufacturers are to blame that this thing is so. I don't believe they are to blame. I recognize the common interest in this matter perfectly. As a producer of wool, I recognize that I am a partner with my friend Faxton, at Utica, who makes it up. But my part of the labor and his part of the labor are distinct; and it is the common nature of man when he comes to me to trade that he shall buy my wool as cheap as he can, and I shall get as much as I can if I sell it to him; and if this government will permit him to go to Buenos Ayres and buy his wool at a lower rate than I can afford to sell it, he won't buy much of me, unless I sell it at a loss. Now, that is exactly where we stand to-day. We have got scattered through the State of New York some inestimable flocks of sheep. We shall take them to the shambles. No property is converted into money quicker than they are. Six weeks turn an ordinary conditioned merino sheep into good mutton. A pound of corn a day will do it. I don't say I shall advise this to be done in our own case. Why? Because, when a man has been almost forty years doing a thing—devoted his life to it, and travelled far and near to learn a little about it—it is hard for him to give up and say, "I have been at work all my life for naught." I would rather live on in hopes that some change will take place for the better. But how many men, who have flocks of forty, fifty, or a hundred sheep, will reason in this way: "I will hold on to these sheep; Congress will put a tariff on wool; we shall get a fair price for it; and all the wool will be raised in this country that is manufactured here, and a great deal more will be manufactured, for we ought to manufacture all the cloth that we wear out?" If we could not do better at any other business than we can at raising wool, we should do it now; but, I say, the fact looms up that we can do better, and that the great mass of wool-growers will do better.

Now, feeling, as I have no doubt you gentlemen of the manufacturing interest do, that you must have us raise wool—that it won't do for us to stop raising wool—here is an inducement for you to help us get a tariff on wool. And that is the whole point of my argument. If I have said anything, it has been to try to reach you, gentlemen, through your pockets, and make you understand that you really had better help us. There is no mistake about it.

Now, Mr. President, indulge me in saying that what I believe is fair in this matter is this, that we should have such protection on our wool as the manufacturer has on his part of the labor. To illustrate: if a yard of cloth laid down here is worth two dollars, and it took one dollar's worth of wool to make it, and one dollar's worth of

labor to make it—if the wool came from a foreign country—let that dollar's worth of wool that is in it pay just as much duty as the dollar's worth of labor that is in it is protected by the duty on foreign cloth. That is fair. And when I say I think it is fair, I say it with this meaning, that when our committee go before these gentlemen who are to propose amendments to the tariff law, you manufacturers shall not be sharp and try to get an act framed that shall give us the appearance of protection, but shall have holes through it big enough to drive a four-horse wagon-load of wool through. Let us meet on this common footing, that, if we work a dollar's worth, it ought to have the same protection that you have when you work a dollar's worth, remembering that this vast debt upon this country is to be paid. We are here the representatives of the producing interests. We are the producers. Where does wealth come from, sir? Why, sir, the labor of man and the fruits of the soil make the whole ability of a nation to pay its debt. We will meet our share of this debt—I speak for the farmer—with perfect willingness; but we ask that, in order that we may do it, we be put upon an equal whiffletree with all other interests. Having used that word, it occurs to me that right here is the simile. If I was a legislator of this country, and saw that there was not a sufficient quantity of wool produced to supply the manufacturer, I would say, That end ought to come up; and I would induce that end to come up. I would *even* that whiffletree. And when I found there was more wool produced than the manufacturers would manufacture, I would say, I will bring up that end. In legislating on this subject I would look precisely to this end—that this country should produce all the wool that it wanted.

I don't know but I have said too much and talked too long; but I have just given the views and feelings of a farmer.

Mr. GEORGE W. BOND, of Massachusetts. I rise to correct a statement of the gentleman last up. What he has said in regard to the price of wool, since the war, may be his own experience; but it does not apply to wool generally. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his report on the state of the finances for 1863, table 39, showed the range of prices in New York, for various articles, for thirty-nine years. From that, sir, the following extract was made, to show the comparative prices between the year 1860, before the war, and 1863, after the war. The average advance on gold was 45 per cent. for the year 1863. The average advance on wheat flour was $11\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the gold price; on corn 20 per cent.; on mess beef 34 per cent.; on butter $15\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.; on cheese $44\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.; on common wool 81 per cent.; and on merino wool 51 per cent.; thus showing that, with the single exception of common wool, merino wool paid at that time a higher advance than any of these prominent articles of farming products. It is not stated here; but the single article of oats—which, like common wool, was an article of army consumption—advanced 80 per cent. and a fraction. Oats and common wool bore about the same advance.

At that time an effort was made to put a duty upon wool; and I think I can explain satisfactorily to you, sir, and the people present, why no advanced price has been realized by farmers; for since that time, it is true, they have not received so high a price for their wool as they did previously. The movement for a high tariff on wool stimulated importations to an immense extent, as you will see by

the tables of imports; so that, in the year immediately following, we imported 75,000,000 pounds of wool, the importers being anxious to get it in here prior to the time when the new duty, which it was evident must be put upon it, should be imposed. Most of that wool arrived in season; a very considerable quantity of it, however, arrived after the first of July, and went into the bonded warehouses. The bare cost of importing cape wool, with the expenses then bearing upon it, was about twenty-three cents, gold. The average sale of cape wool, the first six months of 1864, with a duty of five per cent. upon it, was $24\frac{5}{10}$ cents. The average price for the six months after July, when the new tariff went into operation, (the bulk of the wool being held in bond for a long while, and gradually sold out,) was about $24\frac{3}{10}$, or a little less than it brought before the duty was increased, because the market had been fully stocked in anticipation of the duty. The consequence was that American wool had to bear it *pro rata* with the other. The large importations, caused by the anticipation of the duty, overstocked the market; and wool manufacturers and wool-growers must find themselves ever amenable to the laws of trade. It is simply to those laws that the fact is due that not one cent has been added to the price of wool in this country in consequence of the added duty, which is equivalent to ten cents per pound on domestic washed wool. Since that time domestic wool has not averaged more for gold than it did before; the best clips bringing only about seventy cents, which has been equivalent to about fifty cents in gold.

Mr. R. G. HAZARD. After the clear and able statement which has just been made by my friend, I do not propose to detain this convention more than a moment upon a similar point.

It so happened that I argued the case of the manufacturers before the Committee of Ways and Means, when the subject of a revision of the tariff was last considered by them. During that discussion the question arose one evening as to whether wool had not risen as much or more than other agricultural articles. The next morning I went to the statistics at the Treasury Department, and I will read a portion of the argument that I addressed to the committee immediately afterwards:

“With regard to the advance on wool, I find, from the official tables, that the average price of sheep-washed fleece wool for seventeen years (1843 to 1859 inclusive) was $35\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, and that in 1863 it was 71 cents per pound, or just 100 per cent. advance. That of five other agricultural products, taken at random, viz., wheat, corn, mess-beef, butter, and cheese, the average advance in 1863 over the average prices of the same seventeen years was only $20\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But there is another element of advance in domestic fleece wool not taken into account in the tables. At the middle period of the seventeen years the average loss in scouring good medium wool was 35 per cent., and in 1863 this loss had increased to 44 per cent. in the same class of wool, so that, during the average period from 1843 to 1859, the growers sold, on an average, 65 pounds of clean wool for \$35, and in 1863 sold an average of 56 pounds for \$71, making the cost of scoured wool in the former period 55 cents per pound, and in 1863 127 cents per pound; and hence the real advance in price, after eliminating the element of grease and dirt, was over 130 per cent. against $20\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. average on five other

great agricultural staples; and, since 1864, there has been a further advance in these wools of 10 per cent."

Mr. GEDDES. Now, Mr. Chairman, these figures make a very imposing array, and, I have no doubt, are entirely convincing to most of this body; but here stands with me the stubborn fact that, for months and months, we have offered in this market a ton of wool at fifty cents a pound in gold, and could not get it, when we used to get it for years before the war. That stubborn fact stands right out.

Mr. COLBURN, of Vermont. I have moved the adoption of these resolutions as a whole because I think they breathe the spirit of good will and harmony between the wool-grower and manufacturer. There is the word "equality" there, which I rely upon vastly. The manufacturer has said, in these resolutions, that he is perfectly willing the wool-grower should be protected equally with him, and that is all we ask. Now, sir, if the manufacturers are ready to carry that out, I am sure they will find the wool-growers ready to come in and act with them; but if they undertake to tell us that we now stand upon an equality with them, it will be up-hill business for them to make us believe it. In the town where I reside, which is eminently a wool-growing town, there is now more wool than was clipped there this year. We have to pay pretty dear there for our labor. Thirty dollars a month for the season, two dollars a day, if we hire by the day, two dollars and a half and three dollars during haying; and we cannot grow wool, as my friend Mr. Geddes says, at present prices, and live by it; it is totally impossible. However these other agricultural articles that have been referred to have paid in 1864, or some time ago, they are now paying vastly beyond wool. Butter, cheese, pork, beef—everything—is paying vastly beyond wool.

Well, sir, as I said before, we would like an equality of protection with the manufacturers of wool. Have we got it now? I don't know that I understand exactly what the provisions of the tariff are now, but I have learned one fact from a New York merchant since I came here that speaks volumes. He says that the duties on the quantity of Buenos Ayres wool which will make a yard of cloth are ten and a half cents, while the duties on a yard of foreign cloth, manufactured from precisely that kind of wool, are fifty-five and a half cents. There is a difference of forty-five cents betwixt the wool that goes into that cloth manufactured here and the foreign article. What kind of equality is that, sir? Well, sir, it is a kind of equality that the wool-growers can't stand, any way.

Now, I don't blame the manufacturers for all this. Human nature is human nature, the world over. If they can get a tariff playing into their hands in this way, without any effort on their part, it is natural they should take it. They will buy their wool where they can buy the cheapest; and we would do the same, were we manufacturers. They are not to blame for it; but the American wool-growers have been to blame, for they have never attended to their own interests when there was to be a revision of the tariff. And the reason is obvious. They are scattered all over God's creation, you might say: a great many of them are small growers, and they don't want to be taxed to send a delegation to Washington to attend to their interests; and so the thing has gone on as it has.

