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The committee met at 10 a.m.

Thomas L. Livermore examined.

Mr. Pugh. Please read the latter part of the resolution of the Senate, which I now hand you, defining the powers and duties of this committee.

(The witness read the resolution.)

Mr. Pugh. I understand that you have been a lawyer in your time, and I wish you would now proceed, if you please, to give the committee such facts and information and such opinions as you consider pertinent to the subject of investigation as defined by that resolution, and without waiting for any special question. You may proceed in your own way, and state anything in the shape of facts from your own personal knowledge or from information which you regard as reliable, or any opinions which your experience may suggest to you upon the subjects embraced in the resolution, first stating, if you please, your residence and occupation, and what opportunities you have had to understand the subjects under investigation, so as to give force and effect to your statements.

The Witness. I live in Manchester, N. H., and am agent in this place for the Amoskeag Manufacturing Company. I have the management of the affairs of the corporation here. I have had that management as agent for four and a half years. Before that time I practiced law in Boston for over ten years, and before that for a short time in New Hampshire. Before that time I was in the volunteer service of the United States for four years during the war of the rebellion. While practicing law I was much concerned in the trial of patent causes, and in that way became familiar with mechanical and industrial questions.

The Amoskeag Manufacturing Company—its Mills and their Capacity.

The Amoskeag Manufacturing Company has on its pay-rolls usually from 5,500 to 6,000 people, and in the management of these people I think I have become familiar with the questions embraced in the resolution which has been shown me, so far as those questions have been developed in this place.

By Mr. Pugh:

Question. What is the capacity of the mills to manufacture, and what do they manufacture?—Answer. The mills under my charge use about 40,000 bales of cotton a year, and produce between 55,000,000 and 60,000,000 yards of cloth, at a cost of between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000 per annum.
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Q. You mean that is the cost of the production of the cloth?—A. That is the cost of the cloth.

I should add that, in addition to manufacturing cloth, I carry on for the company the management of the water-works which run the mills in this place, and also the construction of buildings and structures relating to manufacturing establishments, and in that capacity have employed and dealt with many hundreds of laboring people.

Q. That is, outside of the number of operatives?—A. That was included in the 5,500 to 6,000. It is a varying number on that account.

The cloth manufactured by our company is mainly cloth manufactured out of yarn that has been dyed. We dye this yarn. The articles are ticks, denims, cheviots, awnings, and gingham. Besides this we make cotton flannels which are not dyed.

The cost of the labor is about 30 per cent. of the total cost of the goods. That labor amounts to about $1,500,000 a year.

The amount of capital employed, and of plant in the mills, and for quick capital, is about equal to the cost of the yearly product. It takes about as much money for quick capital as it does for establishing the plant and running the mills—after our fashion of running them. As I understand it, those mills which do not have quick capital have to borrow it and pay interest upon it, in order that they may be successful.

COTTON-MILL WAGES.

I have here a memorandum of the wages which we have paid, taken from the rolls of two of our large mills (embracing the one the coarsest and the other the finest work that we make) in the month of July last, which was a fair month to make an estimate from, and is the latest month in which we have run full time, inasmuch as low water has interfered with our operations since then. Our average wages—the average wages of all employed in the mills—for the different departments are as follows: For carding, males, $1.29; females, 95 cents. For spinning, males, $1.61; females, 95 cents. For mule spinning, $1.09. For dressing, $1.28.

The average for the mule spinning and dressing is for both males and females together, as I have not been able readily to separate them. The same is the case with those that I am now about to give: For weaving, $1.34; in the cloth-room, $1.25; dye-house, $1.42; carpenters and mechanics, $1.73. This last item is of people not employed in the mills, but outside the mills, in repairs of the mills.

The average which I have given includes the wages of children as well as adults; as, for instance, some mule spinners get $1.65, and upwards per day, but the wages of the boys in the room bring down the average. So in dressing, the wages of some of the men are $1.50 per day, but the wages of the boys and women bring down the average; and so of the carpenters and mechanics. Some of them get $3 a day, but apprentices and beginners get less, and that brings down the average.

WAGES OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

By the Chairman:

Q. What rate of prices do the women, children, and apprentices receive? It varies, no doubt, very much.—A. It varies very much. There is a wide scale, but in some of these departments women earn as much as $1.25 and $1.35 a day, and the children run all the way from 40 cents a day upwards, depending upon their age and capacity. Some of the men weavers earn as high as $1.67 a day.
COST OF NEW HAMPSHIRE LIVING OF MILL OPERATIVES.

As to the cost of living, I would say that we have a pretty accurate gauge of that in our boarding-houses. The company maintains a number of substantial brick buildings which it lets to boarding-house keepers at a very low rent, upon the condition that they shall charge to women in the employ of the company fixed rates for board and lodging, which are agreed to by the company. At the present time, this rate for women is $2.25 a week for board and lodging; so that, for instance, the women in the carding and spinning departments who average 95 cents a day will earn $5.70 per week, and they are boarded and lodged for $2.25 per week, which leaves to them $3.45 a week, out of which they must pay for their clothing, which is not necessarily expensive, and the rest they can save if there are no extra calls upon them. Besides these boarding-houses, the company maintains seven hundred tenements of a substantial character for families, which it lets to its employés for about $1 a month per room. Many of these tenements have from four to six rooms, so that the rent of the families occupying them is from $48 to $72 per annum. All these boarding-houses and tenements are kept in repair and policed for sanitary purposes by the company.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. What is about the average cost of these houses? — A. About $1,500 a tenement.

Q. The rent of them is less than 5 per cent. on the price? — A. The net rent to the company, deducting repairs and taxes, is about 3 per cent.

Q. State what is the location and what are the sanitary conditions of the houses as to ventilation, cleanliness, &c.? — A. These houses are situated upon good land, which is well drained. They are supplied with water from the city water works, and I think they will compare favorably with private dwellings in point of ventilation, warmth, and health generally. Of course, the cleanliness of the interior depends upon the family occupying the houses for the time being, but we endeavor to exercise an influence which will promote cleanliness on the part of the families.

The Amoskeag Company is peculiarly situated in having a large body of land in this city which is not occupied by dwellings, and which it allows its employés to cultivate for the nominal rent of $1 per annum, where they find it convenient to cultivate garden patches.

A hospital is maintained by a charitable association of ladies in the city in a building which is furnished by the company free of rent. This hospital is open to all persons who need its shelter, but the company (and I think the other corporations in the city) have contributed to its support for the purpose of securing its shelter for such of their employés as need it.

Q. What is the general health of your employés? — A. I think that the general health may be said to be good. It is the desire of the mill-managers in this part of the country, generally, I believe, to light, heat, ventilate, and care for their mills generally so as to make them as healthy and agreeable as circumstances will allow; for other considerations not taken into account, the best mill in this respect would produce the best and the most cloth. Bad ventilation and discomfort generally has, I think, a palpable effect upon the quantity and character of product of the mill. The operative working in a well-lighted, well heated, and
well ventilated mill would retain his strength and spirits to the end of the day, when one working in a mill which was not well lighted and heated and ventilated, would flag toward the end of the day, and not be at his best as a laborer.

HOURS OF MILL LABOR IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The hours of labor in the mills here, for those who work the longest are from 6.30 a.m. to 12 and from 1 to 6.45 p.m., and on Saturday until 4 p.m.; making an average of about ten and three-quarters hours per day for each of the six working days of the week. But large numbers of the employees in the mill are enabled to finish their work sooner than the rest, and they average ten hours and some of them less per day.

OLD-TIME HOURS OF MILL LABOR.

I am informed, and have no doubt from my investigation that it is true, that forty years ago the hours of labor averaged fourteen and a half per day in the mills; that they were gradually reduced by the voluntary act of the mill managers until they reached the limit which I have given as that of to-day. I suppose this reduction was made possible, and was in a large degree due to the improvements in machinery and methods of manufacture which enabled the mills to keep up their product as time went on with reduced hours of labor.

NATIONALITY OF MILL OPERATIVES.

The people employed in the mills here are of various nationalities. In the Amoskeag mills I think that nearly one-third are Canadians, perhaps one-fourth are of Irish birth or parentage, perhaps one-fifth are Yankees, and the remainder Germans, Scotch, and English. There is a considerable German element here.

Q. What seems to be the fact as to the increase or diminution of the number of Americans who go into these manufacturing industries?—A. Relatively to the people of other nationalities, the Americans decrease, but absolutely there are, I think, more Americans at work to-day in the mills of Manchester than there were thirty years ago.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you think that is generally true of mills throughout New England?—A. Well, as far as I know, I think it is of New Hampshire— I won't speak for New England. I think it is true of New Hampshire, but I am subject to correction on that point, because I have never investigated very carefully as to other places than Manchester. Thirty years ago the total number of employees was very much less than now. The number of mills has in that time considerably increased, and then or a little before then, the Americans who were likely to work in the mills were enough to fill all the places, but they are not enough now, and those of them who are in the mills have for the most part the more attractive and more profitable kinds of employment, as for instance, the machinists, the carpenters, the cloth room hands, “the drawing” in girls, and the like embrace many Americans. I do not know but that I have gone as far as I can, within the line embraced by the question, without some special interrogation.
MILL-WORK OF AMERICAN AND FOREIGN OPERATIVES COMPARED.

Q. As to the amount of work they do in the time they are employed, how does it compare between the Americans and foreigners? Is there any difference?—A. We think that a smart Yankee, with his intelligence and bringing-up, is the best workman, but of course this rule, if it be a rule, is subject to exceptions. The Canadians, as far as my observation and inquiry instruct me, are among the most active people—among those who can do the most work in a given time. They, I think, would be looked upon with as much favor by mill managers as any class of people who come to us, if they were more stable. But many of them seem to be inclined to look upon their employment here as but temporary, and to cherish the love of their native land and the desire to return there when they have earned enough money to buy a homestead.

