

(25)

Shall we preserve our Herds and Flocks?

---

"That crowning infamy that the Senate first pitied, then endured, and then embraced!"  
"Why, sir, the birds of the air, the beasts of the field, the very reptiles beneath our feet protect their own. Is it then too much to ask the great American people—including the Democratic party—to do likewise? Shall we do less?"

---

## SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WARREN,

OF WYOMING,

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 1896.

---

[FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.]

## SPEECH OF HON. FRANCIS E. WARREN.

The Senate having under consideration the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That in view of the late unprecedented shrinkage in numbers and values of farm animals throughout the United States, as shown by the last published reports of the Department of Agriculture, the attention of the Committee on Agriculture is hereby especially directed to this subject, with the request to consider and report to the Senate, or to invite the Finance Committee to consider and report, by bill or otherwise, what legislation, if any, is necessary to preserve our herds and flocks"—

Mr. WARREN said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: It has occurred to me during the late very interesting debates in this body upon foreign relations, gold and silver, bonds and loans, popular and otherwise—mostly otherwise—to inquire, are there not other interests equally important that should be kept fully abreast in the public mind with these acknowledged burning subjects? For instance, how fares the farmer and stockgrower? What efforts are we making to sustain the greatest of all our interests, that of agriculture?

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], and the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] have in late speeches touched upon certain of the products of agriculture, and to some of the contentions of the Senator from Missouri I intend briefly replying before I am through. Comparisons disclose that the returns from all other avocations and industries combined are insignificant when measured by the fabulous total of our farm production. I need only mention the one product of hay, little thought of and rarely ever discussed, to illustrate my proposition. The annual hay crop of the United States is worth over \$450,000,000—more than four times as much as our annual product of both gold and silver at its coinage value, or over six times its present market value, and about one and one-fifth times as much as the total annual product of gold and silver of all the world. Yet hay is seldom mentioned in the halls of Congress, while gold and silver engage us at times for days, I might almost say months, together. I desire not to detract one iota from the importance of our precious metals, and I wish to be distinctly so understood, but I use this comparison to fortify my position, that I am justified in inviting your attention at this time to grave questions of public policy respecting certain languishing industries.

I desire, in proceeding with the discussion of live stock this morning, not to attack any political party as such, but I propose to follow the official figures in this investigation, casting the responsibility where I believe it rests, and let the chips fall where they may.

### AGRICULTURE SUFFERING.

I contend that agricultural interests, along with others, are in a bad condition, and that there is a remedy; that the present bad condition is the direct consequence of the application of one theory or policy, and its remedy lies in

adopting an opposite policy; that free trade or insufficient tariff is the bad policy; that a sufficient tariff, with incidental or even intended protection, is the remedy. The former is the policy of the Democratic party, the latter of the Republican party.

A CONDITION, NOT A THEORY, NOW CONFRONTS US.

I do not propose at this time to elaborate on theories and policies; "it is a condition, not a theory, that now confronts us," and I offer, Mr. President, the official books and figures of the Democratic Administration to demonstrate that condition.

The Agricultural Department, in its report No. 123, Division of Statistics, gives a table showing the numbers and values of farm animals in the United States from 1868 to 1895. An examination of that document cannot fail to fill our hearts and minds with apprehension, as well as with a desire, if we be patriotic citizens, to overcome or improve the appalling conditions made there so painfully apparent. To be fair, and brief as well, I will date my comparisons no further back than the year 1879. It was in that year—because of resumption of specie payment—that values became stable, and gold, silver, and paper reached a parity, which has been since maintained. Dividing the time between 1879 and the present in cycles representing Republican and Democratic Administrations, the result is the following:

LIVE STOCK TABLE.

*A comparison between Republican and Democratic Administrations as shown by the values of domestic animals, horses, mules, cattle, sheep, and swine.*

When we resumed specie payment in 1879 our domestic animals, horses, mules, cattle, sheep, and swine, were valued at.....	\$1,445,423,062
During the ensuing six years, until the election of Mr. Cleveland in 1884, the values increased to.....	2,467,868,924
A gain during six years of Republican rule of.....	<u>1,022,445,862</u>
During the ensuing four years, until the election of Mr. Harrison in 1888, values decreased from.....	2,467,868,924
To.....	2,409,043,418
A loss during four years of Democratic rule of.....	<u>58,825,506</u>
During the ensuing four years, until the second election of Mr. Cleveland in 1892, values again increased from.....	2,409,043,418
To.....	2,461,755,698
A gain during four years of Republican rule of.....	<u>52,712,280</u>
During the last two years, under the second administration of Mr. Cleveland, and under proposed and accomplished free trade and sweeping tariff reductions, values again decreased from.....	2,483,506,681
To the comparatively insignificant total of.....	<u>1,819,446,306</u>
Showing the enormous loss in two years of Democratic rule of.....	664,060,375

Mr. President, over \$664,000,000 loss in two years in live stock! Do the American people comprehend this? That their losses in live stock alone have been \$1,100,000 for every working day during the past two years? And this, too, in these piping times of boasted plenty, prosperity, and pugnacity—toward England!