It is perfectly natural that the manufacturers—and they are the smartest men in the United States—should look to their own interests when there is to be a revision of the tariff; it is not natural that they should look to the interests of the wool-grower, or feel very tender as to the amount of benefit the wool-grower was to receive. They look to their own interests; and we have suffered because we have not attended to our own interests, and had nobody to do it for us.

Well, now we are here to try the experiment, for the first time, of bringing the wool-growers and manufacturers together, to see if they cannot make their interest mutual; and I really hope we shall succeed, after all. I have had some little doubt about it; but I feel stronger since these resolutions have come in, and have conceded equality.

It is a fact that we imported about a third part of the wool worked up last year. Now, why was that so? It was either because there was not wool enough grown in this country, or because the manufacturers could buy it cheaper of the foreigner. I believe that the last reason was the predominant one. They bought more wool of the foreigner because they could buy it cheaper than at home, than because it was not to be had here. Now, I believe it would be a grand thing if we could go on hand in hand, and get an amount of protection in this country, both for wool and woollens, that would become gradually, say in ten years, totally prohibitory. Let us clothe ourselves as well as feed ourselves. We can do it. If I were a member of Congress, I would exert what little influence I could get there to make a tariff that should become, in the end, entirely prohibitory upon wools of all kinds and woollen goods.

Some will say, "Then you are going to oppress the poor. You are going to make clothing so dear that the poor man cannot clothe his family at all." Well, that string has been harped upon in this country, for political purposes, a good many years. Oppress the poor man! When the government is ready to give him one hundred and ten acres of land if he can pay ten dollars, if he finds that he can't get sufficient wages to support his family, won't he take up that land, and become a farmer? It is all moonshine to talk about oppressing the poor in this country! There is no country on the face of God's earth where the people are so well off as in this country. We cannot oppress the poor by a high tariff, or anything of the kind.

I do not wish, sir, to say a great deal on this subject; but I do hope we shall go along in good faith—we, the wool-growers and wool manufacturers—and get this equal protection. I am from the State that Mr. Morrill represents, and I had a talk with him about the tariff of 1857. I told him that tariff did not afford sufficient protection to the wool-grower. "Well," said he, "blame yourselves for it. Why didn't you get your statistics, and come to Washington and show them to us? The manufacturers were there in their strength. They showed us these things, and they had their influence there; and you wool-growers ought to have been there." That is a fact. Mr. Morrill is an honest man; he means to do right, and means to treat all interests justly; but he was mistaken in getting up that tariff. He didn't understand the interests of the wool-grower. I think he is disposed to try to understand them; and, as he is now at the head of the Committee of Ways and Means, it is of the highest

importance that we make him understand them, so that, if we get a revision of this tariff, we may get something that will approximate, at least, to equality.

We have had a tariff where the wool-grower was equally protected with the manufacturer. I think the tariff of 1828 gave the wool-grower equal protection with the manufacturer. I think the tariff of 1846, miserable as it was for both interests, protected the wool-grower equally with the manufacturer. But, generally speaking, all these tariffs have been one-sided things; they have operated vastly more to protect the manufacturer than the wool-grower. Still, the manufacturers seem to think—at least, they claim—that, if they can be sufficiently protected, the wool-grower certainly must be; that the protection extended to them will reach, through them, to the wool-grower. Well, there is something in that. If you can make manufactures flourish in this country, the manufacturers will be the more ready to buy wool, and they must pay whatever the market value is. But, if they can buy it threepence a pound cheaper of the foreigner, they certainly will buy it of him; and we cannot blame them for it. If we can put on a duty that will prevent importations, it is certain that we can grow all that is required here. We can grow any amount here, if we can only have the business remunerative. There is no doubt upon that subject.

Mr. GEO. W. BOND, of Massachusetts. The impression may have been taken, from what I have said, that the wool-growers were to reap no benefit from the increased duty on wool. I said that, under the laws of trade, they were reaping the results of over-importation. The imports have fallen off about forty per cent. this year. These importations resulted in a severe loss.

Mr. GEDDES. And our prices falling!

Mr. BOND. Yes, sir; because, under the pressure caused by the anticipation of a high tariff to come, enough wool was imported to supply the market a long while ahead. The wool that is to be imported now will only come in case it will pay its costs, with the duties added. Consequently you will reap the benefit of the advanced duty over and above the cost abroad; though that cost will be affected somewhat by the value here, and by the withdrawal of American competition in the foreign producing markets.

Mr. R. M. MONTGOMERY, of Ohio. With all due deference to the gentlemen who have spoken on this subject, and with all due diffidence in regard to my own ability, I wish to say to you, sir, and to this convention, that I am fearful this debate is taking an unprofitable and unhappy turn. And I want to remark, also, that much that has been said is clearly out of order, because the question before the convention is simply this: Are we ready to pass the resolutions saying that we are in favor of an equality of protection as between these two interests, and equality as between us and the other interests of our country? The question is not whether wool pays as much as it ought to, nor whether we farmers work for nothing and find ourselves; but, whether we are ready to come together on this common ground of equality among ourselves and equal rights with others. It seems to me that these remarks about prices and duties are unfortunate at this time, because this court has no jurisdiction. When our committees go before the Revenue Commission, or before the committee of Congress, or before Congress itself, there is the place to bring forth

these statistics, in better form and more accurately than we are able to present them now, and with more effect. We, as producers, are very free to admit that we are not informed what protection we have had, or have not had, or ought to have. We are seeking information.

Permit me to hope, then, that the discussions of this meeting may take some other turn; that we may agree upon the question whether we will or will not favor equal protection, equal rights, before the legislature; and then let us turn to some other topic, the discussion of which we can make of practical advantage. For instance, let us avoid the question whether a ram will grow twenty or twenty-seven pounds of wool, or whether it will grow that being well-fed or ill-fed, kept in the house or out of doors; and turn our attention to such questions as these, (and perhaps these would be more appropriate for a wool-growers' convention than for this meeting,) whether the common wools are produced in superabundance, and whether the finer or coarser wool (what is usually termed the combing-wool) is the more desirable. Perhaps, too, it would be well for us western people to learn the names of the various kinds of wool, that we may know what we are talking about hereafter.

Another thing occurs to me that would be of value to us wool-growers, and perhaps to the manufacturers also. I have been informed that much wool, good as it may be when it comes from the sheep, is absolutely spoiled for certain purposes by the kind of twine that it is tied up with; it will not take color. There are abuses of this sort that are prejudicial to our interests. Let us have those abuses pointed out; let us agree upon equality, enjoy each other's acquaintance, shake hands and go home, and come together some other time and have another good meeting.

Mr. H. BLANCHARD, of Connecticut. I most cordially concur in the remarks of the gentleman who has just addressed the convention. I do not rise to discuss the relative merits of the tariff, as affecting the wool-growers and wool manufacturers. I believe that that subject will be more properly disposed of by placing it in the hands of a judicious, intelligent, and capable committee. The inquiries which have been sent forth by the Wool Manufacturers' Association to gather information upon this subject are ample to cover all those points that seem to disturb a little—and I do not wonder at it—the minds of some of my wool-growing friends. If the Wool Manufacturers' Association and the Wool-growers' Association shall be able intelligently to answer the questions proposed, I think they will be better able to act understandingly on this whole subject. Therefore, while replies might be made to many of the remarks that have been offered, I don't think it worth while to occupy the time of this convention in meeting points which to us seem very trivial.

Mr. E. B. POTTLE, of New York. I desire to say, in behalf of the committee who reported the resolutions now under discussion, that they reported them with the general expectation that we were entering upon a new era, so far as regards these two great interests, the wool-manufacturing and wool-producing interests; and I think I may add, that the general feeling all round the committee-room was, that by-gones should be by-gones. The past cannot be recalled; and whether the present tariff bears equally upon these two great interests or not, is a matter which cannot be determined by a resolu-

tion, however carefully drawn. But we can agree upon certain principles—upon a common platform, where we can all stand; and on that common platform we can commence that work which we believe will be not only for our mutual interest, but for the benefit of all the interests of the country. That was the theory upon which we prepared these resolutions.

Now, sir, if it were politic to devote the balance of this convention to the discussion of the question with our manufacturing friends here as to whether the tariff of 1857, with all the addenda that have been made to it, bears equally upon these great interests, I have some facts, the recital of which would occupy more time than you would care to devote to it; and doubtless others here have facts of the same character. I think a comparison of views upon that question would hardly leave a single manufacturer willing to rise in his place, and say, upon his honor, that an examination of this question left the impression upon his mind that the producer of wool has been protected by the laws of the country to the same extent that the manufacturers have been. But I have no wish to discuss this question. I wish, with my friend from Ohio, to turn this debate aside from these questions which are calculated to produce friction between these two interests.

There can be no question—it does not argue common sense in any man to get up and maintain the contrary, upon the great principles of political economy; There can be no question, I say, that it is best for any country under heaven to produce the articles it manufactures, and manufacture the articles it produces, as far as possible. Any government that is a buyer of the products of a foreign government, when it can produce those articles itself, must of necessity be engaged in a miserable business to the extent which it does it. As has been said by the friend who preceded me, the true wealth of a nation depends upon the products of the soil, and the labor that is bestowed in fitting those products for the use of man; and every dollar which we pay to encourage the labor of other countries, to stimulate the production of other countries, is so much taken from our own, and so much taken from the actual wealth of the country. Hence it should not be surprising that we, who claim to be at least possessed of common sense, representing these two interests, the wool-growing and wool-manufacturing interests of the country, should come here prepared to lay down, in the form of resolutions, a platform affirming simply the fact of the mutuality of these two great interests; that, looked at from a proper stand-point—looked at from the stand-point which every good citizen should occupy, a stand-point which compels him to ask not only for that which is best for him, but which is best for the whole country—looked at from that stand-point, I say, no other conclusion could be come to than that which we have put forth in these resolutions; that is, that the interests of the manufacturer and the interests of the producer are but one great mutuality, and whenever one is unduly elevated at the expense of the other, the country suffers.