Q. They do not become citizens?—A. Not to that extent that other foreigners do. This is not true entirely, because some of them do become citizens, and I think that in the course of time, as they find out how much to their advantage it would be to become citizens, they will do so more generally. The people who come from across the sea, such as the Irish and Germans, are more stable. They do not generally contemplate returning to the land of their birth, and are therefore, I think, looked upon as people more to be relied upon to stay through the summer and winter at their employment.

Q. As a rule, how long have these employés been in the service of the company you represent?—A. The terms have been very various. Perhaps the best illustration of the amount and frequency of changes is to be found in the fact that each month we have about 10 per cent. of our people leave.

Q. A voluntary leaving?—A. A voluntary leaving, yes; but of course many of these, after taking a vacation, return, so that it is impossible to say how many of them leave not to return. On the other hand, there are many people who have been in the employ of our company from twenty to forty-five years, some of whom have been constantly in the company's employ. It is our desire, as I think it is the desire of all the mills here, to have their employés as permanently employed as they are willing to be.

Q. What is the habit of the laborers in employing their families in the same industry?—A. I think that that is a general habit, especially among the Canadians, where almost the whole family will often be employed in the mill.

CONTENTMENT OF MILL OPERATIVES IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Q. What is your knowledge of the state of feeling among your operatives, as a general fact, as to their satisfaction with their condition, their living, and their wages, their contentment or discontent or distrust, or any want of confidence in their employers? We want to get at the relation and state of feeling in point of fact existing between the employers and employés.—A. I think that as a whole, the working people in our employ are not discontented with their pay or their condition. Of course, I suppose that every one on earth who is employed would be glad if he could get more wages than he does get, but I think that, generally, in this place, the people are contented to remain on the terms under which they are employed. I know of one illustration which has occurred recently. Owing to the low water in the river the Amoskeag Company, was obliged to shut down most of its mills for three weeks.
in September. The doors were not opened during that time, and about 4,000 looms were stopped, and the carding and spinning machinery which supplied these looms was stopped. If there had been any considerable discontent I think that the people would have left at this time and sought employment elsewhere, but as a matter of fact, when the rain came, notice was given, as well as we could give it through the churches and otherwise on Sunday, that on Monday morning work would be resumed, and at half past 6 on Monday morning 3,400 out of the 4,000 looms were started, and before the end of the week they were substantially all started, showing that the people had waited here to get back their employment during the three weeks of idleness.

Q. You closed your mills on account of the dry weather? — A. On account of the drouth. I am reminded by Mr. McDuffie that during this period of enforced idleness there were advertisements in the local papers in Fall River and elsewhere offering employment in the mills there to people who would come from here.

POWERS OF MILL OVERSEERS.

It is the system in the mills here, as I suppose it is generally in New England and elsewhere, to employ overseers — men who are skilled in the particular departments — carding, spinning, weaving, &c., to take charge, each of a given room or set of rooms, and to give to each of these overseers the privilege of hiring the people who are to work under him, and of discharging them for cause.

Q. The power is absolute, without any appeal to the employer? — A. Oh, there is an appeal in all cases, and I may say that I hold myself open to a private appeal from any man, and I have no doubt the other managers in this place do, and I think that all feel bound to investigate every complaint, and to administer justice, if further justice than has already been meted out is necessary. The overseers are limited as to the amount of wages they shall pay, the number of people they shall employ, and in other directions, but they are held responsible for the amount and character of the work they shall turn out, and this, of course, is a great incentive to good conduct on their part toward their help, because an unpopular overseer finds it very difficult to keep his list of hands full, and if he cannot do that he is not looked upon as a desirable person to have as an overseer.

Now, these overseers have the duty of keeping the time and amount of work done by their hands, and of reporting that to the agent of the mills, so that they may be paid upon that report, and in case any one leaves without giving notice, which they are required to agree to give before leaving the employ of the mills, the overseer in the first instance determines whether they have left with cause or without cause, and if a dispute arises between the person leaving and the overseer, the person has a right to bring that, by appeal, to the mill manager — the agent. Out of the five hundred cases per month of persons leaving the employ of the company, I do not think that there is an average of two appeals to me upon the question of wages or of leaving without notice, and I believe that this shows that there is both fairness on the part of the overseers and confidence in them on the part of the employees.

NO LABOR UNIONS IN MANCHESTER, N. H.

Q. Have you any labor unions here? What is the fact as to the number of your employés who belong to labor unions? — A. I do not think
that there is a labor union in this city, and I do not think that there has ever been one here which lasted. There have been several attempts to form unions since I have been here by agitators from the outside, mainly from Fall River, I think, and from one cause or another they have always failed.

**STRIKES.**

Upon inquiry and investigation I have been led to believe that there has never been more than one general strike in this place, and that occurred about thirty years ago. I think that was a strike due to a change in the hours of labor, which was instituted by the mills, and I believe that the strike failed. Since that time there have been small strikes of detached portions of employés, but I never heard of one resulting in success. Some three or four years ago I had a strike of about one hundred of my dyers for higher wages. I thought that the strike was unreasonable and refused to accede to the demands of the strikers, and the result was that after staying away from their work about a week a large part of them—one half or more—came and asked me to take them back in the employ of the company. At that time I took pains to personally interrogate all of the men who came to me, to inquire why they had taken that means of trying to get higher wages, and I must say that with one or two exceptions they seemed to have been actuated rather by the fear of being odd and the fear of the censure of their fellow-workmen than by any discontent of their situation.

**HOURS OF LABOR IN MASSACHUSETTS AND NEW HAMPSHIRE COMPARED.**

Q. How is it as to the supply of labor here generally, so far as you know—of manufacturing labor?—A. The supply of labor in this place, so far as I know, has generally been good; it has been sufficient. That, I have no doubt, is due in a degree to the proximity of this place to the Canadian border, and to its being situated upon a railroad which brings down many Canadians; but I think it is due in a greater degree to the wages which are paid here, which are greater for the same kind of work, I am informed and believe, than are paid, for instance, in Lowell, our nearest manufacturing neighbor, in Massachusetts; and I have been led to believe that this difference is due mainly to the fact that the hours of labor are unlimited here, while in Massachusetts there is a ten-hour law, for it seems to be certain that no law can bring it about that eleven hours' pay shall be paid for ten hours' work. And very recently, in determining whether my scale of wages was one that ought to be maintained, I went to Lowell and had careful inquiry made among several of the leading manufacturing establishments there as to their rates of wages; and upon the information which I got in that way, I was led to believe that we were paying here at least an increase proportioned to the hours of labor; in some cases a little more; that is to say, we were paying wages, as compared with theirs, in the proportion of 10½ to 10, which are the respective hours of labor in the two places. I have no doubt that the ample supply of labor here is to be attributed, in some degree, also, to the favorable character of the place for a residence and to the tenements which are kept for the people. I have been informed that during the last year, when labor was not scarce here, it was scarce in Lowell and Lawrence in reputable mills, where all conditions, excepting, perhaps, wages, were as good as those here. I attribute that to the difference in the hours of labor.
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POWER OF ENDURANCE OF MILL OPERATIVES.

By the Chairman:

Q. What is your observation as to the length of time or the hours of labor that the operative is capable of enduring without physical or other injury?—A. My belief is that he can work ten and three-quarter hours on an average without injury, and I may say that in a limited degree I had some experience myself as a youth, for I worked at a mechanical employment for a while; but of course my judgment must be formed mainly from my observation here. If one goes upon the main street here in the evening—Elm street—he will see the sidewalks crowded as densely as Broadway, New York, by the mill operatives who have finished their work and got their suppers and come out to promenade and see the shops and each other, and they seem to be merry and happy and laughing. I do not think that it is an exaggeration to say that you may often see on the sidewalks here in the evening thousands who have come out under those circumstances. Now, if it were the fact that they were prostrated and tired out by the hours of labor, they would not be out I think as a rule.

Q. There is another point often discussed in connection with that. It is claimed by many people that the same operatives will accomplish as much work in ten hours as they will in eleven or a longer period. What is your opinion on that point, and what your knowledge from your own observation and your intercourse with other men who have had experience in the employment of labor?—A. I do not believe that that is the fact, and the first and most powerful argument with me is what I have already referred to—that the manufacturer in Massachusetts submits to a scarcity of help rather than raise his wages to the point that we pay, and I cannot understand why that should be the fact if he can get as much in ten hours as we get in ten and three-quarters. I do not believe it is the fact.

THE WORK IS DONE BY THE MACHINERY.

Much of the work that is done by the day in the mills is such work as treadling cards and the carding machinery, such as fly-frames, drawframes, spinning frames, &c., by women and girls. That is not labor requiring strenuous muscular exertion. They are sitting down much of the time, where a mill is running as we like to have it done. This labor requires attention. They must go to one frame and another and tie a piece of thread that is broken, or take off or put on a bobbin, or put on a spool with “roving,” and that is labor which does not require muscular exertion to any considerable extent, but requires attention. That machine never tires. It does as much in the eleventh hour as it does in the first hour. It is the machine that does the work; it is the operative who keeps her eye upon it and keeps it fed with material and keeps it cleared out of the manufactured article.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. How many mules can they run?—A. I am now speaking of spinning-frames, which girls tend. Women do not tend mules; that is the work of men. A pair of mules is a varying factor, because it may have more or may have less spindles. Some may have 1,800 spindles, for instance, sometimes.