That there may be no misunderstanding the facts, I ask that the official table of the Department of Agriculture be printed as a part of my remarks:

## Number and value of farm animals in the United States for the years 1868-1895.

January 1—	Horses.		Mules.		Milch cows.	
	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.
1868.....	5,756,940	\$432,696,226	855,685	\$66,415,769	8,691,568	\$319,681,153
1869.....	6,332,793	533,024,787	921,062	98,386,359	9,247,714	361,752,676
1870.....	8,248,800	671,319,461	1,179,500	128,584,796	10,095,600	394,940,745
1871.....	8,702,000	683,257,587	1,242,360	126,127,766	10,923,000	374,179,093
1872.....	8,990,960	659,707,916	1,276,300	121,027,316	10,303,500	329,408,933
1873.....	9,222,470	684,463,957	1,310,000	124,658,085	10,575,900	314,353,931
1874.....	9,333,800	666,927,406	1,339,350	119,501,859	10,705,300	299,609,309
1875.....	9,504,200	646,376,939	1,393,750	111,502,713	10,906,800	311,089,824
1876.....	9,735,300	632,446,985	1,414,500	106,565,114	10,085,400	320,346,728
1877.....	10,155,400	610,206,631	1,443,500	99,480,976	11,260,800	307,743,211
1878.....	10,329,700	600,813,681	1,637,500	104,322,939	11,300,100	298,499,866
1879.....	10,938,700	573,254,808	1,713,160	96,033,971	11,826,400	256,953,928
1880.....	11,201,800	613,296,611	1,729,500	105,948,319	12,027,000	279,899,420
1881.....	11,429,226	607,954,325	1,720,731	120,096,164	12,368,653	296,277,060
1882.....	10,521,554	615,824,914	1,835,166	130,945,378	12,611,632	326,470,310
1883.....	10,838,111	765,041,308	1,871,079	148,732,390	13,125,685	396,575,405
1884.....	11,169,683	833,734,460	1,914,126	161,214,976	13,501,206	423,486,649
1885.....	11,564,572	852,282,947	1,972,569	162,497,097	13,904,722	412,903,093
1886.....	12,077,657	860,823,208	2,052,593	163,381,096	14,235,388	389,985,523
1887.....	12,496,744	901,685,755	2,117,141	167,057,538	14,522,083	378,789,589
1888.....	13,172,936	946,096,154	2,191,727	174,853,563	14,856,414	366,252,173
1889.....	13,663,294	982,194,827	2,257,574	179,444,481	15,298,625	366,226,376
1890.....	14,213,837	978,516,562	2,331,027	182,394,099	15,952,883	352,152,133
1891.....	14,056,750	941,823,222	2,296,532	178,847,370	16,019,591	346,397,900
1892.....	15,498,140	1,007,593,636	2,314,699	174,882,070	16,416,351	351,378,132
1893.....	16,206,802	992,225,185	2,331,128	164,763,751	16,424,087	357,299,785
1894.....	16,081,139	769,224,799	2,352,231	146,232,811	16,487,400	358,998,661
1895.....	15,893,318	576,730,580	2,333,108	110,927,834	16,504,629	362,601,729

Jan. 1—	Oxen and other cattle.		Sheep.		Swine.		Total value of farm animals.
	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	
1868..	11,942,454	\$249,141,599	38,991,912	\$98,407,809	24,317,258	\$10,766,266	\$1,277,111,822
1869..	12,185,385	306,211,473	37,724,279	82,139,979	23,316,476	146,188,755	1,527,704,029
1870..	15,388,500	346,926,440	40,853,000	93,364,433	26,751,400	187,191,502	1,822,327,377
1871..	16,212,200	369,940,056	31,851,000	74,035,837	29,457,500	182,602,352	1,810,142,711
1872..	16,389,800	321,562,693	31,679,300	88,771,197	31,796,300	138,733,828	1,659,211,933
1873..	16,413,870	329,298,755	33,002,400	97,922,350	32,632,050	133,729,615	1,684,431,693
1874..	16,218,100	310,649,803	33,928,200	88,990,569	30,860,900	134,565,523	1,619,944,472
1875..	16,313,400	304,858,859	33,783,600	94,320,652	28,062,200	149,869,234	1,618,012,221
1876..	16,785,900	319,623,509	35,935,300	93,666,318	28,726,800	175,070,484	1,647,719,138
1877..	17,956,100	307,105,386	35,804,200	80,892,683	38,077,100	171,077,196	1,576,506,083
1878..	19,223,300	329,541,703	35,740,500	80,603,062	32,262,500	160,838,532	1,574,620,763
1879..	21,408,100	339,543,327	38,123,800	79,023,984	34,766,100	110,613,044	1,445,423,062
1880..	21,231,000	341,761,154	40,765,900	90,230,537	34,034,100	145,721,515	1,576,917,556
1881..	20,937,702	362,861,509	43,576,899	104,070,759	36,247,603	170,535,435	1,721,795,252
1882..	23,280,233	463,069,499	45,016,224	106,594,954	44,122,200	263,543,195	1,906,459,250
1883..	28,046,077	611,549,109	49,237,291	124,365,835	43,270,086	291,951,221	2,398,215,268
1884..	29,046,101	683,229,054	50,626,626	119,302,706	44,200,893	246,301,139	2,467,868,924
1885..	29,866,573	694,383,913	50,360,243	107,960,650	48,142,657	226,401,683	2,456,428,380
1886..	31,275,242	661,956,274	48,322,531	92,443,867	46,092,043	196,569,894	2,365,159,862
1887..	33,511,750	603,137,926	44,759,814	89,872,839	44,346,525	220,811,082	2,400,586,938
1888..	24,378,363	611,750,520	43,544,755	89,279,926	50,301,592	231,907,193	2,400,043,418
1889..	35,032,417	597,236,812	42,599,079	90,640,369	51,602,780	243,418,336	2,507,050,058
1890..	36,849,024	560,625,137	44,330,072	44,330,072	50,625,106	210,193,923	2,418,760,028
1891..	36,876,648	544,127,908	43,431,126	41,938,365	52,308,019	241,031,415	2,329,787,773
1892..	37,651,239	570,749,155	47,273,553	45,048,017	46,004,807	235,426,492	2,461,755,698
1893..	33,954,196	547,632,204	45,048,017	45,048,017	45,206,498	270,364,626	2,483,506,631
1894..	36,604,163	536,789,747	42,294,064	66,686,767	44,165,716	219,501,267	2,170,810,754
1895..	34,364,216	482,999,129	42,294,064	66,686,767	44,165,716	219,501,267	1,819,440,306