Looking this question square in the face, we have concluded, as I said before, to let bygones be bygones. There has been wrestling and struggling between the respective interests that are represented here, as there has been wrestling and struggling between other interests; and it must have been of great damage to some of those interests, and of great detriment to the prosperity of the country at

large. It cannot be helped that it has been so. As I said before, we cannot recall the past, but we can make provision for the future; and that is all that men can ever do. Are we willing to do it? Are we, as practical men, representing two great interests of this country—the greatest in magnitude of all the widespread and varied interests of this immense country—are we willing to do that which we are ready to acknowledge is for the best interests of the whole country? We have said, in these resolutions, that we are. Now, is it to be presumed that we have said more or less than we mean? If we mean just what we have said in regard to the matter, then what hinders? Certainly, Congress will not set itself up in opposition to the wishes of these two great interests. There can be no motive in the breast of any member in Congress to lead him to protect and encourage one of these interests at the expense of the other. There can be no reluctance on the part of any member of Congress, or of any branch of the government, to permit us to carry out in practical operation just what we have said. Well, then, what hinders? Nothing whatever, unless it may be lack of sincerity on our part. Is any gentleman ready to assume that we have come here with the purpose of engaging in a species of double-dealing—of making professions to the ear which we do not mean to carry out? I will not accept any such insinuation. I think I may say with truth, for every member of the committee, that what we said in those resolutions we meant; and unless they are carried out in the spirit in which they were drawn, and in furtherance of the purpose they have in view, no set of men will be more disappointed, surprised, humiliated, and ashamed, I may say, than the members of the committee who have placed those resolutions before you. You must take those resolutions upon the faith that we are men of honor, and mean what we say; that we expect, in very truth, in the language of one of these resolutions, that it shall be the duty and purpose of these two great national associations—the Wool-growers' Association and the Wool Manufacturers' Association—to see to it that through the revenue commission, and through the Committee of Ways and Means, all the steps are taken that are needful to lay before Congress those facts which are necessary to carry out all the provisions of these resolutions, in the spirit in which they have been offered, and to procure such legislation, at the suggestion of both these great interests, knocking at the doors of Congress, and asking to be heard in relation to this mutual agreement and understanding, as shall promote the future prosperity of these two great interests.

Now, if I am correct in regard to that—if that is the expectation of our friends who came here to represent the wool-manufacturing interests of the country—if that is the expectation of our friends who come here to represent the wool-growing interests of the country, why should we differ about the past? Why should we tread upon the old lava that has been burning us up for the last quarter of a century in this country? Why, sir, I think that American industry and enterprise, with that tenacity which my friend (Mr. Geddes) speaks of, which leads Yankee women to make butter at a shilling a pound, even at a loss, if they can get no more—the never-give-up, never-say-die determination of our country—I think would have triumphed over all obstacles—over the pauper labor and aggregated wealth of other countries, over all the obstructions which we have seen

placed in our way, if it had been let alone and allowed to have scope; but it has not been. The unmistakable curse of this country, ever since I have had anything to do with public life, has been the continual freezing and thawing of the body politic. A tariff this year, and all the energies of the country turned to adapting its industry to it, and altered the next year; and then, when we got a little used to the grooves, altered again. This alternate freezing and thawing destroyed the accumulated wealth of those who had based their hopes upon the legislation of the country. This has been going on for years, and has been owing to the fact of the refusal to recognize the mutuality of the great interests of the country, and to provide that kind of legislation which would put them upon a common platform, where all alike could be prosperous. The refusal to recognize this mutuality of interest has led to this continually changing and shifting legislation, until no business man, when he went to bed at night, while Congress was in session, has known whether he would wake up a rich man or a poor man; and men have been disposed to turn up their eyes and say, mentally, at least, "Thank God!" when they heard that Congress had adjourned. This was not because of any lack of confidence in the members of Congress; it was not because they were thought venal, or foolish, or weak, or anything of that kind; it was because of this vicious American system, of one interest struggling against another interest, which keeps them rolling and tumbling one over another—this up to-day and down to-morrow and this down to-day and up to-morrow. Now, that can be obviated in only one way, and that is by the other great interests of the country following the example which we are trying to set them to-day; that is, to step forth in the spirit of manhood and patriotism, and say, "We will establish a great American system, which shall be known and recognized throughout the world; for no country is so worthy of our care as our own country, and no interests so need to be protected as the interests of American citizens and of American industry." That is the feeling we should have, and that is the spirit in which we should act.

This debt of four thousand millions, more or less, of which some of our friends have spoken—it is a large amount of money, but a very small price to pay for the advantages we have gained; perhaps the best bargain we ever made in this country, sharp as we are as Yankees. But that debt will vanish, it will cease even to be a bugbear upon exciting electioneering occasions, as soon as we can act upon the great principle, that the immense resources of this country are to be used for the benefit of these United States. Just recognize that fact; just start with that proposition, that, instead of enriching half Europe by the products of American industry, you intend to enrich your own country; to make it as independent in time of peace as it has been in time of war; to make it self-reliant, and we need have no apprehensions in regard to our debt. Let the world know that we cannot only carry on a war costing thousands of millions of dollars, without applying to any prince or potentate or government under heaven for the loan of a dollar, relying chiefly upon our own resources, but that we mean, by encouraging the productions of our own country, so vast in extent and variety, to be able to stand up independent of all the world, without shivering, even though non-intercourse should be declared with every nation under heaven for the next eighteen

months. When we have reached that point, Mr. President, we shall be truly Americanized, and not until then. When we shall have reached that point, there will be stability in our legislation, and not until then. When we make up our minds to take care of ourselves, recognizing the oneness of the American people, then there will be stability in our legislation, and not until then. So long as there is a scramble to elevate one interest over another, so long as an eagerness to take advantage of the market of this European country, or that shall occupy the attention of the business men of this country, so long we shall have unstable legislation consequent upon this shifting policy.

Now, sir, are we prepared to come upon this common ground? Are we prepared to recognize the great fact that the wealth of a nation is its own resources; that the honor of a nation is its own safest reliance; that the manhood of a nation depends upon standing up squarely on its own foundations and asking nothing from all the world besides? If we are prepared for this, we are prepared for these resolutions. If we are not prepared for this—if, after all this fair talk, after whispering in each other's ears that we have come up to this millennium of good feeling, where all interests shall be alike protected and fostered, we must go back to the shambles and scramble for the advancement of one interest at the expense of the others—then our time is lost time. But if we mean what we have said, the time is not far distant when every other of the industrial interests of the country, not represented here, will thank us from the very bottom of their hearts for having inaugurated this epoch of mutuality among the great interests of America.

The PRESIDENT. The debate has taken a somewhat wide range. I think there has been a little misapprehension on the subject. We have really two reports before us, and under one some gentlemen have discussed the other. I have no doubt that when we come to a vote it will be unanimously in favor of these resolutions. I do not believe any gentleman here has spoken with any view to oppose these resolutions, or intends to oppose them. When a free interchange of views was invited, and the business committee, headed by the honorable gentleman from Rhode Island, (Mr. Hazard,) brought in the topics for discussion, our friends here, with a little want of parliamentary knowledge, have been discussing these topics under the resolutions; that is all.

The question was called for on the adoption of the resolutions and they were passed unanimously.

The PRESIDENT. Gentlemen, the business now before the convention is the report of the business committee, and there are some explanations that can be made here by the manufacturers, and possibly some by the producers, that will be productive of a great deal of good. I trust that we shall not, now that the resolutions are passed, immediately break up. I see before me gentlemen who were manufacturers before some of us were born, and are still manufacturing. Let those men who have grown gray in this business tell us something about it. We are ready to listen. And if they want to press a little pointedly upon us, let them do it; our skins are not thin any more than theirs are. Let us discuss this matter freely and pointedly, if you please, but without asperity.

I wish to ask these gentlemen if they intend to keep up the one-third shrinkage rule. If they do, I give them notice we will have a debate on it.

Mr. GEORGE KELLOGG, of Connecticut. I am no public speaker, but I wish to say this upon the subject of the one-third shrinkage rule. I have been a buyer in the market these forty years, and I have never bought on any other principle than to examine the condition and quality of the wool, and pay what I thought I could afford to pay for it. I have sometimes taken the unwashed wool in a lot one-quarter off, sometimes one-third off, and sometimes one-half off. I have never known there was any one-third rule on the subject. If I find two or three fleeces of unwashed wool in a lot of washed wool, I throw them out and take one-third; I can't afford to stand and talk about it a great while, if I am making a large trade. But my principle always has been to pay for the wool what I judged it to be worth from its appearance and condition.

There is one other subject upon which I would like to occupy the time of the convention for a moment. A great deal has been said here about the relative position of wool manufacturers and wool-growers. It has been said that the farmers are a long-suffering people. I have been a farmer myself, and raised some wool and sold it, before I went to manufacturing. But I wish to say that since I have been in the manufacturing business—forty odd years—almost all the men who have been in that business have broken down in it. I wish to say from the experience I have had, and from what I have seen, that the wool-growers have had the best end, and the manufacturers have had the worst end. I have lived to see more than one-half, I believe more than two-thirds, of the men who, up to within a few years, went into the business break down and fail. I don't mention this by way of complaint; it has been the effect of the unsteady legislation of this country. When we got used to a tariff, that tariff was changed, and we had to get used to another. Any intelligent man—I don't care if he is a wool-grower—who is able to look back on the last forty years must be satisfied that the manufacturers have had the hardest end. I have nothing further to say on the subject.

The PRESIDENT, (Mr. E. B. Bigelow, of Massachusetts, in the chair.) I wish to say, in regard to the one-third shrinkage rule, that I verily believe there has been a great deal done by wool-buyers that the manufacturers are not responsible for. I have no doubt the gentleman who last spoke has acted on the rule that he mentioned, and probably others have done so, perhaps half of them, perhaps nearly all. But none the less is it true, that the men who go round the country buying up wool insist on that rule. I imagine that the manner of buying wool is the cause of a great deal of the difficulty between the manufacturers and producers. You, gentlemen manufacturers, know your business a great deal better than I, or any of us, can tell you; but I would like to ask why, when there is a great staple brought into the market, varying considerably in value, you don't send competent men to buy that staple. I want to know why you allow it to be bought up on commission. I have been thirty years and upwards raising wool; and it is absolutely true, as the gentleman from Vermont has said, that the manufacturers have been paying a premium upon dirty wool. Occasionally a manufacturer sends an agent who is an intelligent buyer, and is used to it; and he buys discreetly and makes discriminations.