As I was saying, it is the machine that does the labor; it is the woman or girl who gives it attention, and I really do not think she can give
any closer attention in the first hour than in the eleventh hour, provided she is a healthy person, fit to work in a mill.

Q. How generally does that illustration apply to the whole labor in a mill?—A. That applies generally to perhaps a half of the operatives in the mills. There is another kind of work which requires more muscular exertion, which is done mainly by men, such as work in the dresser-rooms and in the dye-houses, where they have to do heavy lifting and hard work, and they have shorter hours of labor. Some of them work less than ten hours.

Q. How is that arranged? Do they work by the piece?—A. Part of them by the piece and part not. The fact of the matter is it regulates itself. Where we find labor too hard for more than ten hours, we stop it, and the machinery is so balanced that the slashers on which, for instance, they work ten hours, take care of the yarn that is spun in ten and three-quarters hours by the rest of the machinery. Then, there is the weaving, which is done by the piece, and it is a fact to which I think every mill manager whom you will encounter, will testify that the weavers are anxious to begin work at the earliest moment and to quit at the latest moment, and that it would not be difficult to find many of them who would be glad if we would keep the mills open longer, because the longer the mills are open the longer the looms work and the more money they make.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. They work by the piece?—A. Yes; so many yards constitute a "cut," and they get so much more pay.

OPERATION OF LAWS LIMITING HOURS OF LABOR.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Suppose a system were introduced of paying, substantially, by the hour or by the piece, and it prevailed all through your entire system of work, and then the proposition was made to the operatives to absolutely limit the hours of labor to ten, nine, or eight hours. Do you think that the operatives themselves would approve of that proposition, or would they prefer to work longer and get more pay?—A. I do not think they would approve of it.

Q. If it were submitted to them, you think they would decide adversely?—A. Of course, if the operatives were persuaded that by the reduction of the hours of labor, the manufacturers would be compelled to pay more per cut, so that they could earn as much in the nine hours as they could in the eleven hours, I suppose they would willingly agree to it, but taking things as they are, with economic laws governing the prices to be paid, I do not think you would find one in a hundred who would agree to the reduction of hours under the circumstances which you suppose.

Q. Then in order to enact a ten, or say, an eight hour law—it would be a matter of indifference as to the number of hours in excess of ten—to be really enforced the compulsion would have to extend to the operatives as well as the manufacturer, would not that be so?—A. I see no other way.

Q. No one should be allowed by law to work more than that number of hours?—A. Yes. If you were to make a thing optional with the operatives, and part of the work were piece-work and part were day-work, I do not see myself how the law could result in any good, because it would either result that all the operatives would agree that they wished
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to work eleven hours, supposing that be the number that was deemed advisable, or else part would want to work eleven and part eight or nine; and the manufacturer could not afford to supply the increased quantity of machinery to those who wished to work eight hours to keep up with those who wished to work eleven, I should think. That is something, however, that I have never figured out, but I should suppose that that would be so.

PROBABLE EFFECT OF EIGHT-HOUR LAW WITH TWO SETS OF HANDS PER DAY.

Q. How would it operate upon the interests of the manufacturer, and how upon the working people, in your judgment, if hours could be reduced so that the machinery could be employed, say, for illustration, sixteen hours a day, and two sets of hands employed, each working eight, would such a system as that be practicable, and, if so, what would be the effect upon the wages of each individual operative do you think?—A. I do not know whether it would be practicable. I can see objections to it, but whether they would be insuperable I am really unable now to say. The three chief objections to it which I see now are these: With two sets of hands running the same set of machinery it would be very difficult to place the responsibility for the care of the machinery upon either; that is a very important factor in maintaining a mill. Then it would be very difficult to find time to repair that machinery, and it would all have to be done in the night-time. You would have to keep a set of workmen in the night-time, which would be more expensive and troublesome. Then the risk of fire would be increased very largely by reason of the lighting of the mills at night. At the present time the insurers object to running the mills beyond 10 o'clock at night, for instance.

Q. The danger of fire increases later in the night-time, does it?—A. Yes, on account of the gas, and the difficulty of seeing around under the machinery for hot bearings, and all that sort of thing, which induces fire. Whether those expenses would be so great as to make it too expensive to manufacture, could only be told, I suppose, by trial.

Q. There would be this about it, that the machinery, which is perhaps the cheapest production in the mills, would work twice as long.—A. Not twice as long, but it would work sixteen hours a day. It would be twice as long if you worked twenty-two hours a day. Then there is this further consideration to be taken into account—whether machinery would in the course of a year do twice as much work by working twice as long. Some mechanics think that machinery needs rest; and the item of repairs of machinery is a very great item in the cost of running a mill. We read of people who make very large profits in running their mills for a year or two or three or four or five years, we will say, and then suddenly for some reason which is not obvious to the public, the mills become bankrupt, when the real reason is that they are worn out. It is not safe to calculate that you can run a mill without spending on an average 10 per cent. per annum of the value of the machinery on repairs and renewals of machinery, and that is a subject which requires very careful attention in running a mill. I know a mill which ran night and day—a cotton-mill—it is the only one I think, that I ever saw do it. That is the mill at Atlanta, Ga., and they thought it succeeded, but I believe the mill was not a financial success. I think it failed. Whether the failure was due to that I do not express any opinion.

Q. Is that recently?—A. Yes; I should not suppose, however, that that was the origin of the difficulty, because I think that was done after it went into the receiver's hands.
Q. Do you think it would be possible to get the necessary number of laborers to supply the working interests of the country where machinery was employed largely, if more than one relay of hands was used?—A. That I do not know. Take the case of Lowell and Lawrence that I have instanced, where they have had a scarcity of labor for their present hours, it would seem as though that scarcity would be multiplied by running twice as many hours. I would be perhaps remedied by paying higher wages.

Q. But that would interfere with the marketing of the production!—A. Yes; and it is a question whether, if you paid higher wages, you could afford to run the mill.

Q. Or to employ anybody?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked the question because the suggestion has been made by many labor reformers, as they are termed, that even six hours, considering the increased productive power of machinery or of the human being and machinery combined, would be as long as laboring people ought to be expected to work—as long as the interests of society require that they should, and inasmuch as there are many unemployed people, a reduction of the hours of labor would give something to others to do. The question whether it could be made to work practically is the serious thing.

The WITNESS. I do not believe at all in such theories. I think that at least in a free country like this, with thousands of miles of land to be taken up in a vast area of country which is inhabited by people occupied in industrial pursuits, and the great variety of employments to be found in this country, it is perfectly safe for at least the life-time of this generation to leave the question of how a man shall work, and how long he shall work, and where he shall work, and what wages he shall get, to himself. It is as certain that wages in a country situated as ours is, will adjust themselves to the level required by the demand and the market, as it is that water will seek its level. I do not believe that any one has ever yet seen in this country a time when distress on the part of the laboring people was universal. It has occurred in certain industries and in certain places without any question, but, every time, the tremendous field which is afforded to the laboring man in which to find employment has come to his relief, and with a little foresight, a little forethought, a little energy, he has been able to find some employment in which he could earn his living and a little more.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. The complaining demand often comes for a particular kind of work in a particular place at higher wages?—A. Yes.

Q. They want to stay in the cities and do the work that they are accustomed to?—A. That is true.

Q. There is a great opposition to change; they cannot get rid of the charm of city life, although it be in tenement houses and frequently without pure air or food?—A. That is true.

CHILD LABOR IN COTTON MILLS.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Won't you please tell us your experience with the case of child labor; how it is, and to what extent it exists here; why it exists, and whether, as it is actually existing here, it is a hardship on a child or on a parent; or whether there is any evil in that direction that should be remedied?—A. There is a certain class of labor in the mills which, to put it in very common phrase, consists mainly in running about the
floor—where there is not as much muscular exercise required as a child would put forth in play, and a child can do it about as well as a grown person can do it—not quite as much of it, but somewhere near it, and with proper supervision of older people, the child serves the purpose. That has led to the employment of children in the mills, I think.

EFFECTS OF LABOR-SAVING MACHINERY.

Q. Before you proceed with that subject, I would like to ask you this question as to the effect of improvements in labor-saving machinery: whether it has been to relieve the human agent, in the production of the harder, or of the lighter portions of the muscular effort necessary to produce the manufactured article?—A. Both.

Q. Then, as the complete effect of it, does the operative work as hard now in producing a yard of cloth as he did fifty years ago?—A. As far as I am able to judge from what I have heard and read of work fifty years ago, I should say that he did not work nearly as hard.

Q. Disregarding the length of hours of labor!—A. Yes. Take for instance the loom. In Germany and even in some parts of this country, as in the mountains of North Carolina, if we believe what we saw in the cotton exposition at Atlanta, they work hand-loomed yet and make considerable cloth.

The CHAIRMAN. They have done it in New Hampshire within my recollection.

The WITNESS. Yes; to-day the loom is worked by power. So that the mule, which is a difficult machine to manage, has become automatic—which relieves the mule spinner a good deal. Is not that so, Mr. McDuffie?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Oh, yes; the old operator required a strong power of hand to start it.

Q. Then what would you say as to the effect that the invention and development of machinery has had—that it has not only largely lessened the hours or duration of labor, but also rendered the work, for the time the operative is employed, much easier?—A. I should say so. I will cite in that connection a very recent illustration of it. By an improved method of dyeing yarn which I have introduced in our mills—a method which was invented abroad—we have relieved probably one hundred men from the very strenuous labor of wringing the skeins of yarn after they have been dried. It is all done by machinery now.