## CLASSIFIED TABLE.

Mr. President, I will give the classified shrinkages for the last one year quoted as to both numbers and values. All classes shrank except milch cows.

	Number.	Value.
Milch cows alone gained.....	17,229	\$3,603,068
Horses shrank.....	187,821	192,494,219
Mules shrank.....	19,123	35,304,977
Oxen and other cattle shrank.....	2,243,952	53,790,618
Swine shrank.....	1,040,782	50,883,359

But it remained for sheep to show the most disastrous shrinkage in both numbers and value, and to mark most plainly the poisonous effect of an un-Republican policy.

## SHEEP TABLE.

In 1884, under Republican policy, our sheep were 50,626,026 in numbers and of the value of.....	\$119,902,706
Under influences of the threatened Mills bill they shrank to 42,599,079 in numbers and to the value of.....	90,640,369
A shrinkage of 8,027,547 head and in value.....	29,262,337
From the lowest point recorded under the Mills bill right up to 1893, under Republican guardianship, sheep increased to 47,273,553 in numbers and to the value of.....	125,909,264
An increase of 4,674,474 head and an increase in value of.....	35,264,595
But again upon Mr. Cleveland's second election we turn backward and downward as usual under the blighting, withering influence of a wrong policy, and in two years sheep decreased to 42,294,064 head, of the value of.....	66,685,767
A loss of 4,979,489 head and a loss in value of.....	59,223,497

A shrinkage in two short years of nearly one-half!

## THE OTHER SIDE OF THE LEDGER.

Now, to exhibit the other side of the ledger. Here is a statistical table (I ask to have it incorporated in my remarks) which shows our importation of wool has increased to nearly triple, not in two years nor three years, but in the first ten months of this present year, ended October 31, 1895.

## Imports of wool (in pounds).

	Ten months ending October—	
	1894.	1895.
Class 1.....	25,807,462	113,672,709
Class 2.....	2,841,422	16,731,985
Class 3.....	54,574,385	80,652,544
Total.....	83,223,270	211,057,238
Rags and waste.....	1,081,441	17,824,008

## Imports of wool goods (values in dollars).

	October—		Ten months ending October—	
	1894.	1895.	1894.	1895.
Carpets.....	\$109,752	\$89,841	\$614,421	\$1,356,307
Clothing.....	77,228	113,302	673,058	1,296,210
Cloths.....	405,339	1,911,057	4,775,874	21,807,839
Dress goods.....	285,841	1,248,895	6,566,170	19,528,051
Knit fabrics.....	48,196	318,183	503,669	1,988,349
Shawls.....	10,165	57,789	69,552	270,264
Yarns.....	20,327	107,186	236,388	1,632,852
All others.....	73,020	171,156	542,235	1,919,785
Total.....	1,029,868	4,017,409	13,981,398	49,899,717

#### SHODDY.

And in the meantime our importations of wool goods have nearly quadrupled, the last month quoted (last October) showing increasing importations, while shoddy—that abomination which cheats alike the woolgrower, by displacing his product, and the consumer, by affording but insignificant wearing service—increased 1,700 per cent. in number of pounds imported—from 1,081,441 to 17,824,008—and this, too, in ten months.

With absolutely no benefit therefrom, we depreciate our wool-growing property nearly one-half and wool manufacturing assets also, while we pour out to England, China and other foreign countries a stream of gold increasing from 300 per cent. to 1,700 per cent. per annum for wool and wool commodities that we could as well produce ourselves if we but return to the sane common-sense principles of collecting smart revenue tariffs from wools and woollens inaugurated nearly eighty years ago and never overturned until by the notorious Fifty-third Congress, which the American people so signally repudiated at the polls in November, 1894.

Can a plainer story than this be told? Or can figures be produced from nearer the throne than those I offer?

These figures are taken from the ledgers of a Department presided over by that Cabinet officer who essays to speak oftener and plainer of the policies of the Executive and his Administration than any one, and whose utterances are usually accepted as inspired by the present head of the Democratic party.

#### DESPERATION.

And yet, Mr. President, the able Senator from Missouri, with Spartan-like valor and desperation, throws himself into the breach and attempts to maintain the Administration, the Wilson bill, and the utterly false and untenable position that woolgrowers are more prosperous under free wool than ever before. Prosperous? How? Because the value of their flocks is nearly cut in half and numbers greatly reduced?