But, generally, it is not so. Just as soon as the clip is off, half a dozen men are round buying wool on commission (I don't know who sets them at work, whether the manufacturer or the merchant;) and I suppose the more they buy, the better they are paid. These men insist on that rule, and we have suffered from the effects of it; and, consequently, as we have got to have one-third taken off if we don't wash, we want to put in at least one-third grease, and we ought to do it. If you require that we shall sacrifice one-third on every pound of wool because it is greasy, it is certainly our business and our right to supply you with that grease.

Mr. C. H. ADAMS, of New York. Why should there be any unwashed wool sold?

The PRESIDENT. In the first place, wool keeps better that is unwashed; it receives dyes better; works better; and there is no reason on earth why we should be told that we should wash it, unless we choose to do so.

Mr. ADAMS. We don't tell you so. We simply say that you bring it part washed and part unwashed. Why shouldn't you bring it all washed?

The PRESIDENT. Because it suits our interest or convenience not to do so. Here are men from the hills and valleys of Vermont, where the snows lie late, and the mountain streams are cold far into the spring; and they don't wish to wash, because, if they do, they can not get their wool to market in time. Here are men from the plains of Illinois, who can wash in good time, and they do wash. Have you any right to insist that these Vermont men shall wash, when there is a good reason why they should not wash, merely because men who can wash as well as not do so? Your interests do not suffer. If they did, then there would be some propriety in your complaining. But I say, and I call upon the most experienced gentlemen who are sitting in this body before me, I call upon Mr. Hazard, one of the most experienced manufacturers in the United States, to say if I am not right; I say that wool keeps better in the grease than where it is washed; and, when scoured, it works better, and takes dyes better. If a man living on the plains of Illinois or Indiana or Ohio, or in any other section of the country where the streams are warm early, chooses to wash, because he does not choose to pay for the transportation of dirt and grease, there is no reason why he shouldn't do it; and it is mere caprice to say that he ought not to do it. And if a man lives up in Vermont, or on the highlands of New York, eleven, twelve, or thirteen hundred feet above the level of the sea, where the streams are cold late, and where it is the first of July before he can wash his sheep, why should he not be allowed to send his wool to market unwashed, so long as he don't injure your interests?

I come now to the question of the justice of the one-third shrinking rule. I say I have demonstrated, hastily, that we have a right to market the wool in either condition; and that the manufacturers ought not, as a matter of propriety, to attempt to dictate to us, as long as we don't injure their interests by taking either course. Now, here is an arbitrary rule laid down, that, if I don't wash my sheep, the wool shall be subject to a deduction of one-third from the price of washed wool. Does the butter dealer, when he goes into the market to buy butter, and puts his butter-trier into a firkin, and finds it not

exactly in the best marketable condition, insist that the owner shall submit to a deduction of one-third; and then, when he tries another lot, and finds it not suitable for the table, only fit for grease, say that too shall be subject to a deduction of one-third? Would any butter dealer attempt to buy butter on any such rule? Take the case of wheat. Here are two men who present two samples of it. The buyer examines one sample, and judges there is a pint of foul seed to the bushel. Well, he deducts from the market value of the good article what he ought to deduct for that pint of foul seed per bushel. In the next wagon, he finds wheat that has four quarts of foul seed per bushel. Now, I ask you how it would look in the market of Syracuse, if some one should come along and say, in such a case, "It isn't all good wheat, and you must each submit to one uniform rule of deduction; you must each submit to a deduction of one-third."

I am taking it for granted that I am addressing intelligent men who are ready to hear these things called by their right names; and I undertake to say there is no other article in the purchase of which the buyer attempts to dictate in that way, and to say that, in case it is not in a certain condition, a fixed rule of shrinkage shall be applied. I contend that the manufacturers injure their own interests by this course. The wool-growers have got so now that they don't sell to the experienced agent; they leave the grease in and wait till the raw buyer comes along. If they see a man whom they know to be a judge, they will hardly take the trouble to show him their wool; they are busy; they don't care whether he looks at it or not. Why? Because they have not fitted it to sell to him; they have washed it poorly. By and by a man comes along who is buying wool on commission; he knows but little about it, and they sell their wool to him; and, if he makes two or three cents on a pound, he does better than the average in such cases. I say that I can, next spring, if I choose, (and no man can convince me of the contrary, because I have seen it for years,) give my sheep a mere dip in the water, or drive them through the stream, and then, when the buyer asks me, "Is that washed wool?" look him in the face and say, "Yes, sir," and the trade is consummated. Whereas, here is another man who does not wash, but his wool has been exposed to the rains of heaven all the year round, while in the other case the sheep have been housed, so that the fleeces are fifty, sixty, or seventy-five per cent. yolk; yet he must submit to the deduction. I think this has produced more irritation between the two classes than any other one thing. I have no doubt that this national convention will recommend a different course; and when that is done it will remove one of the strongest causes of discontent. There are men all about—some, perhaps, in this room; but thousands, I know, not in this room—to whom this is a constant source of irritation.

Dr. GEORGE B. LORING, of Massachusetts. I wish to make an inquiry; but before doing so I desire to say, that having lost the chance, through the ruling of the chairman, to make the little reply which I was prepared to make to the gentleman from Vermont, [Mr. Cutts,] I would simply state to those gentlemen present who have not heard the discussion before, that that speech has been replied to once before by myself in New England, and several times by gentlemen from Vermont in the newspapers—that identical speech. When I hear a son of Vermont assailing what has become, at last, one of the great

interests of that State, I can only say, as Mr. Webster did, in concluding his great Dartmouth College argument, when he paused, and turning to the supreme bench, said, "This may be a light matter for you, gentlemen, but there are those of us who have an affection for that old place, and it may turn upon us, like Cæsar upon Brutus in the senate-house, *et tu quoque, mi fili*—'And thou too, my son!'" This is from Vermont, and there we leave it.

Now we will come back to the question. I want to know if the manufacturers prefer to have the wool washed. Many of them have said to me that they did not like this practice of purchasing washed wool, but would prefer to have a rule adopted by which all wool should be sold unwashed. I think a suggestion in regard to this matter might come from this meeting that would be very useful not only to wool-producers but to wool-buyers hereafter. Is there any special advantage to the manufacturer in purchasing washed wool?

Mr. N. KINGSBURY, of Connecticut. I can only answer the question for myself, and I will attempt to do so in the course of the remarks which I propose to make, which will be very brief. I have a few things which I would like to say, beginning with the one-third rule.

I must confess that I was not acquainted with the fact that there was any dissatisfaction with the one-third rule until within a short time—three months ago, perhaps. As a manufacturer, purchasing wool for the last thirty years, I have made no arbitrary rule of that kind, nor practiced upon any arbitrary rule of that kind. It has been our custom, when purchasing a lot of wool containing, perhaps, fifteen, twenty, or thirty thousand pounds, if there were a few fleeces unwashed, to throw them out in a pile, and for the producer to say, "I want you to take that little pile of one hundred or two hundred pounds of unwashed wool with the other." "Very well; you may put it in;" and the suggestion has almost always come from the seller, "I will put it in at one-third less." I know not how a rule of this kind originated, nor do I know how extensively it has been practiced. The chairman has said that it is practiced, and of course I do not doubt his word on that subject. If it originated with the manufacturer, I think it must have been in this wise. Many years ago, when it was customary for washed wool to shrink from thirty to thirty-three per cent., unwashed wool, at one-third off, would average about the same price as washed wool. That was a very fair statement of the difference between washed and unwashed wool. I am not aware, however, that any rule like this originated from that source. But I do know this, that in purchasing wool of late years the manufacturer's cry has been, "How much clean wool can I get?" I think that question is much more frequently put now than it was a few years ago; because, when manufacturing commenced in this country, and we were struggling along, we did not keep our accounts as accurately as we keep them now. We did not go into all the details and statistics of the manufacture as we do now. It has now become a complete system, to every detail of which we give great attention; so much so, that we are able to tell you, in many of our manufacturing establishments, precisely the shrinkage on every single lot of wool which we purchase, be it washed or unwashed. We are able to tell you precisely how much clean wool we get out of every lot we purchase during the year, and then we are able to go on and tell you

precisely how much clean wool it has taken to make a yard of goods; and how much wool, as it was purchased, in its washed or unwashed state. All the details of the business are followed out very closely at the present time.

Now, I have often purchased unwashed wool, and I have always (except in the cases to which I have referred, where I have bought a little parcel of unwashed wool with a lot of washed wool) paid for that wool what it was worth, in my judgment. I have estimated in my own mind the shrinkage of that wool, or the amount of clean wool it would produce, to see how much it was worth, compared with washed wool. I admit that at present there is a great difference in the shrinkage of what is called washed wool—a very great difference from what there was twenty or twenty-five years ago. I know that some years our wool has shrunk not less than forty or forty-four and a half per cent.—making a proper allowance for the unwashed wool which may have been purchased, so as to bring it exactly in comparison with the other. If we were now to go into the purchase of unwashed wool, making in all cases a deduction of one-third, I admit that the unwashed wool would be cheaper than the washed wool. (When I speak of “washed wool,” I speak of wool which is called “washed,” but which really is not washed wool.) So far as I am concerned, I think I should be entirely satisfied to have all the wool of this country sheared in its unwashed state, and brought to market. I would like, however, to have some little improvement made in the manner of doing up the wool. I presume to say that this intelligent body of wool-growers do not know—they certainly cannot know—the damage they do to every fleece of wool which they tie up with hemp twine. I tell you it is utterly impossible to manufacture a piece of indigo-blue cloth from wool which we purchase of you tied up in twine or in hemp string. We cannot do it without using another dye besides the indigo blue, and to cover up the imperfections occasioned by those strings. We cannot make a piece of bright, handsome, black broadcloth, out of wool tied up in your hemp strings. There should never be one particle of hemp string, or any other kind of string from which a fibre can come, put round a fleece of wool. It is ruinous, and will become even more and more so, as the manufacturers go more and more into the manufacture of fabrics of plain colors, which require an even, handsome finish.