Q. On that same point and from your knowledge of the subject, would you say that labor is any less difficult to procure to-day than it was fifty or seventy-five or one hundred years ago? Are the people as generally employed as they desire to be, or as they were then? I do not mean in this specific locality, but take the nation as a whole?—A. Well, I should say from all that I have read and know, that it was much easier; that people are more generally employed in mechanical pursuits now than they were then in proportion to population. Fifty years ago the number of mechanical pursuits which a person could turn his hand to in this country were very few. Farming and certain labor which was entirely hand labor I think engrossed most people.

Q. Then this subdivision of labor which comes from the introduction of machinery and the simplification of the process that each one goes through in performing labor, is counterbalanced largely by a multiplication of the sources of employment?—A. Yes.

Q. By the development of new industries and trades and the modification of old industries so as to develop different kinds of work?—A. I think that is so.
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CHILD LABOR.

Q. I was asking you about child labor, but there is a little "lead" in that direction in regard to which we have heard a good deal of testimony generally, though not from such witnesses as yourself, and their ideas on that subject it is well to give to the public—to the working people as well as others. You were going on to say that there was much work in a mill that children could perform without much more muscular exercise than they perform in play. Will you continue what you were about to say on that subject?—A. Yes. Now, a good many heads of families, without any question in my mind, were not sufficiently considerate of the mental and physical welfare of their children, and they put them to work in the mills perhaps too early and certainly kept them there too much of the time in former years, and the legislature had to step in and protect the children against the parents by requiring that they should go to school a certain number of months or weeks in a year, or else they should not be allowed to work in the mills; and at the present time there is a very severe law in this State applicable to children—I think some under twelve and some under sixteen. I do not remember the terms of it, but the child has to have a certificate of the authorities in control of the schools that he has been to school the time required by the statute before the mill manager is able to employ him. I think the mill manager is subject to a very considerable penalty for non-compliance with that law. In this city in our mills, and as far as I know in the rest of the mills, we have been very particular to observe the statute. I do not know how it is outside of the city. I suppose that it may depend a good deal upon public sentiment. If public sentiment supports the law, it will be enforced; if it does not, it will not be. I think public sentiment does support it here to an extent, although I think it extends a little too far in preventing children up to sixteen working in mills more than a given time. Mr. McDuff suggests to me, what is the fact, that the city authorities here have an officer who makes it his business to go through the mills to see whether the law is complied with or not.

DANGER OF OVER-EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LABORERS.

Now, I think that when it is provided that a child shall go to school as long as it is profitable for a workman's child (who has got to be a workingman himself) to go to school, the limit has been reached at which labor in the mills should be forbidden. There is such a thing as too much education for working people sometimes. I do not mean to say by that that I discourage education to any person on earth, or that I think that with good sense any amount of education can hurt any one, but I have seen cases where young people were spoiled for labor by being educated to a little too much refinement.

Q. You have known something of farm life, and the necessity that a boy is put under of learning to farm while he is still a boy?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, with reference to the acquirement of the necessary skill to earn a living, without which an education would amount to little—a man having enough knowledge to starve upon has not much advantage—do you think that the child should be withheld from the educating idea in the industrial line to so large an extent as the law now requires?—A. I do not.

Q. Is there danger of too much abstention from that sort of practical education which enables a child when grown to earn his living?—A. I
think so. I will state that in our machine shops we take apprentices to learn the trade of a machinist, which is one of the best trades that any man in this country can have. We agree that if they will agree to serve three years for pay which enables them to live, we will teach them the trade of a machinist; and it is a curious illustration of the effect of very advanced common schools that our foremen prefer for apprentices boys from the country, who have worked on farms and been to a district school a little while, to boys that have been educated in the city. They say that the city boys do not stick to their work as the others do. They are a little above the employment.

Q. Is this employment that you speak about in the mills, in which children are engaged, of a character to tax their muscular or physical frame more than it ought to during their growing period? — A. No, sir; I don't know of any such employment in the mills being put upon children.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Do these attendants upon the machines have to stand all the time necessarily, or do they have an opportunity to sit? — A. They have the opportunity to sit, and they take advantage of that opportunity a great deal.

MILL WORK AND HOUSE WORK FOR WOMEN COMPARED.

By the Chairman:

Q. How about the employment of women; is the employment of a kind that is injurious to them at all? — A. I think not; most of it is employment which allows them to sit, and is not very strenuous. I never heard of any considerable number of cases of women being hurt by the employment. I have until recently had one woman who has worked in the Amoskeag mills, in one of the worst rooms that women work in, for forty years.

Q. If you gave the girls, as a rule, a chance to work in the mill or to be employed as domestics in respectable private families, which would they select? — A. My experience and observation as a housekeeper is that they would take the mills.

Q. What do you conceive to be the reason why, generally, the girl prefers the mills to domestic service? I do not refer to your own case especially. — A. I can only guess at that; I suppose the reason is a compound of two prejudices, if I may call them so; one is, she likes the independence which is the accompaniment of having fixed hours of labor, outside of which she is her own mistress, and the other is the disinclination to take upon herself what she looks upon as occupation of a menial character.

Q. You imagine that they have the impression that it is in some way a little more respectable to work in a mill than to work in a family? — A. I guess so.

Mr. Pugh. There are not so many restraints!

The Witness. There are not.

Q. Which do you imagine, on the whole, taxes the girl the most hours, and which, as a physical tax, is the most severe? — A. Well, I don't know that I could say that I thought there was much difference in that respect, taking everything into account.

Q. Still the girl's evenings are not at her command if she is in a family, as a rule? — A. Well, I don't think that in most families they are at work in the evenings, but there is a little more restriction about going out.

Q. That is comprised in your idea of independence? — A. Yes.
HOURS OF LABOR OF MASSACHUSETTS AND NEW HAMPSHIRE CONTRASTED.

Q. Occasionally we have found men who said they worked their operatives in New Hampshire eleven hours, and in Massachusetts they only worked ten hours. You have been over that ground a little. Are there any reasons which you have not stated, why working people in New Hampshire, or mill owners, would labor under disadvantages if limited to ten hours, to which the Massachusetts mills would not be subjected?—A. Yes; we have the disadvantage of being inland, where we have to pay for the transportation of everything that we consume and everything that we make.

Q. How serious a disadvantage is that, in a general way, I mean?—A. Well, take the freight bill of the Amoskeag corporation from the mills to the seaboard and the seaboard to the mills, I do not think it is any exaggeration to say that our freight bills are $60,000 per annum greater than they would be if we were situated at, say, New Bedford, on the seaboard—that is 2 per cent. on our capital.

Q. Fall River has water communication too, has it not?—A. Yes; that would be the same, supposing the mill to be properly situated on the sea.

Q. How is it about Lawrence?—A. There the disadvantage is less aggravated because they are 26 miles nearer the seaboard, and have competing roads. The same is true of Lowell. The nearer the seaboard they are the less the disadvantage they labor under to that extent.

Q. And the matter of competition helps them out?—A. Yes; it helps them out considerably. Of course, water power in some degree counterbalances that disadvantage, because it is cheaper than steam, but the difference between the cost of water power and the cost of steam power is very much less than it used to be, on account of the great improvement in the means of generating and using steam for power.

Q. You are obliged to employ it yourself to a considerable extent, I suppose, also?—A. Yes.

Q. Then in a city located like Manchester, an inland manufacturing city, having water power developed already to its full reliable extent, if that business is to be increased much in the future, it must be upon the basis of steam power, must it not?—A. Yes.

Q. And therefore the comparison between an inland city and one upon the seaboard would be still greater to its disadvantage in the future if there is to be future growth?—A. It would be.

Q. There is no distinction in the length of hours that the man and woman operative are actually employed in the mill, I understand you?—A. Not in the same employment. I think an answer which it is difficult to explain away, to the criticism that in New Hampshire we make our people work ten and three-quarter hours, and that in Massachusetts they make it only ten hours, is that between the three cities, within 26 miles of each other, all having about the same character of mills and the same character of management, and the same character of treatment of operatives, to wit, Lowell and Lawrence, in Massachusetts, and Manchester, in New Hampshire—labor in Manchester is plenty and that in Lowell and Lawrence it is scarce.

Mr. PUGH. That is a very strong fact.

Q. How is it as to the quality of labor in the three cities comparatively?—A. I have never personally investigated that subject, but I have heard it asserted by those who were here when the ten-hour law went into operation in Massachusetts, that thereupon many of the best
operatives came to Manchester from Lowell and Lawrence. I do not know of my own knowledge to-day whether the character of our operatives is superior to theirs or not. There are gentlemen here who will be before you, and who can tell you how that is, because they had charge of mills in both States.

ANNOUNCEMENT TO WORKING PEOPLE.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like the gentlemen of the press who are present to make public announcement of the fact that the committee is in session here, and that we would be glad to hear from any of the working people who desire to lay anything before us. Of course we do not know them personally; but if anybody has any complaint or any suggestion of law or legislation, or anything that they want to lay before the committee, the invitation is as free and full as it can be made to them to come and state it.

Mr. Pugh. It would be well for us to get two or three of these laboring people in each one of the mills of which the "capital side" has been or is to be heard by the committee. If we could get the names of two or three of the employees it would prevent any criticism upon the examination as an ex parte examination. Would it not be well, now, if we could get the names of some reliable men whom their own class would trust to state the facts about their position? It would be well to have their testimony if we could get two or three in the same mills where the employer has been heard before the committee.

The WITNESS. I can give you the names of some men who have been a long time in the employ of the company; two men, for instance, who have been with us forty to forty-five years.

Mr. Pugh. It would be very well to have some such men. [To the chairman.] Do you not think so?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. Bourne, agent of the Stark Mills. Do you want any women?

Mr. Pugh. It would not be a bad plan to hear some of them also.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. They can be accommodated as to hours, whether afternoon or evening. We do not want them to think that this is to be an ex parte examination.