#### NOT DUE TO PANIC.

Mr. President, it will not do in this connection to lay the blame to a panic, and then assert that Republican wrong-doing brought on the panic and consequent dissipation of both numbers and values of live stock, because, sir, we have endured panics before with no such results. We had a panic in 1873, but the fluctuation in values and numbers of live stock was, according to the Agricultural Reports herewith submitted, scarcely noticeable. The shrinkage after 1873 is just clearly enough shown in these tables to indicate that there was some disturbance and that live stock took notice thereof; but the change was so unimportant and infinitesimal that when quoted it only serves by comparison to show the enormity of our late losses. I would make comparisons but for want of time.

It is not alone to panic values, so called, that I call your attention, but to the fact made absolutely manifest in these tables that numbers increase and values appreciate invariably under Republican Administrations, while with corresponding regularity and mournful emphasis they decrease and depreciate under Democratic rule.

#### NOT DUE TO RISE AND FALL OF GOLD AND SILVER.

And it will not do to attribute all of this remarkable shrinkage to the rise of gold and fall of silver, because neither one of the metals has gone up or down in the scale correspondingly with live stock in the changes of Administration.

Mr. President, the shrinkage in values in live stock, always attendant upon a Democratic Administration of this Government, has become so marked in the past few years, so tremendous, so appalling, as to seem to point, unless soon corrected, to almost annihilation of the flocks and herds of the United States, obliging us to soon depend upon other nations for even our meat as well as our wool product.

## POLITICAL FUNERALS.

The Senator from Missouri taunts the Republican party upon the political effect of the McKinley bill, and he says:

What was the result of that legislation? The Republican party came back from their appeal to the people utterly discomfited and defeated. They gathered into this hall a funeral procession, stamped with the disapproval of the people of this country. The McKinley law was repudiated distinctly and emphatically.

Well, Mr. President, it is a tender subject, this of political funeral processions. They are always sad and sometimes expensive, but the one mentioned by the Senator is now ancient history—a chestnut, so to speak. Why didn't my friend allude to something more recent. For instance, the very marked obsequies accorded the late and lamented Fifty-third Congress.

The McKinley bill was passed by a House of Representatives consisting of 173 Republicans, 156 Democrats, and 1 Independent. A not large Republican majority in truth.

The Wilson bill was passed by a House consisting of 127 Republicans, 219 Democrats, and 10 Farmers' Alliance or Populists. A pretty decided Democratic majority, it is admitted.

The Democrats thus gained from 156 in the Fifty-first to 219 in the Fifty-third Congress. The Republicans lost from 176 in the Fifty-first to 127 in the Fifty-third Congress. A Democratic gain of 53 and a Republican loss of 54.

In the present Fifty-fourth Congress the Republicans gained from 127 in the Fifty-third to 244. The Democrats lost from 219 to 105. A Republican gain of 117 and a Democratic loss of 114.

Nothing to brag of from a Democratic standpoint, it seems to me.

## HOODOO VS. JONAH.

And judging by the "off year" elections of 1895, the election of 1896 will leave scarcely a "corporal's guard" of the faithful to mark the spot where once stood an imperious, triumphant, rampant Democracy fighting under the unpatriotic black flag of Wilsonism—emblem of protection to foreign industries and distress to our own. Gentlemen on the other side are welcome to all the satisfaction they can get from the contemplation of results of the McKinley bill displaced by the Wilson bill. If the McKinley bill of Republican fame was a "hoodoo," your own Wilson bill has certainly been a "Jonah," and it seems to me a most conspicuous, indigestible, and soul-stirring Jonah at that. If I may be permitted to make comparisons, I believe that the Jonah of Biblical times was a sweet morsel in the bosom of that ancient and respectable whale when compared with the nauseating, rantankerous Wilson bill in the distended stomach of the corpus delicti of Democracy. After the next November election, when my friend from Missouri and the remnant of the Democratic party shall have taken to the woods and are anxiously inquiring if indeed there is still "a God in Israel," and pleading that if so His face may be again shown them, they will never utter the name Wilson as a talismanic persuader nor present the flagrant Wilson bill as their testimonial of character and their evidence of good faith.

## FREE WOOL NOT A BOON.

Mr. President, I listened to the able and eloquent Senator from Missouri, as I always do, with pleasure, whether agreeing with him or not, willing and anxious to be convinced that free wool is a boon and a deficit in revenues a blessing. But, alas! he did not, to my mind, produce one tittle of responsible proof beyond his own dogmatic declaration that such was true.

I have not the time now nor the disposition to enter into an extended wool speech—I may do so at some future time—but I desire in passing to notice some of the contentions of the Senator from Missouri on this subject. His first proposition is as follows:

I believed then and can prove now that free wool has done more for the woolgrowers of the country and for the woolen mills of the country than any legislation that the Republican party has ever enacted.

Where is his proof? I search the printed copy of his speech in vain. Beyond showing the reaction—and it was disappointingly slight in this case—

always following a complete demoralization of prices and which is so well understood, nothing is in evidence to substantiate the claim. What would be the best evidence to prove this proposition? Why, the testimony of the wool growers themselves, and the testimony of the wool manufacturers themselves, to be sure. Has he introduced such? No! Who are the best judges of the prosperity of woolgrowing? The woolgrowers themselves, or men not interested in the business and who have no particular knowledge of its ramifications? Who are the best judges of woolen manufacturing? Have the growers petitioned Congress for free wool, or the manufacturers for lower tariff? On the contrary, they are on record, in the archives of this Capitol, through petitions, memorials and resolutions innumerable. Individuals and associations unanimously claiming distress under free wool and asking for relief for an industry almost annihilated as to woolgrowing and severely crippled as to manufacturing.