A DELEGATE. What would you suggest?

Mr. KINGSBURY. If tied up with any string, it should always be a woollen string, and the string should compare somewhat in fineness with the fineness of the wool.

Mr. POTTLE. Will the manufacturers send us out such an article for that use? If you will manufacture it, and send it out, see if we don't send you our wool tied up with such strings.

Mr. KINGSBURY. Create the demand for it, and we will send you the strings.

Mr. POTTLE. We create it now.

Mr. KINGSBURY. Say you will adopt them, and we will send you the strings; we can make them.

Mr. POTTLE. We pledge ourselves to use them; only we shall want you to discriminate between wool that is tied up with that kind of string, and wool that is tied up with hemp strings.

A DELEGATE. In sacking the wool, would it not be necessary to use woollen sacking?

Mr. KINGSBURY. We receive damage from the sacking, as well as from the strings, but not to the same extent. I think we could get along with the fibres which come off of the hemp sacking, although we have considered a smooth cotton sacking much better than hemp sacking. In regard to the strings, I hope we shall, in a very few years, create a public sentiment so strong, that not a soul of you will be able to sell a fleece of wool tied up with hemp strings.

Then there is another thing which I want to say in regard to this matter of strings. I believe there is a gentleman here who took off from one single fleece *seven ounces of string!* When we have sorted a lot of wool, we always find a great pile of string, for which we have paid from sixty-six up to seventy-five and eighty cents a pound. We are able to sell it for about three or four cents a pound, so that it is nearly a dead loss to us. In Germany, I believe, no string is ever put on the wool; that is, I have never seen any wool imported from Germany that had strings round it.

Mr. POTTLE. I want to state the simple fact, that, for twenty years—the length of time that I have had my eyes upon this business—I have never known of any complaint because of the kind of string we have used. The wool-growers have tied up their wool with these strings without knowing that there was any wish on the part of the manufacturers that they should use anything else. I say this in justification of the wool-growers. As to the man who put seven ounces of string round a single fleece, of course I have nothing to say in his defence. He was simply a scoundrel.

Mr. KINGSBURY. I am not at all casting reflections upon the wool-growers for putting hemp string on their wool. It has been the custom, and we have not felt the damage that it has been to us until quite recently; and we have had no opportunity to state the facts to the wool-growers. This afternoon they have asked us to make any suggestions that would be for our mutual advantage, in plain English, that all can understand; and, therefore, I am making them in that way. I have said nearly all I have to say upon the subject. I conceive it to be one of the advantages of our coming together here, that we can talk over these matters, and that will have a tendency, of course, to rectify all these mistakes; and if we could come together and see each other every year, or once in two or three years, and talk over some of these subjects which we feel aggrieved about, I think great good would result. For instance, it has been said to us who are manufacturers, "You make most wretched work in the purchase of wool." Well, we are aware of that, gentlemen. You ask us why we don't send out competent men to purchase our wool. I will tell you. It is because we are not able to procure our wool in that way, as wool is now purchased in the United States of America. There is no country in the world, that I know of, where wool is purchased as it is here. How is it? Suppose, just after shearing, we start some competent man to go through the wool-growing States and purchase wool, a man competent to judge of the value of washed and unwashed wool. What is the result? He goes out among you wool-growers and commences to buy, and at once you are surrounded by buyers. Every man in town is a wool-purchaser. Every merchant is a buyer, and every man who has got a little wool wants to get a little more. The object is to speculate in wool, and the whole clip is swept off in two or three days—bought up by farmers, blacksmiths, shoemakers, mer-

chants, and every class in the community; and the poor manufacturer, who sent his agent out there at considerable expense, had been able to pick up a few lots that will afford hardly profit enough to pay expenses. We cannot purchase wool in that way, so long as everybody is to be a wool-buyer. We cannot afford to send out agents under such circumstances; and you must all know that this is the case, to a greater or less extent, in every place.

Mr. POTTLE. Is not the remedy in your own hands? If the manufacturers would at once say, "We won't buy these lots of wool, picked up by blacksmiths and blackguards and merchants—these men of whom we know nothing"—how long would they come into the market?

Mr. KINGSBURY. There you have got us. We cannot do it. We want wool; we must have wool. You don't produce any surplus, certainly. You only produce seventy per cent. of what we want; and we must take the wool, whether well bought or poorly bought. Wool we must have, or the machinery of the country must stop. We are compelled to submit to a great many of these things, such as wool tied up with large strings, dirty wool, and greasy wool, because we must have the wool.

Mr. POTTLE. There is not one man in a hundred who goes round picking up wool who is able to hold it thirty days. Now, if you say you will only take that wool at a lower price than was paid by these men, how long will this state of things continue?

Mr. KINGSBURY. Then competition comes in; somebody else will offer more than we do. It is a thing the manufacturer cannot regulate. We understand it; we know that the wool is not bought judiciously, or as we would like to have it bought; but it is bought as it is bought, and we cannot help it. All these things may be remedied by future action on the part of the wool-growers and manufacturers.

I have already occupied more time than I ought, and I will make but one remark further, and that is, that, for one, I am rejoiced to find myself here face to face with the wool-growers of the country; and I rejoice to give to you, the wool-growers of the country, my pledge, that, in time to come, we, the manufacturers; will feel that our interests are mutual, and that we cannot sustain the one without sustaining the other. The wool-grower and the wool manufacturer must go hand-in-hand; and if we will thus go hand-in-hand, I believe we can procure such legislation as shall be necessary to protect your interests, and such legislation as shall be necessary to protect our interests, so that the great wool-growing and wool-manufacturing interests of the country, now larger perhaps than any other interests, shall go on in a state of prosperity beyond even our highest expectations, and we shall loom up before the world as a people unsurpassed in our manufacturing interests.

Mr. H. BLANCHARD, of Connecticut. I rise with much diffidence to speak on this subject, because I see so many interests involved in this discussion, which it seems to me are so poorly comprehended by many of us, in their bearings each upon the other, that I cannot expect to elucidate the subject in such a manner as to give entire satisfaction to all the parties concerned.

I have had some experience in the matters under discussion, and perhaps can sympathize with the wool-growers; having been, from the position which I have occupied in years past, associated with

them in a way that enables me fully to comprehend all their wants. I know the difficulties under which they labor; and it is this knowledge that has caused me, while listening to these debates, to rejoice from the bottom of my soul that this manufacturers' association is organized, and that this national wool-growers' association is organized; that the information which it is necessary should be communicated by the one to the other, may be made available for the practical benefit of those concerned. All this discussion in relation to the different breeds of sheep is interesting to us as manufacturers. Many of us can look back to the time when the efforts to improve the breed of sheep were commenced; and these discussions are not unprofitable, but will, undoubtedly result in good. The remarks which the honorable chairman has made, and the requests which he has made, were made in good faith; and yet, if we were a little captious, we might ask, "What obligations are we under to send agents to you to buy your wool?" No other business is conducted in this way. When we, as manufacturers, want to sell our products, we either do it in person, or we have an agent, who knows their value, and does not receive his estimate of their value from the man who proposes to buy them. You do not do so. Why not? It is in your power to do it. If you farmers would have a competent agent, who understood the condition of foreign markets and of your own product; who himself knew the relative value of wool, washed and unwashed; whose business it was to tell you what Mr. Kingsbury has told you, that, if you put hemp twine upon your fleeces, it is full of fibrous matter, which will be left in the wool when it is drawn through, and cannot be extracted—he could have told you all this, and he would have been able to come to me and say, "Here is a lot of unwashed wool which I wish to sell you." "Very well," I say, "what is your price?" He would not say, "The price of washed wool, a third off." If he was an intelligent man, he would know himself the value of that wool; and if I wished to purchase, we should have no difficulty in getting at its market value, if there was a market value attached to it.

It is not my province to come here and advise you what to do. I only state these as some of the difficulties which exist. I believe that every intelligent manufacturer to-day makes his estimate, in purchasing wool, upon what he believes will be the net result, after scouring, in clean wool. If he errs in judgment, he will either fail in business or lose money—that is all. I think enough has been said upon that subject, without occupying your time further upon it.

I will mention a difficulty that exists, to meet the objection that we manufacturers are not fair in our method of buying wool. I have travelled over the mountains of Washington county, Pennsylvania, a good many times, in company with a gentleman well acquainted with the farmers. I go to a gentleman who has raised a clip of wool, and, after examining it, I say to my agent, "There is a fine clip of wool; it is, I believe, everything that is desirable; you may pay sixty-two and a half cents a pound for it." I go to another lot, and I say, "The condition of this is bad; its quality is not what I want; it isn't worth more than fifty-five cents." Then I go to another lot, and I say, "This is worth fifty-seven cents." "Ah!" says he, "If I pay one man sixty-two and a half cents a pound, I can't buy another clip of wool in that neighborhood without I pay the same price." Am I not right? Who will contradict that assertion among you

wool-growers? [A voice: "That is true."] I only call your attention to this, to show you one difficulty under which the manufacturers labor, not to find fault with the wool-growers.

I don't think you can turn upon us, and say that we can correct all these difficulties that exist. I do not know any other way for the manufacturers to do than they have done. The laws of trade cannot be ignored by us; if we should attempt it, we should fail. Supply and demand regulate prices. Every business man will buy where he can buy the cheapest, and sell where he can sell the dearest. That is the principle—the very principle which you act upon in your business transactions. In effecting our sales, we adopt such a system as in our judgment will make the closest discriminations as to values, as to demands, and as to the proper time to supply those demands.

Gentlemen have complained here about the amount of wool in the hands of the farmers. Is all the wool of the country worked up each year? Why should the manufacturer hold 200,000 pounds of wool, that is worth sixty or seventy cents a pound, and lose the interest on his money, when the grower can as well hold it until he wants it? There are two sides to this question. It is no object for us to buy a year's stock of wool in June, that is not to be worked up until the next May. I think, therefore, that gentlemen need not be discouraged if they have a stock of wool unsold on hand. The season has not closed; the new clip is not yet in.