Mr. Pugh. Yes. So far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly willing to sit here evenings to hear their testimony.

THE LABORER'S SHARE OF THE PRODUCT OF LABOR.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. The great complaint that gets into the press and among the politicians is that the laborer does not get a fair share of the product of his labor. I understand you to say that they get about 30 per cent. of the joint product of the capital and labor!—A. Yes.

Q. Is that 30 per cent. upon the actual cost, or 30 per cent. on the market value?—A. On the actual cost.

Q. You, of course, make out your expense account, and you include the cost of labor?—A. Yes.

Q. And your profits you reach, of course, by deducting the expense account?—A. Our profit we reach by deducting the cost of manufacture from the market price plus the cost of selling.

Q. Have you any objection to stating the general net profit from your industry?—A. No, sir.
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Q. What is the general net profit per cent. upon the actual cost of the product?—A. Since I have been connected with the mills it has been about 7 per cent. upon the amount invested. It has been about 14 per cent. upon the actual stock of the concern, but, as I have told you, there is about so much quick capital employed as the cost of the plant, and the cost of the plant about represents the capital stock. In other words, our mills and machinery are worth about $3,000,000, and our capital stock is $3,000,000.

Q. That is the active capital?—A. That is the capital stock borne on our books. We have then beside that a surplus of quick capital, amounting to about $2,500,000, which is employed in the business, nearly as much more as the capital stock.

COTTON MILL DIVIDENDS.

Q. What dividends do you declare, and how often?—A. The dividends are ordinarily declared semi-annually. The regular dividend is 5 per cent. on the capital stock; 5 per cent. semi-annually.

Q. That is, 10 per cent. per annum?—A. Yes; but there have been during this time extra dividends, which have brought the total up to about 14 per cent. per annum upon the nominal capital stock.

By the Chairman:

Q. Upon the $3,000,000?—A. Upon the $3,000,000. I should add that this includes a little profit due from a sale of land; for this company owned substantially all the land on which this city is built, before the city was started, and has sold the land to the people who have built here, and it still sells land; and there is perhaps 2 per cent. out of the 10 per cent. of the annual dividend due to the sale of land. In this connection it is proper for me to state, to prevent misapprehension, that in addition to this plant of the mills, and to this quick capital, the company has property in land, which I have not included in this statement, because it is not germane to the inquiry.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. The products of the industry were not invested in lands?—A. No, sir.

Q. As to the growth of your manufacturing interest; how has that been?—A. The growth of the plant has not been regular. In times of prosperity mills have been built; in dull times they have not been built. I cannot, from recollection of the records, state precisely when the chief growth has occurred, but since I have been here I can say that the prosperous times of 1879-80 induced the building of mills here to the extent of nearly 100,000 spindles, out of the total of 450,000 spindles which are here now.

Q. How long have these mills been running?—A. The present mills began running here in about 1838, the first of them. Prior to that time, as early as 1831, there were some woolen mills which were running here, but which no longer exist.

Q. How does the extent of manufacture at the beginning compare with what it is now?—A. The first mills that were run here by the Amoskeag Company, the wooden structures that I have spoken of, as nearly as I can judge, were about one-twelfth of the size of the present Amoskeag Mills, to say nothing of the other mills which have been built here.
MARKETS FOR COTTON GOODS.

Q. Where is your market? Confined exclusively to this country, is it?—A. No, sir; we export to the hot latitudes in and about the Caribbean Sea and, to some extent, to Brazil.

Q. What is the extent or per cent. of your product exported?—A. I am unable to say precisely; but it is but a small per cent. I should say that it did not exceed 5 per cent. of the whole.

Q. What character of fabrics do you export?—A. Mainly the Amoskeag Mills' export, what is called blue denims—such stuff as workmen's overalls are made of, and which in the hot countries are used for dresses and aprons for the women, I am told.

COST OF LABOR IN COTTON GOODS.

Q. What per cent. of the cost enters into the fabric as cost of labor?—A. As I said, it is about 30 per cent. That includes the labor expended in the repairs of machinery and in handling the cloth after it is woven to get it ready for the market, and in trucking about—freighting—all of which is an essential part of getting the goods ready for the market, and we charge it in as labor.

Q. That includes the cost of transportation?—A. Not the transportation by rail from here, but only the cost up to the time we put the goods onto the cars.

CAPACITY OF NEW ENGLAND COTTON MILLS.

Q. What is your opinion as to the capacity of the manufacturing industries, say, of New England, to supply the demand, the American demand, I mean?—A. I have not any doubt that at the present time the capacity exceeds the demand.

Q. The capacity to produce exceeds the demand?—A. Yes; but I regard it as only a temporary inequality, for the growth of population in the country rapidly overtakes the increase of spindles which occurs in prosperous times; and according to past experience it ought not to take more than a year more to make the number of people equal to the product of the spindles, or, in other words, to make the consuming capacity of the population equal the productive capacity of the spindles.

Q. You do not manufacture anything but cotton goods?—A. That is all.

OVERPRODUCTION.

Q. Have you ever suffered in your profits from an overstock?—A. We have; we are suffering from it now.

Q. From overstock of production?—A. Yes, sir. Some of our looms we are running upon goods which at present market rates pay but a small, an exceedingly small, profit, so small that if we were confined to those goods we could not pay a dividend, but upon other goods we make enough money to make a dividend.

Q. What character of goods make up your overstock?—A. At the present time I think that these very export goods that I have spoken of, and what are called gingham's, are those which are mainly produced in excess. When I say that there is an overstock, I do not mean that what we alone make produces an overstock, but that there is an overstock in the whole market, which affects us.

Q. Of course you only export when you have to go abroad for a mar-
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ket?—A. Well, our export is a pretty steady one; it is a class of goods that has had a pretty steady demand.

Q. Are those better goods than are shipped to those foreign markets by the manufacturers of other countries?—A. I do not know except from hearsay; but inasmuch as I have been told that foreign goods of the same character bear our label sometimes in the foreign market, I have concluded that ours are the best.

PRICES OF AMERICAN COTTON GOODS AT HOME AND ABROAD.

Q. What is the difference in the price that you get in the American market for the same style of goods and the price that you get in the foreign market?—A. I cannot speak precisely upon that subject, because the business of selling is not in my hands, but my impression is that there is practically no difference.

Q. You are able to get in the foreign market the same price that you receive here for the same kind of goods?—A. Yes; but that is only on a specialty, as I have said, so that I do not think any very general conclusion could be drawn from our example.

Q. Do you know anything of the export of these other mills in New England?—A. No.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What are the goods you say you export?—A. Denims.

Q. What sort of cloth is that?—A. It is a very heavy cloth made of a warp dyed blue or brown and with white filling.

Q. What is it used for?—A. For overalls, aprons, and women's dresses.

Q. What is it sold for per yard?—A. It varies according to the quality, but it will bring anywhere from 10 to 15 or 16 cents a yard.

Q. To you, at wholesale?—A. Yes; depending upon the weight and quality.

Q. Is it an article composing a very large portion of your whole manufacture?—A. No; and with respect to the prices obtained for the exports as compared with what we sell at home, I really speak without any accurate knowledge, because I have no means of separating the money received on foreign goods from the money received on domestic goods. We intrust the sale to a commission house, which makes returns, and I simply see the aggregate sales without knowing to whom they sell, or what they get in any individual instance, so that I do not believe my testimony on that subject is worth pinning anything to.

Q. That is as to relative prices?—A. Yes.

ABILITY OF AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURERS TO SUSTAIN THEMSELVES AGAINST FOREIGN MANUFACTURERS.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. How do you compare your ability to sustain yourself in competition with foreign manufacturers of the same kind of goods?—A. As far as I have been able to judge, there are some few kinds of goods in which the great proportion of the value consists in the material, and a small portion of the value consists in the labor, that we could compete with the foreign manufacturers in. These denims that I cited are perhaps an illustration of that. They are very coarse goods, into which little labor, comparatively, enters; but when it comes to finer goods, such as our gingham, which constitute one-half of our product, I do not think we could run our mills upon them without a protective tariff.
MARKETS FOR COTTON GOODS.

Q. Where is your market? Confined exclusively to this country, is it?—A. No, sir; we export to the hot latitudes in and about the Caribbean Sea and, to some extent, to Brazil.

Q. What is the extent or per cent. of your product exported?—A. I am unable to say precisely; but it is but a small per cent. I should say that it did not exceed 5 per cent. of the whole.

Q. What character of fabrics do you export?—A. Mainly the Amoskeag Mills' export, what is called blue denim—such stuff as workmen's overalls are made of, and which in the hot countries are used for dresses and aprons for the women, I am told.

COST OF LABOR IN COTTON GOODS.

Q. What per cent. of the cost enters into the fabric as cost of labor?—A. As I said, it is about 30 per cent. That includes the labor expended in the repairs of machinery and in handling the cloth after it is woven to get it ready for the market, and in trucking about—freighting—all of which is an essential part of getting the goods ready for the market, and we charge it in as labor.

Q. That includes the cost of transportation?—A. Not the transportation by rail from here, but only the cost up to the time we put the goods onto the cars.

CAPACITY OF NEW ENGLAND COTTON MILLS.

Q. What is your opinion as to the capacity of the manufacturing industries, say, of New England, to supply the demand, the American demand, I mean?—A. I have not any doubt that at the present time the capacity exceeds the demand.

Q. The capacity to produce exceeds the demand?—A. Yes; but I regard it as only a temporary inequality, for the growth of population in our country rapidly overtakes the increase of spindles which occurs in prosperous times; and according to past experience it ought not to take more than a year more to make the number of people equal to the number of spindles, or, in other words, to make the consuming capacity of the population equal the productive capacity of the spindles.