Mr. President, the evidence is on the other side. I am unwilling to discredit or impeach the testimony of witnesses who know the facts and who tell the truth, having certainly no incentive for lying, for if they are making more money now than before they would, as a matter of course, desire present conditions to continue.

#### FALLING PRICES OF WOOL.

Now as to figures, I deem those most correct that are obtained from direct financial transactions in business. I have here in my hand the actual statements, accounts current, bills of sale, and memorandum covering the shipment and sale of all the wool grown by one firm covering the nine years from 1887 to 1895, inclusive (the period covering threatened Mills, actual McKinley and Wilson bills). The papers are too voluminous to print in full, and as they are the private papers of a business office I will not ask that they be incorporated in my remarks, but submit an abstract, showing concretely the transactions. These papers are originals, not copies, can be verified by affidavits of both vendors and vendees, and I will hold them at my desk subject to the inspection of any interested party.

I offer this as a fair criterion, because it is from not only a large but an old holding, founded over twenty years ago, using the same ranges ever since, and one methodically conducted. Furthermore, I know personally both sellers and buyers and all particulars about the flocks and their clip.

Under the baneful influence of the threatened Mills bill this wool in 1888 brought but a trifle over 14 cents per pound. It rose regularly through a Republican Administration to 18½ cents per pound, and when a Democratic Administration came it as regularly and more rapidly fell to 9 cents per pound.

Can anything be more conclusive than such evidence as this, drawn from the actual daily or yearly transactions in wool?

#### COMPARATIVE PRICES OF WOOL.

*Table showing annual shipments and returns from the total clip for nine years of a Western sheep grower to a Boston commission house, the wool being all that was grown from the flocks and their increase, and handled and shipped and sold in the same way every year.*

Year.	Number of pounds.	Net per pound at shipping point.	Date account was closed.	Remarks.
		<i>Cents,</i>		
1887....	262,773	14.06	Nov. 29, 1887	
1888....	229,646	14.06	Nov. 14, 1888	
1889....	304,961	15.9	Dec. 5, 1889	
1890....	369,387	17.8	Nov. 21, 1890	Administration changed this year from Democratic to Republican.
1891....	390,701	18.5	Feb. 27, 1892	McKinley bill passes, but after portion of clip was sold.
1892....	318,630	17	Apr. 4, 1893	McKinley bill in full force. Large part of clip yet unsold when Democratic party won at polls.
1893....	303,174	13.4	Jan. 1, 1894	Free wool threatened and Wilson bill introduced last of year.
1894....	218,388	9	Apr. 17, 1895	Wilson bill passes.
1895....	.....	.....	.....	Clip not yet all sold, but that portion sold indicates no higher prices than for 1894.

But I present further evidence.

It has been the custom of wool merchants and commission men to issue for the use of their clients and customers, circulars, from time to time, quoting market rates—prices actually given and taken in daily commerce. I have here in this bundle a full set of such circulars covering the past ten years. I have selected those showing prices of Wyoming, Utah, and vicinity, wool at and near important dates in the consideration of tariff bills, and I have marked off from the circulars I present all extraneous matter and the quotations of other sorts, so that the RECORD may not be unduly encumbered. But the entire collection is subject to the inspection of any Senator.

#### MILLS BILL WOOL FLUCTUATIONS.

January 5, 1888, before the Mills bill was introduced, prices were:

Territory (including Wyoming, Montana, and Utah) wools: The principal sales now are on a scoured basis of 62 to 65 cents for fine; 58 to 60 cents for fine medium, and 55 cents for medium. Prices of wool in the grease have ranged from 15 to 24 cents; but the bulk of the transactions were at 17 to 20 cents per pound.

Mills bill reported in the House April 2, 1888.

April 13, 1888, prices had fallen:

Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah-wool—	Cents.
Fine, average.....	14 to 16
Fine medium, average.....	16 to 19
Medium.....	17 to 20
Coarse.....	14 to 17

The Mills bill passed the House July 21, 1888, and was referred to Senate Finance Committee, and July 27 prices were:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, average.....	14 to 16
Fine, heavy.....	12 to 14
Fine medium.....	15 to 18
Medium.....	19 to 21

Thus it seems wool fell from 15 cents to 24 cents January 5, to 11 cents to 20 cents per pound April 13. The introduction of the bill had done this, whereas when the bill actually passed the House wool did not drop, but reacted to 12 cents to 21 cents, effects having been overdiscounted.

The Mills bill was reported to the Senate October 3, 1888, with free wool eliminated, and October 5 prices showed:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, average.....	15 to 17
Fine, heavy.....	13 to 15
Fine medium, average.....	16 to 19
Fine medium, heavy.....	14 to 16
Medium.....	18 to 21

A slight increase

In November, 1888, occurred the election of a Republican President and Congress, and November 23 wool is quoted at:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, average.....	16 to 17
Fine, heavy.....	14 to 15
Fine medium, average.....	18 to 21
Fine medium, heavy.....	16 to 17
Medium.....	20 to 23

An increase to just the prices prevailing before the Mills fiasco was precipitated upon us.