I wish to say a word in reference to the remarks of our friend who has broached the one-third rule. We expect, usually, that a washed fleece which weighs three pounds will weigh about four and a half pounds unwashed; and if a man comes to us, and wants to sell a few fleeces of unwashed wool with a lot of washed—you know how it is; they want to sell the whole lot together—we say, "Put it in, and take off one-third;" but I presume there is not a manufacturer in this house who goes into the market to buy three or four thousand pounds of unwashed wool, who does not exercise all the powers that he possesses in deciding what the shrinkage will be. The one-third rule has no influence at all upon his estimate; he decides the question upon its merits. If you prefer to put your wool into the market in an unwashed state, I don't suppose many of the manufacturers would object. But I think if you tried the experiment of taking one neighborhood, and let them wash their sheep well—that is, in a clear running stream—and then, after they are properly washed, let them run a week before they are sheared, leave out the tag-locks, and put the wool up properly, according to the custom of the country—putting in everything that is clean and is wool—and then let another neighborhood put up all their wool unwashed; and, if you had a mathematical demonstration which would so solve the problem as to enable us to tell exactly the relative value of the two lots, nine manufacturers out of ten would take the washed wool rather than the unwashed. Some might take the unwashed, but, everything else being equal, the great majority would take the washed instead of the unwashed.

You may ask my reasons for this opinion. Our honorable friend, the president, has said that wool will keep better in the grease; but that reason is not relevant in this country, where we have no surplus to be kept for any length of time. The custom has been, in this country, to wash our wool; and that is the custom to which our manufacturers have become habituated. Well, we all know that the customs

of a country cannot be changed by the resolutions of a convention: it requires something more than that. Yet if it should be found, upon trial, that it is beneficial to have the wool brought to market unwashed, I presume the manufacturers would make no serious objection. There may be cases in which it may not be expedient to wash high-blooded sheep; perhaps it might not be advisable to wash imported sheep, under peculiar circumstances. I presume no objection would be made to receiving washed wool from the rolling country of the western States, where the climate is such that the streams are warm early in the season, and the sheep can be washed early.

I express these opinions for myself only. I think the wool-growers would find a more ready sale for their wool if it was well washed and put up in good condition. The difficulty in selling wool has no bearing upon this question whatever. If you will take some measures by which your wool can be intelligently brought to the manufacturers, you will have no difficulty in getting the full relative value for your product. Take Ohio, the largest wool-growing State in the Union. Two-thirds of the clip are bought up by the country merchants. The manufacturers cannot help that. We are not responsible for that. The country merchant thinks he is a very good judge of wool; he thinks he understands how much wool ought to shrink, and what its relative value is; and, as he approaches the farmer to buy from him his clip, understanding his peculiarities, and calling into exercise all the shrewdness of which he is capable in making a bargain, he pulls on just such a string as he thinks will be most effectual in order to induce him to sell that clip at the lowest price. Is not that so? I think you will agree with me that it is so. Now, what can the manufacturers do to correct such an evil as that? The merchant gets ten or fifteen thousand pounds of wool collected in his loft. Some of the manufacturers go out into the country, and they find this lot of wool on hand. They want the wool—they are out in the country to buy wool—and they buy it; the merchant charging them, perhaps, two or three cents a pound more than they could have got it for from the producer. The merchant leaves the impression on the mind of the wool-growers that the objections which he brings against their wool are brought by the manufacturer. I suppose that none of you need be told that to be qualified to judge accurately in regard to the relative value of wool requires a little more experience than is derived from dealing in it for four or five weeks in a year, and simply examining the outside of a fleece. I think the manufacturers are not responsible for the manner in which your wool is sold in the country. I cannot take any blame to myself; I think the onus is on you. But if you can, in your individual capacity, or in your collective capacity as an association, devise some way by which your wool can be intelligently brought to the manufacturers of this country, all these difficulties which have been described here will be removed.

Now let us look at the course pursued in other countries. Is there any other nation in the world that sells wool as we sell it? Take Germany, for instance. There the skirts are taken off the fleeces, two or three are laid together, and they are rolled up in one parcel, with perhaps a single string around them, and perhaps none. If there is a string, it is a twine of hemp that is made smooth and glazed, so that the fibres, when it is drawn out, shall not be left in the wool.

There is no objection to such a string, and in that condition there is a value to be attached to that wool, as washed wool. We go into the market and buy foreign wools, and make our estimate of the shrinkage. We buy American wools, and estimate the shrinkage. The millions of pounds of wool coming from Texas is unwashed; but there is no difficulty in getting at the value of it. It is just as good as Vermont wool; but the facilities for washing are so poor that they are not able to wash it. The one-third rule does not prevail in regard to it. In short, I may say that there is no one-third rule which has been established by the manufacturers. If any exists, it has been established more by the local buyers than by any other class of purchasers. I have often seen unwashed wool that I would not take at forty or even fifty per cent. discount, while I have seen other lots which at twenty or twenty-five per cent. discount would be very cheap. There is no other principle of action, as I have already said, by which manufacturers are governed, than this: "What percentage of wool can I get from that lot?" and, when that is decided, we regulate the price.

Mr. H. CUTTS, of Vermont. I wish to be indulged in making a short statement in answer to the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Dr. Loring; and, in that statement, I think I shall be borne out by more than one gentleman here present. The gentleman says that he has replied to the speech I made once before. I deny that he has ever answered any speech that I have made anywhere in this world, and I can produce witnesses to bear me out in this statement. The only color of support that he has for this statement is this: On one occasion, at Concord, New Hampshire, he came out with a similar speech to that which he has made to-day, and, with the same dictatorial manner, undertook to prescribe to breeders what breed of sheep they should raise. I answered that speech then as I have answered a similar speech to-day. If my speech appears to him to be the same as that I made at Concord, it is because I was answering a similar speech made by him. I don't know that I have ever made a similar speech anywhere else.

I must say one word more in answer to the imputation the gentleman puts on me of being unpatriotic—that is, of not being a true and faithful son of Vermont, in saying what I have said. "*Et tu, Brute,*" he says. How is it? I accorded honor to these men for all the improvements they had made, both here and at Concord, on the former occasion to which I have alluded. All I object to is, that he should undertake, as the champion of a particular breed, to say that that is the only breed to be raised, and that no one else shall say there can be any improvement upon it. He sets that up as the golden calf that must be worshipped; and, if any man doesn't worship that golden calf, he is declared to be unpatriotic to Vermont, where he sets it up. That is the way I understand it. Now, I have yet to learn that, great as has been the improvement made upon merinoes in Vermont, all men must sit down and fold their hands, and say there can be no further improvement; and if any man presumes to doubt that statement, he is to be denounced as unpatriotic. I claim to be as patriotic as that gentleman, or any other; and I claim that my statement is true in regard to this—that that gentleman has never answered any speech of mine.

Dr. LORING. This matter of packing wool has been one of very great interest to me, as a practical matter. How to get at it, is the

question. What we want is a uniform price for wool, if we can find it. Now, shall we get that by having a part of our fleeces washed, and a part unwashed; a part tied with strings, and a part not? or shall we endeavor to create some temptation to those who are growing wool here, to present their wool properly in the market? Perhaps the German method of tying with glazed twine might answer. Might not wool be packed in cotton bagging, or something of that sort?

Mr. BLANCHARD. One suggestion occurs to me. If I wished to manufacture a piece of broadcloth with a brilliant lustre, and give it no other color except that which was embodied in the wool itself, I would wish to have it free from any foreign substance. If I wished to pack in linen sacking, and in the most perfect manner, I would scorch the sacking, so as to take off the little fibres on the inside. Or, if it was very fine wool, I would take sacking that had been used, and the fibres worn off, and then, I think, the manufacturer would find very little difficulty. But if you would pack it in the most perfect way, you would either pack it in cotton, where there would be no fibres to rub off, or in linen sacking, scorched in the way I have suggested.

Then, in regard to the string. I suppose all the string that is necessary is just enough to keep the fleece together. A very small twine, just strong enough for that purpose, is all that is needed. Every gentleman can use his own judgment. There is an abundance of this kind of twine in the market. I can buy twine for sixty-five or seventy cents a pound that the manufacturer never would complain of; but I can't buy it for twenty or sixteen cents a pound. Instead of weighing three or four ounces, all the twine necessary would not weigh more than the tenth of an ounce. So far as fancy cassimeres are concerned, and the great bulk of the woollen productions of the country, there is no objection to packing the wool in the ordinary wool-sacks, as it now comes to market. There would be no objection to ninety-nine one-hundredths of the wool that is manufactured to-day on account of the sacks in which it is placed. I was speaking only of the extreme cases.

Dr. LORING. Now, I want to ask another question. Suppose it was known that the whole clip of wool in the United States was unwashed: I want to ask the manufacturers whether they would not consider that they could go into the market and purchase that wool with more chance of forming a correct judgment in regard to its value, than they now do, knowing the various methods of washing that are pursued, and buying part of their wool washed and part unwashed?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Another remark is necessary in replying to that question. The judgment of men accustomed to discriminate between the different qualities of wool in this country has been formed on washed wool, as a general thing. A new exercise of judgment would be required with unwashed wool; for, so far as my observation goes—and I think I can find those present who will agree with me—fleeces in the unwashed state appear, in their size and fibre, different from washed fleeces. Hence you must educate the judges of wool—so far as American wool is concerned—to decide upon a different scale from the present. I do not say that cannot be done. Of course, if all the wool of the United States was unwashed, they would know what its value was no better than now. Every wool-grower

might shear his clip unwashed; and there would be just as much difference in the value of their wool, unwashed, as to condition, as there is now. I don't think the purchaser could get at its value any better than now.

Dr. LORING. The statement has been made here, in regard to this one-third shrinkage rule, that it is not universal. One gentleman remarked that it is rather a local matter. Here is the monthly special report of the wool market of Chicago; and underneath it says (which would seem to bear out that statement) "one-third off for all buck fleeces unwashed, and ill-conditioned wool." Now, that is not a general test applied to all the wools brought in the Chicago market: it is merely applied to unwashed wool and buck fleeces, which are considered, I suppose, to vary in value from other wool in that proportion. Now, if this is the case—if this is merely a local matter—cannot something be done to establish a rule which will prevent the introduction of such fleeces into the market.

