such as the chemical industry, and that educationists as a body commend it for its greater simplicity and for the time that would be saved if it were universally adopted. As we have before said, the reason why the English-speaking people have not adopted the system before now is that heretofore they have held such a predominance in manufacturing, especially in the textile and engineering trades, that their measures have not only been understood by almost all the world, but have governed the system of measures even in metric countries. But the Anglo-Saxon peoples no longer hold a monopoly of manufacturing, and this fact is becoming thoroughly appreciated in Great Britain if not in the United States. It will be appreciated in the latter country as soon as its foreign trade reaches nearly the proportions of that of Great Britain."

Returning to Mr. Dale's letter, we must accept his correction regarding the status of the British representations at the International Congress on counts of yarn. We believe it to be a fact nevertheless that the majority of those engaged in textile manufactures in Great Britain—especially those engaged in foreign trade —are in sympathy with the recommendations of that congress. The following is a report of the conclusions of the congress as published in the preface of a pamphlet containing the proposed tables, compiled by McLennan, Blair & Co., yarn merchants, of Glasgow:

All the varied systems of counts of yarn have evidently been created by the spinners and reelers for their own convenience, and are adapted to the special materials and thickness of yarn with which they are intended to deal. Very few of them are decimal. Little regard has been paid to the convenience of manufacturers, particularly to those who produce goods where several classes of yarn are used in the same fabric For facility of export to foreign countries, no consideration has been given at all. This confused state of counts is productive of much unnecessary labor. The urgent need of the trade, is a system of counts which will embrace all classes of yarns, be convenient for the spinner and reeler, and also for the manufacturer, and which will be understood in all countries. Count being the relationship of length to weight, it is obvious that such a system could not be attained unless there were one uniform system of weights and measures. The "Metric" system of weights and measures is so perfect, and has been adopted so widely, that it forms the most suitable basis for a uniform system of counts of yarns. Several conferences have been held on this subject, the most recent being that of Paris, in 1900, where it was agreed, that the best system was that of a fixed weight, and a variable count length. The unit was fixed at 1 metre, equal to 1 gram. Number 1 would mean that a length of 1 metre would weigh 1 gram; number 100 would be 100 metres per gram, etc. Exception was allowed for raw and thrown silks, to enable the count to show the degree of variation and irregularity incident to this class of material. The system agreed upon in that case was, on the contrary, that of a fixed length and a variable count weight. The length of skein adopted was 450 metres, and the unit of weight the ½ décigram; thus the count of a silk is expressed by the number of ½ décigrams which a length of 450 metres weighs. The count in International Metric System was also to be indicated on the bulletin. As the old systems of counts have some technical conveniences, they will no doubt in many cases for some time be retained. A principal object of the present series of tables is to enable spinners and reelers, with ease to mark on their packages and invoices, in addition to the local count, the equivalent in the International Metric System. This would facilitate the export trade, and be convenient for all calculations made in metres and grams. For single yarns the Metric System requires no explanation. For folded yarns the Congress decided, that the number should indicate the completed thread, no matter of how many strands it may be formed, or what may be the counts of these different elements.

The very confusion in yarn counts, so well set forth by Mr. Dale, is the best argument that can possibly be used for a universal count based on the metric system. If it were adopted by Great Britain and the United States, the largest textile manufacturing nations in the world, it would in a comparatively short time become practically universal. No such universality can be hoped for while the British and American people have in their own trades so many different systems. At the worst it would only add one more system to the hundred already in use in various countries; at the best it would merge them into one rational system, understood by the whole world, and from which calculations can be more easily made than by any other system.

As for British textile opinion, we would call Mr. Dale's attention to the fact that at the annual meeting of the British Silk Association, just held, the following resolution was adopted by a unanimous vote:

"That this meeting of the Silk Association desires to re-affirm that as one uniform international standard of weights and measures would be of great assistance to the silk industry, the Association desires to urge the necessity for H.M. Government promoting legislation providing for the compulsory adoption of the metric system of weights and measures."

As for British opinion in other departments of the textile trades, we quote the following from an article in the Textile Mercury, written as a comment on the book published by Messrs. Halsey and Dale:

"From the tone of the book we question whether the authors have grasped the metric system thoroughly, or whether they have yet ever purchased articles in countries where it is practised. If they had, certain statements would probably not have been made—for instance, that the retail buyer purchasing cloth would ask for 5/10ths of a yard instead of a half, and so on. As a matter of fact such cumbersome fractions are no more used where the metric system prevails than they are in England or America; people buying in shops ask for a "half metre" of cloth, or "quarter kilo" of tea, as would be the case if the system came into use here. Further, the authors are not quite fair in contrasting the divisions of English with those of the metric system, for, while they give the latter in full they do not give those of the former. We wonder, for instance, whether they have heard of the foot, or the hundred-weight. In the textile trades the yard and the inch are mostly used, the former for indicating the length of the pieces, and the latter for the width of a piece, while the metre in practical use is the measure of length, and the centimetre the measure of width, the centimetre being equally as good a measure of the number of picks in a cloth as an inch. The authors