#### M'KINLEY BILL WOOL FLUCTUATIONS.

In April, when the bill was introduced, prices were:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good.....	16 to 17
Fine, heavy.....	13 to 15
Fine medium, good.....	18 to 19
Fine medium, heavy.....	16 to 17
Medium.....	20 to 23

In October, after the bill passed, the quotations were:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good.....	16 to 17
Fine, heavy.....	14 to 15
Fine medium, good.....	19 to 21
Fine medium, heavy.....	16 to 17
Medium.....	23 to 23

In April, 1891, the quotations show:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good .....	16 to 17
Fine, heavy .....	14 to 15
Fine medium, good .....	19 to 21
Fine medium, heavy .....	16 to 17
Medium .....	22 to 23

October, 1891, values have remained the same for nearly eighteen months last past :

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good .....	16 to 17
Fine, heavy .....	14 to 15
Fine medium, good .....	19 to 21
Fine medium, heavy .....	16 to 17
Medium .....	22 to 23

April, 1892, showed a slight average fall from six months before, but the same average as two years before, as follows :

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good .....	16 to 17
Fine, heavy .....	14 to 15
Fine medium, good .....	18 to 20
Fine medium, heavy .....	16 to 17
Medium .....	20 to 21

And now, after six quotations each, showing effects of Mills bill threatening, and McKinley bill accomplishments, we turn to

#### WILSON TARIFF BILL FLUCTUATIONS.

The bill was introduced in the House December 19, 1893, and December 29, ten days afterwards, we find the prices of wool have slumped away to but two-thirds the price last before quoted and before a free-wool bill was drawn ; thus again showing how the effect of threatened changes are discounted before their passage :

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good .....	12 to 13
Fine, heavy .....	9 to 11
Fine medium, good .....	13 to 14
Fine medium, heavy .....	11 to 12
Medium .....	13 to 14

One month more of Wilson bill scare and up to January 26, 1894, wool has slumped another cent per pound :

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good .....	10 to 11
Fine, heavy .....	9 to 10
Fine medium, good .....	11 to —
Fine medium, heavy .....	10 to 11
Medium .....	11 to 12

Wilson bill passed the House February 1, 1894, and February 23 wool had risen a little, as follows, showing again the paradoxical reaction process; but, aside from this, there existed a suspicion that the bill could not pass the Senate :

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good .....	10 to 11
Fine, heavy .....	9 to 10
Fine medium, good .....	11 to 12
Fine medium, heavy .....	10 to 11
Medium .....	11 to 12

June 22, 1894, the Senate having in the meantime agreed to the free-wool provision of the bill, another fall is recorded:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good .....	10 to 11
Fine, heavy .....	7 to 9
Fine medium, good .....	10 to 11
Fine medium, heavy .....	9 to 10
Medium .....	11 to 12

September 23, 1894, one month after the passage of the bill, the following

quotations, slightly higher, still again show that always present, but difficult to explain, "reaction:"

	Cents.
Utah and Wyoming wool—	
Fine, good.....	10 to 11
Fine, heavy.....	8 to 9
Fine medium, good.....	11 to 13
Fine medium, heavy.....	10 to 11
Medium.....	13

AS TO 1895.

The following is the market quotation for January 1, 1895, and is lower than the last quotation (September, 1894):

	Cents.
Utah and Wyoming—	
Unwashed, light fine.....	8 to 10
Unwashed, heavy fine.....	7 to 9
Unwashed, fine medium.....	10 to 11
Unwashed, selected medium.....	11 to 13
Unwashed, low.....	10 to 11

April 1, 1895, finds prices unchanged, as follows:

	Cents.
Utah and Wyoming—	
Unwashed, light fine.....	8 to 10
Unwashed, heavy fine.....	7 to 9
Unwashed, fine medium.....	10 to 11
Unwashed, selected medium.....	11 to 13
Unwashed, low.....	10 to 11

The 1st of April having passed, elections in many small cities and nearly all country towns showed the overwhelming drift of public sentiment in favor of Republicanism and protection, and confidence returned. Also the belief grew that 1896 election would emphasize those of 1894 and 1895 in this regard. Thus, the shortness of time remaining to the present Administration and the prospect of change, added to the unprecedented short stocks of woolen merchandise, have stimulated production and trade, and the convening of the Fifty-fourth Congress, with avowed intentions of imposing a tariff on wool, has also improved prices.

But the fact remains that fine staple Wyoming wool was selling in Boston at the beginning of 1893 at 60 cents the scoured pound. It is worth to-day barely 37 cents—other wools in proportion. These prices can be verified from the market reports of any reputable Boston journal or from the books of any reputable dealer.

Mr. President, I quote from the speech of the Senator from Missouri:

Fine, unmerchable, was worth in September, 1894, 13 to 15 cents. December 19, 1895, it was worth 14 to 15 cents, showing a gradual improvement in prices during one year under the Wilson law. These figures are taken from the American Wool and Cotton Reporter for December 19, 1895, which I have and can produce if necessary.

This is the nearest to proof of anything the Senator offered as to improving wool prices, but expected tariff relief is what stimulated this rise, as shown by the following, published just after the date mentioned. I ask the Secretary to read.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Boston Commercial Bulletin, December 28, 1895.]