Mr. BLANCHARD. No rule can be adopted but an actual test. If a hundred bales come to me that weigh two hundred pounds apiece, and whoever purchases them of me throws out three or four bales of unwashed wool (which is no unusual thing,) and I find that those three or four bales weigh three hundred pounds apiece, I should say that the one-third rule was near enough for all practical purposes, on so small a quantity. But, if I was buying twenty or even ten thousand pounds, I should want a closer discrimination than that.

Dr. LORING. I have listened to this discussion with great interest. Very many suggestions have been made that will be of value to wool-growers, if they will only heed them. I find that it is an almost interminable subject. The manufacturers differ, and the wool-growers differ, in regard to it, and now I move, as the sense of this convention, that the National Association of Wool Manufacturers be requested to appoint a committee of three from their body, to unite with a similar committee to be appointed by the National Wool-growers' Association, to investigate this matter of the one-third shrinkage rule, and report at some subsequent meeting; and that the chairmen of these two organizations be requested to make the nominations.

This motion was carried, and the convention adjourned to seven o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The convention was called to order shortly after seven o'clock by the chairman.

Mr. R. G. HAZARD, of Rhode Island. Mr. President: In the course of the discussion in regard to washed and unwashed wool, a question which I think very pertinent was asked by a gentleman on the other side, and answered in part by my friend Mr. Blanchard. It was, whether there would be greater or less difficulty in judging of wool in the unwashed condition than there is in the washed. There is, however, I think, Mr. President, one element in that question which has not been introduced, and which would go to increase the difficulty of judging of the unwashed wool; a small error in judgment will make a great difference. I will endeavor to illustrate it by taking two extreme cases. Suppose, in the first place, that a manufacturer is buying a lot of wool, say a hundred pounds, which is very clean. He estimates that it will waste not more than five per cent. He pays

ninety-five cents a pound for the lot, and estimates that the wool costs him, allowing five per cent. for waste, a dollar a pound. Suppose he errs five per cent. in his judgment, and that, instead of wasting five per cent. it wastes ten. He then gets ninety pounds of wool for his ninety-five, which, instead of a dollar a pound, will be a dollar and something over five cents. A difference of five per cent. in his judgment has made a difference of between five and six per cent. only in the cost of his wool. Now take the other extreme. We will suppose that he buys a lot of wool, of which he estimates that the waste will be ninety per cent., and for that he pays ten cents a pound. He has then, he thinks, ten pounds of clean wool, costing him ten dollars, which will also be a dollar a pound. Now, suppose he errs in judgment five per cent. in this case, and that, instead of wasting ninety, it wastes ninety-five per cent.; then he has only five pounds of wool for his ten dollars, making it cost two dollars a pound. In the one case he suffers a loss of less than six cents per pound on it, and in the other of a dollar a pound. I present these as extreme cases, merely to illustrate the point. I don't present it as conclusive, by any means, but merely as one element to be taken into account when that change is made.

I was also asked by the president for my opinion upon this point: whether it would be better that all the wool should come into the market washed or unwashed. As an abstract question, I think it would stand a little differently from the practical question which we have to meet. The practical question is, whether we would have the wool come into the market with no pretence that it has been washed, or have it come into the market called washed, but in reality differing very little from unwashed wool, and upon that question I have no hesitation in saying that, for one, I would prefer to have it come in unwashed. The difficulty in judging of it, I think, would hardly be greater; the variety, certainly, would not be greater, if all came in unwashed, than now, when it comes in partly washed and partly unwashed, with all the grades, from well washed down to merely running the sheep through a brook.

But, independently of this question, I still think upon the abstract question I should prefer to have the wool come into market in an unwashed state, and I will mention some reasons for this preference. One is, that I believe wool keeps in better condition, and works better, when we receive it in that state, and one reason of that is probably this: it is a fact familiar, I believe, to nearly all manufacturers, that if you take a fleece of wool, as we receive it at the mill, and immediately throw it into water, it is very difficult to scour that wool clean. There is some peculiar effect produced upon it by throwing it into cold water, which makes it extremely difficult to get it into a proper condition to work afterwards. I don't know whether other manufacturers have noticed this fact, but that has been my experience, and I think I can see a reason why it is so. It is, that the yolk of the wool will make, to some extent, a scouring liquor, which will mix with the oil of the wool. I have had wools from which I have made a liquor which would not only scour themselves, but other wools in addition. Some African wools will do that. It is reasonable to suppose that if a fleece is merely wet with cold water, and then given to the manufacturer, we should encounter the same difficulty. I admit, sir, that in practice we do not usually encounter it; for I believe the farmers

are very careful to provide that we shall not, by suffering their sheep to run long enough after they are washed before shearing, to get the wool back into its natural condition. Thanks to them for that.

I think, Mr. President, there is a reason for adopting some rule in regard to the relative value of washed and unwashed wool. I do not say the one-third rule is the proper one. I think the proportion has varied from what it was when we got a part of the wool really washed and the other part unwashed, though I do not think the difference is so great as the gentleman [Mr. Blanchard] supposes, because I think that the change in the method of breeding sheep has caused as much gain to unwashed wool, in proportion, as wools have lost by being washed. It has already been sufficiently explained, that, when wool comes to market, the one-third rule practically has no effect. If the whole lot is unwashed, a price is put upon it according to its merits, without any reference to what it would be if washed. But when, as is generally the case, much the larger portion is washed and only a small portion unwashed, it is found convenient to have some standard as an approximation to what the unwashed wool is worth, as compared with the other; inasmuch as, the bulk of the wool being washed, the price will be fixed upon that. But in such a case, if the unwashed wool amounts to any considerable portion of the value, I think almost every purchaser examines that as much as the other, and exercises his judgment on the question whether it is worth more or less than the one-third difference; and as he considers it worth more or less, the amount is added, or taken off. But there are cases in which it is important to have a rule for that purpose, as near as may be to the actual condition of things; and yet it is not very important to have it exact. A man, for instance, looks at 100,000 pounds, perhaps a part of it only exposed to view. He has no opportunity of seeing whether there is or is not any unwashed wool among it, and must judge how much it is worth if washed. He fixes the price, and then, perhaps, goes home. When the seller comes to pick it out, he finds some unwashed wool; and, in such cases, it is well, to save trouble, to fix upon some deduction upon that unwashed wool which shall be somewhere near what it is worth; and the one-third rule has been adopted for that purpose in the same way, as, in some places where there is no law regulating interest, they still make a rule regulating the price of money where there is no contract.

I have no hope that any recommendation which we may make will cure the evils which grow out of the fact that wool is purchased by incompetent, ignorant, or reckless buyers. But there is another question which lies back of that, which it may be important for us to discuss, and which ought some time to be settled; and that is, whether it is better, in the main, that wool should come into the market washed or unwashed—whether the general interests of society require the one or the other. That is a question of itself important to be considered, and one upon which discussion may throw light. I have already stated the reason why I should prefer it in the unwashed condition, upon the abstract question. At the same time, I am aware, as no gentleman can fail to see, that in this case, as in all cases, the interest is mutual between the manufacturers and the wool-growers. It is for the interest of the manufacturers that that course shall be pursued by the wool-growers that in the end will enable them to give us the greatest quantity and the greatest value of wool at the

lowest cost; and if, in one section of the country, the farmers are so situated that the expense or inconvenience or injury to their sheep by washing is greater than the cost of transporting the extra waste, and the other disadvantages attending that, I should say, decidedly, let them take that course by which they can give us the greatest value at the least cost. And if, in another section, they are so favorably situated with regard to washing that they can usually give us the greatest value by washing, let them pursue that course there. And so with regard to all the other points, I think that is the main thing to be considered. If, by producing the wool in connexion with a very large amount of oil, you can still give us a greater value of wool at the same cost, then let us have the oil with it; and—I was almost going to say, but I think it is hardly necessary to say it, for the hypothesis is scarcely admissible—if, by giving us the wool in connexion with five, ten, or twenty per cent. of twine, you can give it to us cheaper than by not putting on the twine, then let us have the twine. In all cases, that one principle must be the controlling one. That course which is the most economical, on the whole, will be adopted in the end; for it is to that that natural causes make the thing tend. I am aware of the influence of custom, which has been very well alluded to by one of the gentlemen who has preceded me, and of the influence of habit, and, sometimes, of prejudice: but prejudice and habit and custom are all things which yield most readily to discussion, to inquiry and knowledge; and it is therefore hoped that a discussion of this subject may lead us to the true result in regard to this particular matter.

While I am upon this point of mutuality, which I think is one of the most important we have to discuss, I will merely remark, that perhaps, from a proper point of view, we may consider the wool-growers as the manufacturers of cloth. They are engaged in the first of a series of processes by which grass and grain are converted into cloth. There are other processes more or less divided in different countries and in different sections. Sometimes the spinning is done by one man, who transfers the yarn to another to be made into cloth; and in England it is quite common for the maker of the cloth to transfer it to the finisher, to be colored and finished. Now, I say we can no more separate the interest of the wool-grower and the wool manufacturer in this country than we can separate the interest of the spinner from that of the maker of the cloth, or that of the maker of the cloth from that of the finisher; they are indissolubly united together.

There is only one other point to which I wish to advert in this connexion. It is one which I believe has not yet been touched upon, but I deem it of great importance. I allude to the demoralizing influence of the present system of purchasing wool, and putting it up for market. I find that men who are honestly disposed to put up their wool in good condition have not been encouraged to do so. On the contrary, I am well aware that the mode in which manufacturers have bought their wool has had a great tendency to discourage any such course of procedure. One man has his wool well washed, shears it as soon as it is sufficiently dried, and offers it for sale in that condition. His neighbor has scarcely wet his wool, or not more than wet it—has done it no good at any rate; or, if he has, suffers his sheep to run long enough for the yolk to be increased

to the usual weight before he shears. An unskilled buyer comes along, and looks at both parcels; and the chances are that the man who puts up his wool poorly will get more than the man who puts it up well, because his wool, having been put up clean, will feel dry and a little harsh and brittle, while the other man's will have a softer and finer feeling. The result is, that the man who has put up his wool well really has contributed to the price paid to the one who has put up his wool badly. In that way the man who puts up his wool in good condition fails to get a fair price for his product, and the other man gets an advantage to which he is not entitled. I think this has a demoralizing tendency in all cases.

