

Box 1374, Boston, Mass.,

June 22nd, 1914.

My dear Miss Tarbell:-

I received your letter and the check for the book a few days ago. In compliance with your request I leave prepared the enclosed memorandum of my work on weights and measures and the tariff. It seems fearfully egotistical, but I could not think of any better way than to put it in the first person for your information. I have written far more than you will need and I want to suggest that you make your sketch as impersonal as you can, directing attention rather to the lessons these incidents teach, the power and the value of unvarnished truth, and the pleasure a person experiences in discovering hidden facts of importance, and watching their effects when made known.

You know how ready I have been to give what facts I had to others who could use them, and I know how much you have regretted that in your own case it was not advisable to give me credit for much that I did. That is the situation now, for you are the bête noir of powerful interests who are closely identified with the business in which I am now gaining a livelihood. The time may come when you can speak freely, if not while I am living, then after I am gone, but for the present it will be best, that if you refer to any help you personally may have obtained from me, you confine it to a reference to what you may have found in my writings on the tariff question.

I want to assure you that I prize very highly the compliment you pay me in asking for this sketch. I will send you the photograph in a few days.

With kind regards,

I remain,

Faithfully yours,

Sam J. Dale

Miss Ida M. Tarbell,

New York, N. Y.

M E M O R A N D U M.

By Samuel S. Dale
(See back of last page)

My interest in schedule K was awakened in 1886 by the discussion of that schedule, which hinged largely on the amount of wool required to make a pound of wool cloth. To settle the question I made a four-year test of the wool used and cloth made in the Hecla Mill, Uxbridge, Mass., weighing all the wool myself. This required much extra labor and patience on my part, but it disclosed the facts. The records (see No. 1) of these facts was treasured for twenty-three years and made public in 1909 during the framing of the Payne bill. The test itself was notable as being probably the longest and most exhaustive of its kind that has ever been made, and illustrates the method I have followed since, namely, first, to get at the facts regardless of the time and labor required, then reach conclusions and make them public when they would have the greatest effect.

Whatever service I have rendered on the weight and measure question or tariff, has been the result of following the common sense rule to find out the facts before making statements on a question.

At the beginning of the agitation in 1900 to make the metric system compulsory in the United States I shared the belief which nearly everyone acquired at school, that the metric system was perfect and certain to become the world's single standard. I began an investigation of the weights and measures of the textile ^{industry,} and particularly on the Continent of Europe, expecting to find facts to strengthen my belief, but existing chaos of textiles weights and measures that I discovered forced me to become an active opponent of the metric system and such I leave since remained. I worked on that question incessantly and enthusiastically knowing that I had discovered facts not generally known. Although extending my inquiries to

other fields, I confined my public discussion mainly to the textile industry.

The work consisted in digging laboriously through masses of dry technical data of all kinds, searching the old records at libraries, correspondence, controversy in the press and before the Commission on ^{Coinage, Weights and Measures} and arranging the material thus obtained. Such work and the agitation to make public the facts that had convinced me, occupied me constantly for nearly seven years. I have been rewarded by seeing others convinced, as I was; first, that the metric system is inferior to our established English system; second, that, while the metric or other new system can be forced into this country, our old system cannot be forced out, and consequently the compulsory use of the metric system will cause a permanent confusion, where we now enjoy a high degree of uniformity; and third, that the only way in which our weights and measures can be improved is to restrict the use of the metric system and eliminate certain unnecessary units in our old weights and measures.

Conditions similar to those found in textile manufacturing were found by other investigators in other trades and industries. The facts were placed before the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures at Washington with the result that in 1906 only four votes out of 17 could be obtained for the compulsory metric bill, whereas six years before only three votes were recorded against a similar bill. The facts we had made public aroused the textile and engineering trades in England, and it was to the opposition of these trades that the defeat of a compulsory metric bill in the House of Commons in 1907 was mainly due. This weights and measures issue is always with us, and ^{I still} continued to do what I can to spread the knowledge of the facts.

Soon after the metric agitation subsided in 1907 the tariff question became a live issue.

At that time ~~1906~~¹⁹⁰⁸ ~~my~~^{Mr} interest in the textile tariff question was stimulated by a letter received from a party leader, a prominent candidate for President, who was proclaiming from one end of the country to the other how the tariff should be revised and would be, if he was elected President and his party placed in power. ^{Mr Dale} I had written this man in regard to the tariff question and in his reply he stated that the details of the tariff schedules were all terra incognita to him. ~~Some years later I discovered that it was the~~^{I have heard since that} fashion for party leaders to admit their ignorance of tariff details, as if such ignorance were commendable and not inconsistent with a knowledge of principles, and the ability properly to revise tariff schedules. But in 1908 ^{he} I was even ^{ev} more unsophisticated than ~~I am~~ now, ^{and the mentioned above} and letters ^{overwhelmed} me with astonishment and roused me to the need of facts at Washington. I applied to the textile schedules of the tariff the same methods that had been followed in connection with weights and measures. It is hardly necessary for me to go into particulars regarding this part of my work. I was in possession of a large amount of technical information which had a direct bearing on the textile schedules. Soon after I had ^{begun} the tariff discussion, the late Senator Dolliver asked me to visit him. We spent one entire day together discussing schedule K and the substance of our conversation is embodied in question and answer ^{form} ~~found~~ in Dolliver's speech of April 4th and 5th, 1909. You know about this incident, as I believe Dolliver told you of the help I had given him, and he told the Senate on June 9th, 1909 what he thought of it. Here is a passage from that speech which repays me a hundred fold for all my dreary drudgery on this question; and which also illus-

Digitized by Digital Image, 2009. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pelletier Library

generously
fates, how ~~much~~ Dolliver acknowledged the help I was able to give :-

"I sat down with him as a learner to see if it were possible for a man of moderate abilities to comprehend even what was talked about when wool tariff was up in the Congress of the United States. The more I talked with him, the more distinctly I saw that he dealt with exact facts and with perfectly accurate statistics, and the more that was impressed upon my mind, the more anxious I became that his opinions already expressed in a general way in the editorial columns of the Boston Textile World Record, should have the influence that the nonpartisan opinions of experts ought to have upon such a controversy as we have here.