Q. You do not manufacture anything but cotton goods?—A. That is all.

OVERPRODUCTION.

Q. Have you ever suffered in your profits from an overstock?—A. We have; we are suffering from it now.

Q. From overstock of production?—A. Yes, sir. Some of our looms we are running upon goods which at present market rates pay but a small, an exceedingly small, profit, so small that if we were confined to those goods we could not pay a dividend, but upon other goods we make enough money to make a dividend.

Q. What character of goods make up your overstock?—A. At the present time I think that these very export goods that I have spoken of, and what are called ginghams, are those which are mainly produced in excess. When I say that there is an overstock, I do not mean that what we alone make produces an overstock, but that there is an overstock in the whole market, which affects us.

Q. Of course you only export when you have to go abroad for a mar-
ket?—A. Well, our export is a pretty steady one; it is a class of goods that has had a pretty steady demand.

Q. Are those better goods than are shipped to those foreign markets by the manufacturers of other countries?—A. I do not know except from hearsay; but inasmuch as I have been told that foreign goods of the same character bear our label sometimes in the foreign market, I have concluded that ours are the best.

**Prices of American Cotton Goods at Home and Abroad.**

Q. What is the difference in the price that you get in the American market for the same style of goods and the price that you get in the foreign market?—A. I cannot speak precisely upon that subject, because the business of selling is not in my hands, but my impression is that there is practically no difference.

Q. You are able to get in the foreign market the same price that you receive here for the same kind of goods?—A. Yes; but that is only on a specialty, as I have said, so that I do not think any very general conclusion could be drawn from our example.

Q. Do you know anything of the export of these other mills in New England?—A. No.

By the Chairman:

Q. What are the goods you say you export?—A. Denims.

Q. What sort of cloth is that?—A. It is a very heavy cloth made of a warp, dyed blue or brown and with white filling.

Q. What is it used for?—A. For overalls, aprons, and women's dresses.

Q. What is it sold for per yard?—A. It varies according to the quality, but it will bring anywhere from 10 to 15 or 16 cents a yard.

Q. To you, at wholesale?—A. Yes; depending upon the weight and quality.

Q. Is it an article composing a very large portion of your whole manufacture?—A. No; and with respect to the prices obtained for the exports as compared with what we sell at home, I really speak without any accurate knowledge, because I have no means of separating the money received on foreign goods from the money received on domestic goods. We intrust the sale to a commission house, which makes returns, and I simply see the aggregate sales without knowing to whom they sell, or what they get in any individual instance, so that I do not believe my testimony on that subject is worth pinning anything to.

Q. That is as to relative prices?—A. Yes.

**Ability of American Cotton Manufacturers to Sustain Themselves Against Foreign Manufacturers.**

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. How do you compare your ability to sustain yourself in competition with foreign manufacturers of the same kind of goods?—A. As far as I have been able to judge, there are some few kinds of goods in which the great proportion of the value consists in the material, and a small portion of the value consists in the labor, that we could compete with the foreign manufacturers in. These denims that I cited are perhaps an illustration of that. They are very coarse goods, into which little labor, comparatively, enters; but when it comes to finer goods, such as our gingham, which constitute one-half of our product, I do not think we could run our mills upon them without a protective tariff.
RELEATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

THE TARIFF: ITS EFFECT ON COTTON GOODS.

Q. How much benefit do you get from a protective tariff in the prices? What per cent. is added to the price of your fabrics in the American market on account of the tariff?—A. I suppose that all our profit is due to the tariff.

Q. All your profits are derived from the tariff?—A. Yes; on that class of goods. In other words, I think if there were no tariff, there would be but little trade on that class of goods where there was a large amount of labor. We could not sell them in competition with those which could be imported.

Q. Did you express any opinion as to the power to consume in this country being equal to the power of production, with all the inducements to invest in manufacturing industries?—A. I did express an opinion. It was this: That, at the present time, the cotton mills exceed in productive capacity the power to consume.

Q. But you think the increase in population will supply that inequality?—A. Yes, very soon, as I remember it now, according to Mr. Atkinson's statistics, which appear to be well founded, it took an increase of several hundred thousand spindles a year to keep up with the increase of population, and we exceeded that limit a little the last year or two; but it will not take more than a year or so more to restore the equilibrium.

INFLUENCE OF CHEAP LANDS ON THE LABOR MARKET.

Q. Well, will there ever be a change in the conditions of labor and capital, and of consumption and production, in this country from what they are now?—A. I think there will. When all the cheap lands are taken up so that there is no employment, like that of farming, into which the overflow of labor can pour; but I suppose that time will be a long time removed. As long, however, as the abundance of cheap lands affords the means of livelihood and of profit to all those who choose to engage in cultivating them, as is the case now, so long labor will always be in demand in this country, and will always bring a good price, I suppose.

Q. What is your judgment as to the ability of our manufacturing industries to live without the benefit of a protective tariff?—A. I do not believe that with the labor market as it is now, and as I suppose it will be until the lands are all consumed, the cotton manufacturing industries could, in general, compete with those abroad without protection.

WAGES IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA CONTRASTED.

Q. What per cent. of difference is there between the cost of labor here and in England?—A. I can only speak from hearsay on that subject. Perhaps my knowledge is not very accurate. I have only a general idea, from what I have been told by those who have examined into the subject abroad, that the cost of labor is very much less in general there than it is here. But, there is another reason why, in cotton manufacture, we could not compete with them, beside the mere cost of labor, and that is the cheapness of coal and iron, which, of course, depends, in part upon the cheapness of labor and in part upon the proximity of the coal and iron to the market in England.
RELATIVE COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF COTTON MILLS IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

A cotton-mill, we are told, upon what seems to be very good evidence, can be built and put into good running order in England for $12 per spindle, or less, and the same mill in this country would cost perhaps, from $14 to $16 per spindle, at least.

Q. That increase is due to what? — A. Sixteen dollars a spindle is the cheapest that we have been able to construct mills for in Manchester. I said $14 because I had heard people say that mills had been built somewhere for $14. I know that $16 has been the cheapest here. That difference is due partly to the difference in material out of which the mills are built and equipped, and partly to the proximity of the coal and iron mines to the place where the mill is to be built.

Q. Is not coal cheaper here than in England? — A. No; I think it is very much dearer here.

Q. What is the cause of that? — A. I do not think there is any mystery about it. Coal in the coal mines in this country is in exactly the same position as it is in the coal mines in England; but in this country, for the most part, coal has got to be got out by labor which is dearer, and then transported a long distance to where it needs to be used. In England the mill will be in one acre of ground, and the coal mine in the next acre. And I have had a manufacturer of ginghams—a weaver of ginghams—the class of goods that I make, tell me that he got his coal delivered at his boiler at the rate of $2 per ton. It costs me over $6 a ton landed at my boilers.

COAL AS AN ELEMENT OF COST IN MANUFACTURE.

By the Chairman:

Q. How important an item is coal? — A. In running the Amoskeag Mills, without any steam power, simply using coal for heating and dyeing, we consume over 12,000 tons per year. If we ran all steam power, it would take at least 15,000 tons per year more, I think.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. How would it be as it is in Alabama, for instance, where the coal and iron and lime stone and plenty of timber and raw cotton are all right there in sight? — A. Well, that being the case, as soon as the laboring population is equal to the demands of manufacture, Alabama would be among the most favored States for manufacture. To return again to the cheapness of mill-building in England, the iron ore and the coal to smelt it all being close at hand and very cheap, the mill manager can afford to build his machinery and run it with but little repairs, and throw it away in a little while.

REPAIRS AS AN ELEMENT OF COST.

But the mill-manager in this State must expend, if he would be on the safe side, at least 10 per cent. of the value of the machinery per year in repairing it and keeping it in order. He could not afford to throw it away as they can. Now, in making up a profit sheet, a thing that is lost sight of sometimes, but which is most important to keep in sight, is the constant corrosion of the plant by wear and tear, and for that you must allow in your profit sheet. No mill that is to be managed with any reasonable degree of certainty of profit can afford to do any-
thing less than to charge against its profits 10 per cent. every year for renewals and repairs.

Q. The cost of iron ore in England is about the same as here, is it not?—A. I am unable to speak upon that subject.

Q. Where was the machinery purchased with which you run your mills?—A. Most of it was bought in New England. In Lowell, Mass., and Saco and Biddeford, Me.; but we have bought some machinery from England and Scotland.

Q. How does our machinery for running cotton mills compare in quality with the machinery in England?—A. I think the general impression among manufacturers here is that American machinery, with some few exceptions, is the best; that it is more ingenious, better finished, and, upon the whole, stronger and more capable of enduring wear and tear.

PROFITS ON CAPITAL IN COTTON MILLS.

Q. You say that the profits you realized upon your capital do not exceed 14 per cent.?—A. Fourteen per cent. upon the nominal capital. I speak now of the last four or five years, because I think, in years past, profits have been greater than that—in former times.

Q. Well, you get that advantage you think, altogether from the operation of the tariff laws?—A. On the main part of our goods, yes; I do think so.

DUTY ON COTTON GOODS.

Q. What is the rate of duty upon that class of goods upon which you derive the most profit from the tariff, do you remember?—A. My impression now is that it is about 40 per cent., a duty which is greatly in excess of any profit that we make, or it was, until the recent revision; I am not certain whether that revision reduced the duty or not. If it did, it did not reduce it below a sum considerably in excess of any profit that we could hope to make. As far as that is concerned, the competition on most of the small goods is so fierce, and the margin so small, that the tariff, in order to be of any use to us, must be, practically, prohibitive.