The situation shows a decided change. There is more confidence among holders and more interest on the part of the buyers. The prompt movement in Congress to restore a duty on wool and to give greater protection to manufacturers is responsible for the changed condition of the market. \* \* \*

Holders in some cases have virtually withdrawn their wools from the market; others in some instances have placed limits on their stocks anywhere from 1 to 4 cents per pound above the level of early December sales, and all are indifferent about accepting business on the terms at which they would have taken it a fortnight ago. The advances asked, however, have not been established by actual sales, and the market is largely nominal pending developments. \* \* \* The situation is a novel one, as the wool trade never before faced the possibility of legislation to take wool off the free list, although it had abundance of experience of the disturbing effect of the movement to put it there and its results.

But whether the protective policy shall prevail in this instance or be halted by Executive disapproval, wool men generally feel that the vital change is not far off, and are therefore less disposed to part with stocks at recent low prices.

WHO KILLED COCK ROBIN ?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri asserts that

sheep have been butchered by the thousands, and that the shepherd kings, Mr. Lawrence and others, have caused it. True, the sheep have been, necessarily, butchered by thousands—yes, even by millions—to pay debts and expenses and provide food for the poverty-stricken sheep husbandman; in poverty because of the hostile or “incompetent Democrats”—to borrow the Senator's words—but not because of the advice of shepherd kings.

I send to the desk and ask to have read, first, a quotation from the Senator's speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paper will be read in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

We have heard from interested protective sources that sheep have been butchered by the thousand. It is true. Who caused it? The shepherd kings of Ohio, Mr. Lawrence and his colleagues, who, when we passed the Wilson bill, went among their people and said, “These incompetent Democrats have rendered your sheep worthless; cut their throats and pile them on the market.

Mr. WARREN. My esteemed friend from Missouri does himself great injustice in this declaration. He has been misinformed, and his statement is wholly without foundation in fact.

Mr. President, it is said figures will not lie. They will not if honestly given and not juggled with, but so-called statistics and figures under prejudiced and unfair arrangement are sometimes, indeed, the blackest of liars. I am reminded of this whenever called upon to scan the humbuggery of wool figures offered by free traders and self-appointed guardians of sheep growers and wool manufacturers, who assume to know more of these industries and what is good for them than the men who have devoted a lifetime to their up-building and improvement. It is asinine for those who repealed the McKinley bill to protest that they did it in the interest of the woolgrowers and wool manufacturers, and to claim credit for self-imposed services, patronizing hospitality and chaperonage.

Now let Mr. Lawrence speak. I send to the desk and ask to have read a quotation from a speech delivered by him before the Association of Woolgrowers of Ohio, copies of which were sent to thousands of sheep growers. Mr. Lawrence has in all his private and public utterances and letters, widely distributed, given similar advice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

#### WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH OUR SHEEP ?

Woolgrowing can not be made fairly remunerative under free wool. Our policy is to fatten and sell the wethers and old ewes, but keep all suitable for breeding and increase the number as rapidly as possible. If the year 1896 will, to a moral certainty, reverse the free-wool perfidy; then, even in advance of a new protective tariff law, sheep will rapidly go up in value.

We naturally ask, will not conditions improve before 1896, even under free wool? It is safe to say prices of wool will, like all other commodities, fluctuate, sometimes advance somewhat, and it is scarcely possible that prices can decline below the level of the free-wool prices of the last year.

In view of all this, woolgrowers are advised to keep and enlarge their flocks of breeding sheep.

Mr. WARREN. Now I ask to have read from the desk the marked paragraph in Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 77, which I send up, showing what the woolgrowers say, through their national association, in an address directed to every woolgrower in the land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whatever may be the result, this association urges all engaged in sheep husbandry—

- (1) To maintain State and county woolgrowers' associations.
- (2) To cooperate with the national association.
- (3) To maintain their flocks of sheep and especially to keep and increase the number of ewes, at whatever sacrifice. We so advise because, first, until the President's message of December 6, 1887, there never had been any political party which ventured to favor free wool, second, because only a portion of any political party now is committed to any such policy; and third, because, judging by apparent public sentiment manifested in many forms, and by the justice of the policy of protection, it is believed there never will be in any future Congress any danger to sheep husbandry by hostile legislation.

## INKY BLACKNESS.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this only serves to show the density, the enormous breadth, width, and depth, and the inky blackness of the Senator's misinformation regarding this whole subject.

## NO SUCH MONOPOLY.

It is idle to say that the wool men and woolgrowers are in connivance against consumers and that they propose "to exclude foreign wools, and to shut out the foreign manufacturer, and give them the monopoly." It has not been so during the eighty years of tariff. There has never been a year, perhaps never a month, that wool and woollen cloths have not come into this country from foreign shores. The Senator himself disproves this part of his speech by another portion when he says: "We imported of woollen fabrics \$36,987,904"—referring to 1893 under the McKinley tariff.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri says, and I quote him:

I see from the returns of protection papers, which never breathe a sentiment in favor of my opinions upon the tariff question, that the price of domestic wool has gone up in the United States; and, in addition to that, I can prove from the same sources that the woollen mills were never so prosperous as they are to-day and have been during the year 1895.