So I asked him to let me talk with him as a man to man; I ignorant, trying to get some instruction from the wise and from the learned. I had hardly knowledge enough of the subjects, of the matters at stake, to frame my questions, and those who read will see how ignorant the questioner was and how accurate in his knowledge was the man who was kind enough to answer the questions. I put that dialogue into the RECORD, and here we are debating this question."

While he thus acknowledged the help I had given him, it should not be forgotten that the facts I had dug up would have had no effect on public opinion if they had not been made known. This Dolliver did in his great tariff speeches in 1909. You followed him and after that the truth was common property. I have continued my work on the textile tariff with the object of making protection fair to all producers and consumers. As you know I am a *protectionist* on principle, believing that free trade is essentially unfair, and that customs tariffs properly adjusted are necessary to correct the discrimination resulting from free trade. During the tariff agitation following the passage of the Payne bill the Tariff Board asked me to assist them in the work on schedule K. I consented to act as *adviser* only and I terminated that connection after a year's service because I was satisfied their work was not calculated to bring out the facts and a fair revision of the schedule.

When the Democrats undertook the revision of the tariff I continued my work and the results *supplied* two most striking illustrations,

the bill with

Digitized by The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pelletier Library

not of my own ability, but of what I believe any one can accomplish by getting at the truth about a public question and then making it public. The first was in connection with schedule K. The Underwood tariff bill as it was reported to the House provided for the following rates; - Free wool - 15% on tops; 20% on yarn; and 35% on cloth. I believed that there should be a duty on wool, and that the House rates were too low. But I also saw that free wool and 35% on goods were inevitable, and so I directed my discussion to the equalization of the rates on tops, yarn and cloth. My mill records showed that in order to be fair to top maker, yarn spinners and cloth makers, the rates should be ; 6% on tops; 18½% on yarn; and 35% on cloth. The bill passed the House unchanged. My statements of facts were widely distributed, going frequently to every member of the House and Senate, and I had no public support of the rates named, but the following comparative table shows the original Underwood rates, my recommendations and the rates finally adopted for the law;

<u>ORIGINAL UNDERWOOD</u>	<u>MINE</u>	<u>THE LAW</u>
15%	6%	8%
20%	18½%	18%
35%	35%	35%

The second illustration of what facts will do to shape opinions and legislation was in connection with the cotton schedule. The Democratic House had twice passed the same cotton schedule, in 1911 and 1912, and when it became certain in 1909 that a Democratic bill would become a law, I pointed out in March and April that the Underwood cotton cloth schedule was impracticable, because it was based on what could not be determined, the size of the yarn when spun. At the same time I recommended a method by which the Underwood cotton cloth tariff could be made practical, namely, having the rates ^{based} on the average size of the yarn as it is found in the cloth itself. The House rejected the suggestion and passed the bill with

Digital Image, 2009. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pelletier Library

the cotton schedule of 1911 and 1912 unchanged. A month later facts had begun to get their work in and in May the Senate Finance Committee adopted my plan in part, using in its amendment defining the yarn number a *plan* almost identical with that used in my recommendation two months before. Three weeks later the Senate Democratic Caucus retored the old form of the schedule. A month later the Finance Committee again adopted my plan in part, and six weeks later the Conference Committee of the two Houses adopted three of the four recommendations made by me in March, and in that form the bill became a law in October. My March 1913 definition of the yarn number on which the rates are based, being retained almost word for word, and thus showing the source of the information used by Congress;

Editorial, March, 1913

"All this trouble can be avoided by a few lines in the law providing that the rates shall be based on the count of the yarn as found in the finished fabric from which the sizing material has been removed, the count to be determined by taking the length of the yarn to be equal to the distance covered by it in the cloth."

Law, signed by President Wilson, Oct. 3, 1913.

"The average yarn number of the yarn in cotton cloth herein provided for shall be obtained by taking the length of the thread or yarn to be equal to the distance covered by it in the cloth in the condition as imported."

The Democratic Congress was convinced that these changes in the woolen and cotton schedules must be made or trouble would be the result. They were convinced, as I had been in 1900 in regard to the metric system of weights and measures, as the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures had been convinced between 1900 and 1906 regarding the same question, and as Dolliver and his Progressive Republican associates in the Senate were convinced in 1909 regarding schedule K; namely, by a plain statement of facts. That was the way in which the Democratic Congress was forced last year to

shape the textile tariff law in accordance with recommendations from the outside. And this is the more noteworthy because the changes were made when the public and Congress were profoundly stirred by the agitation against the interference of the lobby in legislation, an agitation started by ~~the~~ President Wilson's charge that an insidious and powerful lobby was working to defeat ~~exchange~~ the Underwood tariff bill. During that time the personal influence of outsiders in Congress was destroyed. Many Representatives and Senators acted as if it were dangerous to talk or write to an outsider regarding tariff or other legislative matters. And it was at such a time that the plain, unvarnished truth, placed before Congress, compelled the changes to which I have referred in the Democratic woolen and cotton schedules.