Q. Its benefits, then, are neutralized by this competition at home?—A. I do not think they are neutralized; but the profits we could otherwise make are somewhat neutralized by competition at home.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. But without the tariff, I understand you to say, the foreign article coming in more cheaply than you could afford to make it here, the manufacture would cease?—A. That is my judgment.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Would not a duty of 30 per cent. afford you the same protection that you get now—I mean in effect?—A. I think it would.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You mean a reduction of 10 per cent. of the duty on such articles would not result in their larger importations?—A. I do not think it would. I think that the moment you get it below a prohibitory point that moment it would hurt us. I could not, without going into an elaborate calculation, tell you what that point is.
By Mr. Pugh:

Q. This law of supply and demand would override any fixed rate?—A. Yes. In order to have the duty prohibitory you must have it large enough—so large that it will not be infringed upon by fluctuations from one year to another.

By the Chairman:

Q. Forty per cent. is as good as 80 per cent.?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. And you think 30 per cent. is enough?—A. At the present time it is, but next year it might not be.

By the Chairman:

Q. But it is a matter of no difference to the public whether one or the other is the amount, if the main point is to make it prohibitory?—A. Yes; I do not think it is worth while for us to make any "bones" about it. What we want is a prohibitory tariff.

DOES THE EFFECT OF PROTECTION FALL ON THE CONSUMER?

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. You do not conceal the fact that whatever protection you get comes out of those who consume your fabrics. That is a necessary result, is it not?—A. It is, I think, when you look at it in one aspect, but when you consider that those people are the very people, for the most part, whose wages are enhanced by the profit, why, then, perhaps, their profit is greater than their loss.

TARIFF FOR REVENUE—IS IT SUFFICIENT PROTECTION?

Q. Do you not think, now, with your experience and opportunity of learning the operation of these laws, that a tariff that would produce $250,000,000 per annum could be so adjusted in its details as to afford all the protection that the manufacturing industries of this country would need?—A. I am obliged to say that I never have pursued the subject so far to be able to form any opinion on it.

Q. All above whatever would enable the manufacturing industries to live and prosper would, of course, be an unnecessary burden?—A. If it were a burden at all.

Q. Yes; if it is visited upon the consumer, of course it would be an unnecessary and unjust burden, and that is the question—to find out where that is, is it not?—A. Yes.

PROFITS OF MANUFACTURE.

By the Chairman:

Q. Do you know, as matter of fact, of any manufacturer in this country whose profit is beyond a reasonable return upon the capital invested and used, at the present time?—A. I do not.

Q. I mean any article whatever. I use the word "manufacturer" in the broadest sense—including every kind of manufacturer of which you have knowledge?—A. As far as I have knowledge, I do not. I must qualify my answer by saying that my knowledge is confined pretty exclusively on that subject to cotton manufacture.

Q. Take the woolen trade; what is your understanding of the general
condition of business in that trade in the country? Is it making large profits or excessive profits?—A. I got the impression that they were rather suffering.

Q. And the iron trade?—A. I have the same impression about the iron trade. I have heard that their mills were stopped.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. That has been the result under the operation of a high tariff?—A. Well, that is a sequitur which one must draw for himself. I suppose it will be true in this country as it is in every other country where there is capital to be invested, that when it is apparent that considerable profits are made in any industry people immediately put their money into that industry, and that has a tendency to reduce profits; but I do not think the fluctuations of any industry from one year to another afford any basis for a solution of the question of tariff, because when prices are down in any one year they are up another year.

ADJUSTMENT OF MACHINERY TO POPULATION.

You can probably never adjust the growth of machinery to the population, sometimes one may be ahead and sometimes another. This year we may have reason to plume ourselves on profits and next year to mourn because nobody is making any. And it seems to me that he who would really draw a conclusion upon which to base an opinion to be adopted for guidance in the regulation of tariffs must look back to the operations of a long series of years.

Mr. Pugh. In regard to iron: It seems to be the fact, from the statistics in Washington, that the production of pig-iron last year was about one and one-half or two millions of tons more than the consumption. Our capacity is said to be equal to the production of 6,000,000 tons of pig-iron, and we could consume only a little over half of it. It is very much the same case with England. She is equal to the production of 8,000,000 tons of pig-iron, and could not sell more than 6,000,000 tons of that.

By the Chairman:

Q. With regard to the cost of the necessaries of life among your operatives: I suppose they are able to buy for cash?—A. They would be able to if they got into the habit of it; some of them, perhaps many of them, do. But like all the rest of the world I don’t doubt they buy a great deal on credit, and pay at the end of the month.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Are not the manufacturing industries of the United States, as a rule, in a higher state of prosperity, continuously, than any other industry; is not that your information?—A. Well, I cannot say that I have any information on that subject. I think that, as a rule, they are prosperous, taking them year in and year out.

Mr. Pugh. The farmers complain that they do not make over 5 or 8 per cent. in the most prosperous seasons, and the merchants are all the time failing.

The Witness. Well, in taking the average of manufacturing concerns, it is only fair to include in that average the number of those concerns that make a failure of it.

Mr. Pugh. I mean as a general rule.

The Witness. Yes; I understand. I take it that the difference between the farmer, the manufacturer, and the merchant is very much
the difference between a first-class security for investment and securities that are not so good. The farmer has an assured living, to say the least, and ordinarily ought to save some money. The merchant and manufacturer can make some profits which seem to be very much higher, but do not hold out, and I imagine that taking the country right through you would find that the average profits of manufacturing are about the same as the profits in other departments of business.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What do you think would be the average profit of the farmer around here if there was no manufacturing?—A. Well, I do not suppose farming would pay at all here. I suppose the farmer would be unable to hold out here if it were not for the manufactures of the mills here.

COST OF FUEL AND CLOTHING OF OPERATIVES.

Q. Do you furnish any fuel or clothing to your operatives?—A. We give them coal at cost, and we allow them to have the cloth that we make at substantially the cost of making and selling—a mere trifle in addition to paying for the expense of keeping open store for them.

Q. What difference is there in the price of your coal to your operatives and that which they would have to pay outside?—A. It varies; but I have been told that it costs a difference of about $1 a ton.

Q. What does it cost your operatives now?—A. Six and a quarter and six and a half dollars, I think, for fine to coarse coal delivered.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Where do you get your coal from?—A. From Pennsylvania. It comes to Portsmouth, N. H., and thence to this place by rail.

Q. About $6 a ton?—A. Yes. That is, anthracite coal.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You do not use bituminous coal?—A. No; we use anthracite.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. What do they use bituminous coal for?—A. I could not tell you. Mr. McDuffie can tell you that.

Q. What is the transportation per ton from Pennsylvania here?—A. I do not know, because I do not pay those bills. But I fancy that from the mines to the mill the transportation is about two-thirds of the cost.

Q. Say about $4 per ton?—A. I should fancy that was it.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The rate from the shipping point where the railroad companies land it—where it is billed to the company—to tide-water will sometimes run as low as $1.08 to $1.10, and it is $1.05 more to Portsmouth. It will run up from that to $1.75, but most of the time it is about $1.15 from wharf to wharf.

The WITNESS. Supposing it was 75 cents per ton from the mines to tide-water, and $1.15 from there to Portsmouth, and $1.05 from there here, that would make it $2.95, so that I should say it was very close to $4 from the mine here.

OPERATIVES' COST OF LIVING.

As to the cost of the necessaries of life to the operatives here, the nearest approach that you can find to that is what the boarding-houses furnish board for. That I have given you. They board and lodge the girls for $2.25 per week. Assuming that their boarding-houses cost
them nothing, that is that they charge simply what they pay for them, it is about $2 per week that they charge. That includes their profit and supports the building.

Q. That is for girls and women?—A. For girls and women. For men they charge $1 to $1.25 more per week.

Q. Does that include washing?—A. I think it includes plain washing.

Q. That is considerably cheaper than the corresponding class of people get board for at other points—that is, your operatives get their board cheaper than operatives do elsewhere, do they?—A. I think likely. That, of course, is more than the actual cost of their food, because the boarding-house keeper has to get his profit out of it.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 12, 1883.

GILBERT B. WHITMAN examined.

By Mr. PUGH:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. I reside on the corner of Harrison and Union streets, in this city.

THE AMORY MANUFACTURING COMPANY—ITS MILLS AND THEIR CAPACITY.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am the agent of the Amory Manufacturing Company.

Q. What do you manufacture?—A. Cotton cloth.

Q. To what extent? How many operatives do you employ?—A. Eight hundred.

Q. How long have your mills been running?—A. Only three years.

Q. You know what information the committee desire. Without waiting for questions, just state to the committee any information that is in your possession regarding the relations of labor and capital. State the wages you pay to your laborers, the hours of labor, the condition of the laborers and of the houses in which they live, the rent they pay, &c.—the same line of questions which you have heard us ask, and have heard answered to-day.—A. The Amory Mills contain 56,000 spindles, 1,420 looms, and are engaged in the manufacture of sheetings, shirtings, and jeans.

WAGES.

The average wages we pay our weavers is $1.06 per day. Our wages run from $20 per month to $42 per month, depending upon the class of goods and the skill of the weaver. About one-third of our help are Canadians; the remainder are of mixed nationality, the Irish element preponderating; then come the English, Scotch, and German.

Q. What proportion of them are Americans?—A. Out of eight hundred operatives probably we have eighty Americans.

HOURS OF LABOR.

We average ten and three-quarters hours per day of labor. In my early experience in the mill I worked from 5 o'clock in the morning until half past 7, then had a half an hour out for breakfast, and then resumed work and kept on until 12 noon; then we had a half hour recess,
and we then worked till half past 7 at night. The work in those old
days, say thirty years ago, was very much harder than it is to-day.