Protection papers, indeed! The Senator then offers as his only evidence from such quarters two items from the Wool and Cotton Reporter, one relating to wool, the other to manufacturers, neither one of which proves the Senator's assertion. But before disposing of the items let us accord due examination to their source.

Is this paper a protection sheet, and is its editor prominent in the ranks of protection? By no means. It was this very journal, the Wool and Cotton Reporter, that circulated the free wool petition in 1890 and presented it to Congress. Its proprietor, F. P. Bennett, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and, though not favoring "radical changes," as he said, fought the protectionist schedule and personally advocated free wool, or, what is much the same, a greatly reduced and ad valorem duty. The attitude of this very paper, later on, is shown by the article I send to the desk to have read:

The Secretary read as follows:

[From American Wool and Cotton Reporter of August 24, 1893.]

[Editorial.] A SIGNIFICANT APPOINTMENT.

\* \* \* But with Mr. Wilson at the head of the committee, ably seconded with reference to the woollen interests by the Hon. M. T. Stevens, woollen goods manufacturers may rest assured that their interests will not be unduly discriminated against. They may congratulate themselves that after the unsatisfactory experience which we have had under an excessively high protection, the new Administration gives evidence that it is not its intention to go to the other extreme. With free wools, which will enable our manufacturers to purchase their raw materials on the same terms with their foreign competitors, and an average duty on goods of about 40 per cent, which may be increased or decreased as the class of goods made may demand, there is abundant reason for the manufacturer to look forward with confidence to the future, which, when our currency laws are placed on a sound and business-like basis, will bring, we believe, a good measure of prosperity.

[At this point the honorable Senator from Wyoming yielded the floor to Mr. PUGH, to offer a resolution.]

Mr. WARREN. I have sent to the table and there has been read an editorial, which shows that that paper was for free wool. I desire to present to the Senate another article from that paper, and ask, Do the wool manufacturers indorse the paper quoted and its editors?

I send to the desk a few lines and ask that they be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The National Association of Wool Manufacturers has thought it necessary to adopt by unanimous vote a statement that—

In the judgment of this association Mr. F. P. Bennett, editor of the Wool Reporter, is not in accord with the views of the great body of the wool manufacturers of the United States, and his advocacy of tariff legislation prejudicial to the manufacturer, from the standpoint of membership in this association, is damaging to the best interests of the industry.

Mr. WARREN. After this reproof from the manufacturers we next find the proprietor of this "high protection paper" affiliating with the wool

First. That our live-stock interests had always thrived under Republican administration, the numbers and values together increasing, thus showing that it is not a matter of inflated inventory.

Second. That under Democratic administration both numbers and values of farm animals decrease, thus showing that it is not a change of book-keeping, but is a contraction such as the state of business and the markets of the day alone enforce.

Third. That this variation in prices applies to all classes of farm animals, with the single exception of the comparatively unimportant item of milch cows.

Fourth. That while many causes growing out of a wrong administration of our national affairs conduce to this shrinkage, yet in taking up the item of sheep and wool—the only one permitted me to review to-day—it is clearly demonstrated that in the free list and the lower revenue tariffs imposed by the Democratic party occurs the assassination of the sheep and woolgrowing industry.

Fifth. That the shrinkage shown in other farm-animal values is as surely, if not as directly, traceable to free-trade ideas and practices.

Sixth. That corresponding with our own great national shrinkage is an immense increase in the business of foreign countries in crowding our markets with products which our own wanton legislation has crowded its citizens out of producing.

Seventh. That while the sheep of the United States are worth but slightly more than one-half what they were two years ago, the wool exportation from England to America in 1895 was nearly triple that of 1894, the importations of woollens nearly quadrupled, and shoddy, that iniquitous adulterant and counterfeit, which defrauds the wearer of cheap and medium-priced clothing, increased by about 1,700 per cent.

Eighth. That the sheep growers, merchants, and woollen manufacturers alike protested against the changes proposed by the Wilson bill, and they have likewise all appeared before Congress since its passage with memorials, resolutions, and petitions asking immediate relief.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri held awe-stricken in their seats the members of this body by his scathing, drastic exhortation, or bastinado rather, of the members, individually and collectively, of the highest tribunal in the greatest and most illustrious Government on earth. Senators sat hushed and with bated breath listening to his brilliant, eloquent phrases, to his earnest pathos, as he fearlessly denounced the wearers of judicial ermine—who, from long-established custom and environment are debarred from "talking back"—for unworthiness and unfairness. And for what? Because, forsooth, law, or ordinance, or precedent, or rule, of nearly one hundred years' standing had been reversed by that court. And yet this same Senator glories in the fact accomplished, that the economic law, rule, and precedent of wool tariff—established and continuing for nearly eighty years—has been overturned by that anomalous absurdity, the Wilson bill, that crowning infamy that the Senate first pitied, then endured, and then embraced!

Will the Congress of the United States duly weigh and consider the deplorable conditions of our live-stock interests? Shall we not "about face" and change our un-American, unpatriotic policy of especial protection to foreign stock growers and manufacturers to that time-honored American policy of protecting the interests of our own citizens and institutions?

Shall we stop this drain of our gold for foreign wools and woollens, and turn the tide again in our favor by the collection of gold for imports on such as we do not produce?

Why, sir, the birds of the air, the beasts of the field, the very reptiles beneath our feet, protect their own! Is it then too much to ask the great American people, including the Democratic party, to do likewise? Shall we do less?