

Memo for A Tariff Made State.

1. We are not sure about this. Some mills have mechanical ventilation
2. Better cut this out as what you saw was probably due the wires being near the exit of the dust pipe leading from the picker room, and which carries the dust to the outer air. If you are sure it came from the windows let it stay in.
3. Better verify Towle's statement if you have not done so already.
4. Eben S. Draper is listed in Textile World Record Directory as president of the Manville Co. Better verify this, however, because we read when he was elected Governor of Massachusetts two years ago that he had resigned all the positions he held in corporations. Why not ask MacColl? Draper is Governor of Massachusetts, now running for another term.
5. Children do not run the looms. Better say machines.
7. This would be strengthened by quoting his remark. "If I can get my property improved \$2000 worth by spending \$500 in prizes, why shouldn't I do it? It is good business."
8. This subject "The Stand Pat Intellect" gives you an unequalled opportunity to expose the shams and reveal the truth of the matter. You will find a mine of well arranged data in Boston which will aid you in turning on the light.
6. We advise omitting this part referring to the Metcalf's. First, it is rather foreign to your story, but the chief reason is that the Metcalf's do not deserve compliments in connection with the tariff. They represent a class of worsted manufacturers who know that schedule K is wrong, who privately admit it, and yet refuse to come out and state what they know to be the truth because they are benefiting by the inequalities. For a year or more we have heard of the Metcalf's private admissions, but not a word would they say in public. That is

the meanest kind of standpatism, and in the Metcalfs it is all the more inexcusable because their father, Jesse Metcalf, set an example of outspoken opposition to the Whitman gang twenty years ago that deserves all praise. You may have read his letter in the March, 1890, Bulletin of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, which is in the volume we let you take some time ago. It was addressed to Wm. Whitman and was a reply to a circular letter on tariff revision. Here are a few extracts:

"Your resolutions are preceded by a 'Whereas, it is the sense of the people that a revision of the tariff is necessary.' We believe this to be a misstatement. The people want a reform of the tariff, instead of a revision. They want less taxes, instead of more, as you propose..."

"The first resolution beginning with a statement that the Woolen Association has not learned anything since its organization twenty-five years ago, is correct though humiliating. It continues with an inference that the Association does not believe in duties on raw wool, but with a reverent fear of the political football, 'they leave the subject', in the language of Ethan Allen, to the 'wisdom of Jehovah and the Continental Congress'."

"The second resolution charges the 47th Congress 'with reducing the duties on manufactured goods so far below the reduction of the duties on wool as to destroy their compensatory character.' As the duties on the kind of goods now imported range from 55 to 100 per cent it would seem that the manufacturers ought not to complain, if the people will keep quiet under such extortion, and that it is a reduction of the duties on wool that is required, and not an increase on goods. The resolution concludes with the correct statement that higher duties on goods would have enabled the American manufacturers to increase their prices and profits."

He goes through the whole twelve resolutions in this style, closing with this:

"In conclusion, let us beg of you, before it is too late, and your industries are ruined, to use your great opportunities to remove the burdens from the people and take off the restrictions on trade and commerce that now oppress the business interests of the country."

Nothing last year was more provoking than to have the sons of the man who wrote that letter talking privately about the carded woolen manufacturers being right, and giving the public and Congress the "silence" treatment. If the Metcalfs had done in 1909 what their father did in 1890 it would have given the handful of carded woolen protestants the help needed to break down the combination that prevented amendments to Schedule K. They did not do it; they deserve censure instead of praise.

Gallery 3:

"for the first time"

This is not correct. The correspondence was published at the time of the trial, but had been quite generally forgotten when in 1908 attention was called to it anew by the pamphlet. The nature of the duty substituted was well known to anyone who would take the trouble to apply it to tops of different values.

The evidence that W. devised the McKinley tops duty in 1889 and 1890 has always been accessible. B. did not know about it, or he had forgotten, until some time in February, 1909, when he obtained W's testimony of Jan. 2, 1890 before W. & M. Com. and then issued his "pamphlet no. 2" as a reply to W's pamphlet of February 12, 1909.

Gallery 4

"To keep this out"

Not correct. You have just stated it goes in with the 4 and 7 cent duties in force.

~~X~~
Suggestions for Questions to be presented to J.R.MacCell.

How does the cost per square yard for mercerizing in the United States compare with the cost abroad?

Does not mercerizing have the effect of increasing the market value of the cloth; and if so, would not the ad valorem protective duty increase in amount on the mercerized goods, making unnecessary an extra duty to protect the mercerizer?

A prominent cotton manufacturer of New Bedford, Mass., has recently asserted that he withdrew from the Arkwright Club because that Club would not supply its members with a statement of how its funds were disbursed. Will you kindly inform me whether this charge is correct?

The same cotton manufacturer also charged that the Cotton Manufacturers' Association is not representative, that its members are largely mill supply dealers and mill officials, as distinguished from manufacturing owners; that its meetings are attended by but a small number of cotton manufacturers; and that resolutions dealing with the general interests of the cotton trade are adopted with only a small number of manufacturers present. Are these charges well-founded, and if not, which ones are unwarranted?

Is it true that during the tariff revision last year representatives of the cotton manufacturers engaged an ex-customs official to assist them in framing a cotton goods schedule, and that the schedule so framed was substantially adopted either in whole or in part by the Ways and Means Committee and by the Senate Committee on Finance?

Was any attempt made to canvass the entire cotton manufacturing trade, South as well as North, to obtain opinions and suggestions regarding the revision of the Dingley cotton goods tariff? Or were the suggestions to the House and Senate Committees framed by a comparatively small number of manufacturers?

Does not the increase in the price of raw cotton cause the value of cotton goods to advance, and does not such advance result in an increase of the aggregate duty collected on a given quantity of goods under the ad valorem protective duties?

~~X~~-----
The first question regarding the cost of mercerizing is offered as a substitute for the last one in the letter.