Mr. R. M. MONTGOMERY, of Ohio. If this convention will be patient with me a few moments, I flatter myself I can put this thing in a better shape than it is at the present time. I don't know that I shall succeed; but I hope I may.

I wish to congratulate my fellow wool-growers, in the first place, that this discussion has brought out one thing which I was glad to hear, and which will give us at least one advantage when we go home. It is this: We have been selling our unwashed wools to the buyers in the western country, who have told us that the manufacturers required that this difference of one-third should be made between washed and unwashed wool. The manufacturers tell us now that that is not the rule. Next year, when we sell our wool to them, and they tell us that the eastern buyers insist on taking off one-third on unwashed wool, we can say to them, "Gentlemen, the eastern buyers require no such thing—you scoundrels! You take the wool from my neighbors' old ram, and sell it honestly to those eastern men for unwashed wool; and you buy my wool, that is washed by the rains of heaven better than one-half the wool that is sold in the market, taking one-third off, and sell it to them with three-thirds on."

I am authorized to say, for the men of Ohio, that we do not complain because of the amount of the reduction, but we complain of the uniformity of the rule; that all wool that a man is honest enough to say is unwashed must be reduced one-third, while another lot, equally dirty, if called washed, comes in without any reduction. What we complain of is, the making of this wool, which is called washed wool, the standard by which we must suffer in the sale of our wool, if we choose to sell it in an unwashed condition. We understand the manufacturers very well. We understand that they buy it according to its value, without reference to the rule. But we object to the rule imposed upon us of an indiscriminate reduction, whether it is in one condition or another, if it goes by the name of unwashed wool.

Perhaps I shall explain it better by an illustration than in any other way. Two or three years ago (the precise time is not material) my wool did not come into market until late in the season. I did not ask any price for it; but one day there came along a man who has bought all the wool in our neighborhood for a good many years, and he said to me, "I would like to buy your wool; I can give you just seventy-five cents a pound for it." "Very well, I can take seventy-five cents." I will say that my wool was tolerably well washed that year; not so well as it used to be, because circumstances have changed. I have a neighbor, whose boy told me that two

men washed five hundred of his sheep in one afternoon, and might just as well have washed a thousand; and not only that, but it was six weeks before they were sheared. I asked this buyer, "Did you buy Mr. —'s wool?" "Yes." "What did you give him—seventy-five cents?" "Yes." This man, who has bought perhaps five hundred thousand pounds of wool a year in my neighborhood, could tell me that he gave this man precisely the same for his half-washed wool that he gave me for mine, which was tolerably well washed! I had some unwashed wool, which was as good as that man's half-washed wool; but he deducted one-third on that.

Now, we would like to sell our wool for what it is worth, without reference to what another man sells his for. I think I have said enough on that point. It is needless for any honest wool-grower to say that he deprecates this as much as the manufacturers. It is only one of the many practices by which those of us who are tolerably honest are made to pay for the dishonesty of others. We ask the manufacturers to make a discrimination, and give us what our clean and well-put-up wool is worth, and not make us suffer for the misdemeanors of our neighbors.

It has been asked why we wish to sell our wool in an unwashed condition. One reason is, that we don't want to subject our sheep to the labor of carrying ten or twenty pounds of wool soaked with water, as it will be if they are washed anything like well, for a week, more or less, until it gets dry. We don't choose to dress them in wet clothes for that length of time. Another reason is, we want to shear our sheep early; and if we undertake to wash them, we cannot do it, for the water is too cold, both for the sheep and the men, early in the season. A great many men in our western country cannot go into the water. One is subject to rheumatism, another to ague. A great proportion of our men are foreigners, raw men, not capable of handling sheep skilfully; and then the cost of getting it done is more than the increased cost of getting it to market with the dirt still in the fleeces.

Mr. W. F. GREER, of Ohio. Permit me to call your attention to one fact, which seems to have escaped you; and that is, the objection with which the one-third rule is met in our own State. And I may be permitted to remark, that the facts which have been stated here with regard to this rule are of great importance, and would give a value to this convention if nothing else were accomplished. It has been remarked by one of the speakers, that the fact that the growers object to this rule was unknown to him until quite recently. Now, sir, this matter has been discussed in our State association for four years; in fact, it was the cause of the formation of the "Wool-growers' Association" in our State. What we object to is the standard by which the value of our unwashed wool is fixed. If the manufacturers will, in determining its value, estimate it upon the basis of scoured wool, we will not object. But the standard of washed wool is so uncertain, that it is not a very safe one to base an estimate upon.

Mr. E. B. POTTLE, of New York. There is one question which I wish to ask my friend [Mr. Montgomery] in connexion with the subject he has been discussing. It has been asked whether the growers prefer to sell their wool washed or unwashed. I say I should prefer to sell it unwashed; and the first and obvious reason is, that it is a cruel thing to wash sheep. No matter how careful the man may be in driving the sheep to be washed, they will get heated; and then,

when they are in the pen, the very nature of the animal is such, that, before you can catch half a dozen, they are in a perfect state of fermentation from heat and fright. They are taken and soused into a trough or brook; and it is like taking them from fever heat and putting them directly into the coldest water. I have seen the injurious results following from washing in my sheep for a week afterwards; and I have been obliged to put them into my warmest stable, and keep them there ten or twelve hours, until they were brought into a state of perspiration, to counteract the effect of the sudden change to which they had been subjected.

The second reason is, that it is wrong to require hired men to go into a brook and stand all day for the purpose of washing the sheep. Now and then a man will protest against it, and refuse to do it; but, as a general thing, they submit to it, because they labor for us, and are bound to obey our orders. It is an unhealthy practice; and many a man, now a hobbling cripple, may date his misfortune back to the time when he went into the brook to wash sheep, when it was cold enough to chill a man clear through. That has been the custom; but I think we are intelligent enough now to correct that practice. We ought to put our wool into the hands of the manufacturer without subjecting either man or beast to the inhumanity to which this custom of washing has given rise.

Now, I put the question to my friend, does your experience concur with mine on this point?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. My experience fully concurs with yours; and I may add, that frequently I have seen very injurious effects from washing. I think the universal testimony of my neighbors is, that the sheep do not gain, but lose all the time from the day they are washed until they are shorn, as a usual thing. But I say to you, sir, that I apprehend these wool manufacturers will very readily understand the cruelty that this custom engenders to the sheep, and the injury it does to men who will handle sheep carefully, and they will accept our explanation without much question. It is only our reckless, careless, devil-may-care farmers who will tell us it don't hurt the sheep. They don't pay any attention to it, and don't know whether it hurts them or not.

Mr. POTTLE. There is another fact that should be mentioned in connexion with this matter, and that is, the way sheep are handled when they are washed. The man who owns the sheep don't go into the water and wash them. You cannot get a gentleman (I use the term, of course, in its social sense) to wash sheep. The work is intrusted to Irishmen and Dutchmen; and no matter how careful you may be in instructing them, they will catch the sheep and handle them as they would sticks of wood. Sometimes, when a sheep has died in consequence of this rough handling, I have taken the pains to have it skinned, and shown the carcase to them, to let them see the effects of their treatment. When a sheep has been caught up by the wool, and held so that its whole weight is sustained by the wool, and thrown into the creek in that way, if you will kill it and skin it half an hour afterwards, you will find a space of from six to twelve inches from which the skin has been entirely raised from the carcase, and that the blood has settled there until it is as black as your hat. Inhumanity like this ought to be stopped.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I want to say one thing more, and, having said that, I will detain you no longer. We, as wool-growers, and especially in Ohio, have asked whether there was any advantage in having the wool brook-washed, except for the matter of convenience in transporting; and we have asked different questions in reference to this subject, part of which we asked really for information, and part of which we asked, hoping that the answer, having authority as coming from the manufacturers, would give us an argument against the gentlemen who buy our wool of us. At least, that was one object that influenced me. If we learn from you manufacturers that you don't object to the wool in an unwashed state—that it is no damage to the wool—we then have an argument which we can use, when we go home, to those who buy wool. We have your authority for saying there is no benefit in washing the wool, and it gives us some advantage in carrying out the practice of not washing among ourselves.

The PRESIDENT, (Mr. E. B. Bigelow, of Massachusetts, in the chair.) It is quite a custom among producers to put tag-wool into their fleeces, as they put them up. Before washing, say about the first of May, when the sheep are first turned out to grass, they are tagged; and, in tying up the fleeces, a handful of this tag-wool is put into each fleece. One of the manufacturers at the New York meeting asked my opinion of that practice. I told him, and I wish to express that opinion here again to my brother producers. It is a fraud. We have a right, under the custom of this country, to put all the wool that is clean into the fleece. But if we sell our wool washed, and if the tags are cut off before washing, we are bound to put those tags into a tub and wash them as well as the wool is washed before we put them into the fleece.

Mr. POTTLE. Will the gentleman allow me to make one statement? My practice has been—and it is the usual practice of men who mean to be honest—to throw the tags into a pail and give them as thorough a washing as the fleece gets, and then roll them up inside the fleece. I discontinued that practice because I became satisfied, first, from looking at the tags after they were washed, and, second, by consulting two or three eminent manufacturers, (and I want to see whether the testimony of these gentlemen concurs with theirs,) that the process of washing destroyed the value of the wool; and I will tell you why. Before these tags are washed you can separate the good wool from the poor, and what there is left will be worth something. The result of washing is, that they are all felted together, and you cannot get them apart. Several manufacturers have told me they would rather have them separate than have them mixed up together, the pure with the impure. Hence I have adopted the practice ever since of putting the tags in one corner of my wool-house, unwashed, insisting upon the condition, when the buyer came round, that they should be taken with the fleeces, according to the general custom.

Mr. RANDALL. I had proposed to suggest that same course. If the sheep have been allowed to run to grass, and the tags have become stained by dung, there is no doubt the course mentioned by Mr. Pottle is the only proper one. The point I make, however, is, that putting unwashed wool into a washed fleece is fraud, and it would be so declared by a jury.

Another question asked me was with regard to putting in dead wool. Every farmer, who has any considerable number of sheep, will have