Mr. Pugh. I saw that Mr. Atkinson stated a short time ago that a
person that ran a hand loom, some years ago, made, I think, three yards
of cloth a day, and now they make ten.

The WITNESS. On hand looms?

Mr. Pugh. No; on machinery. What number of yards does a weaver
make per day?

The WITNESS. It depends entirely upon the character of the goods.
on sheetings they average 26 yards per day.

Q. How much could a hand make on a hand loom?—A. Well, possibly
8 to 10 yards; not more than that.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Would that be the old-fashioned loom—the loom of our mothers?—
A. Yes; where they throw the shuttle with the hand, and work the
truckles with the feet.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. They have trebled the quantity?—A. Yes. Speaking about that
hand loom, I would say that the old spinners had the right shoulder a
half inch higher than the left, from the constant swinging of the arm
in throwing the shuttle. In the old times, in the weaving department,
the warps were carried by hand on the shoulder, and now they are car-
ried on little trucks. There is no lifting done, except to place them on
a low truck.

Q. It is not such a drain upon the physical powers now as it was
then?—A. No, sir.

Q. Tell us what you can with regard to the houses which your oper-
avitives occupy, their rental, &c.—A. We have no houses. We have two
acres of land upon which we propose to build houses some time, but
thus far we have had no trouble in finding all the help we want, and
they find their homes here in the various blocks of the city. I do not
propose to raise the question of houses until the question is raised with
us by the help.

OPERATIVES' RENTS.

Q. What rents do they pay here to outside owners generally?—A.
My help that live in blocks would average perhaps $5 per month.

Q. Without regard to the number of rooms; they do not rent by the
room?—A. I think not.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. About what accommodations will they get for $5 per month?—A.
Not over four rooms for that price.

Q. Would they get a tenement of four decent-sized rooms for about
$5 per month?—A. I think that is about the average price.

SANITARY ARRANGEMENTS.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Do you know anything here of sewer gas?—A. Yes; our sewerage
here is very imperfect.

Q. I should think it would be very easy to drain this city perfectly.—
A. The system of sewerage which obtains here is to tap the main sewer
at the various corners and put in an iron grating which serves as a re-
ceptacle for water during a storm, and also to ventilate the sewer in fair
weather. That is so, Mr. McDuffie, is it not?
Mr. McDuffie. You should explain to the committee, Mr. Whitman, that you are taking a high stand on this subject, having studied the sewerage system a good deal. The sewerage system that prevails here is about the same that prevails in other places, whereas Mr. Whitman and myself, and others, who have studied this question, like to take a position far in advance of people generally. If we were going to put a water-closet in a house we would ventilate it through the roof. Hence, in speaking of the sewerage system here, Mr. Whitman speaks from the highest stand-point of sanitary engineers at the present time.

The Witness. I think that is proper.

The Chairman. Your theory is the correct one. We had that pretty thoroughly explained in New York. They are commencing throughout the country, generally, to construct their sewerage upon this system that you suggest, but it is only recently that that has begun to be so. They are now overhauling the sewerage in New York City in accordance with that principle. We had the secretary of the board of health of New York City before us, and he went over the matter pretty fully, and your notions are just his as to what ought to be done. In the city of New York it is very much worse than almost anywhere else, as matter of fact.

Mr. McDuffie. To speak by comparison, this city is really very well drained, because it has excellent facilities for drainage, being on the side of a hill and emptying into the river.

The Witness. That is the very reason why we should have the modern system, because they have spent no money on the other. They could afford to give us the modern system and pay out less than in New York and elsewhere.

Q. You sell all your goods here in these American markets, do you?—A. No, sir; we export a few jeans to China, but nearly all our goods are consumed here. During the dry weather we had to stop some five hundred looms, and they were stopped three weeks.

**STRIKES.**

Q. You have never been troubled with labor strikes?—A. No, sir. Our help all returned when we were ready for them; they seemed to be here waiting, and I have no reason to think that they are discontented with their lot, more than I was with mine under the same conditions, only that I had longer hours.

Q. You have been engaged personally in manufacturing?—A. Yes, sir; I began my mill life when I was fourteen years old. I began life in a cotton mill at fourteen, and have been there thirty-four years.

Q. You have come up through all the different stations?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the condition of the labor you employ now as compared with the labor you have been associated with?

The Witness. In my younger days!

Mr. Pugh. Yes.

**OLD TIME COTTON OPERATIVES CONTRASTED WITH THE NEW.**

The Witness. Well, that was thirty years ago. In the mills with which I was connected in Rhode Island the help were all Americans. I remember the first Englishman that came to our place was looked upon as a curiosity. Things have all changed now.

Q. It is almost a curiosity now to find an American in the mill, I suppose?—A. Yes; the American element have all gone into the cities,
Q. Into other industries?—A. Yes, with very few exceptions.

Q. Why is that—is it because they could make more in other industries, or because they were shovéd out by the competition of foreigners?—A. The foreign competition pushed them out, in my opinion.

Q. Did it displace them on account of the foreigners working cheaper, or what was the reason, do you think?—A. Well, the reasons were various; that would be one of them; the growing country, and positions offering out of the mill, the Americans were glad to get an opportunity of making a change. The conditions of the operative, however are constantly improving. Our new mills are built with a view to better ventilation and better light. A great many mills are taking out their small old-fashioned windows and putting in windows as large as is possible without endangering the strength of the structure.

Q. Then your experience is that the condition of the manufacturing operatives has been greatly improved?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In wages, and in mode of living, and in every other respect?—A. Yes, sir; that is my judgment. We have had occasion within the last two or three weeks to run our carding department at noon times. We would let part of our help go out at half past 11 and return at half past 12 and then the other part would go out, and so we would spread it out, letting one girl do two girls' work for an hour. I found that one-third of my weaving would be running, no matter what time I went in, between 12 and 1; a great many weavers took their dinner into the shop and took that opportunity of doing some weaving. If they had been in an exhausted condition they would not probably have done that.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. This was voluntary on their part?—A. Yes.

Q. It increased their pay?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. These foreign operatives, of course, have improved their condition very much by coming here?—A. Yes, sir. I have some help in my employ that have been with us since the starting of the mill, and I can see an improved condition month by month, and year by year, in dress and in other ways. I have every reason to believe that they are contented.

SHARE OF "JOINT PRODUCT" GOING TO LABOR AND CAPITAL, RESPECTIVELY.

Q. What per cent. of the cost of the product of labor and capital goes to the employer and what to the laborer; what is the division?—A. Well, our rate of wages is a little better than that paid in other States for the same class of work, and it costs us 25 cents a pound to manufacture our goods, bringing us from 8 to 10 cents a yard, depending, of course, on the time and the quality of the goods and the average weight, which would be 3½ yards per pound.

COTTON GOODS: COST OF MANUFACTURE.

Q. That is about 1 cent per yard for labor, is it not? I see that Mr. Atkinson made that statement.—A. Yes; that is just about it.

Mr. PUGH. The average rate or average cost of labor per yard of the kind of cotton goods that you have described—drillings, sheetings, and jeans—Mr. Atkinson said was about 1 cent per yard.
DIVIDEND AND SURPLUS.

The Witness. Yes. We have divided 6 per cent. annually, and our quick capital is $114,000. For the year ending May 1 we divided two 3 per cent. dividends and carried $30,000 to our quick capital.

Q. That is surplus?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What per cent. does that all make on the capital?—A. A little over 9 per cent. that would be. But we have sold goods very much cheaper for the last six months, and I do not think we can do it next year.

Mr. McDuffie. Allow me to suggest that that would be hardly enough to allow for the depreciation of property.

The Witness. We allow for that.

By the Chairman:

Q. Just explain now what the statement is. You have your fixed capital and your quick capital. It is 9 per cent. upon the fixed capital, is it?—A. Nine per cent. upon the fixed capital; yes.

Q. And what does it amount to on the fixed and quick capital combined?—A. Well, a part of the quick capital is part of the fixed capital. It is what we had left after we built the mill—with the earnings added.

Q. Some of your surplus now is part of your fixed capital?—A. Yes.

Q. And what you use as quick capital has been in former times saved from the surplus earnings?—A. Yes, and added to what we saved from our fixed capital in construction.

Q. Your fixed capital was more than you expended in the plant?—A. Yes.

Q. What is the fixed capital?—A. Nine hundred thousand dollars.

Q. How much was put into the plant?—A. Eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Q. That gave you $50,000 surplus from the fixed capital?—A. Yes.

Q. And that amount was used as quick capital?—A. Yes.

Q. By how much additional from your earnings did you increase this $50,000?—A. Sixty-four thousand dollars additional.

Q. That makes $114,000?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, now you pay 9 per cent. upon some amount—A. (Interrupting.) We have paid 6 per cent.

Q. Upon the whole?—A. Upon $900,000.

Q. You paid 6 per cent. upon the fixed capital then?—A. Yes.

Q. Then it would be not far from 5 per cent. upon your total of fixed and quick capital—I may not figure very correctly, but it would not be far from that?—A. No, not far from that.

Q. That is an annual dividend?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. For how long a time have you paid that, or about that?—A. Well, last year we paid 6 per cent., and during the three years that we have run.

Q. You have been only operating about three years?—A. Only about three years.

Q. Before declaring a dividend you make a deduction for repairs and improvements, I suppose—the necessary expenditure to keep the plant in order?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The dividend is the net amount, with the property kept up in good order?—A. Yes.

Q. And did you have a surplus remaining this last year, after declaring this last dividend?—A. Yes; $30,000.
Q. Such an amount as that, I suppose, is very easy to use in addition to your quick capital, if your business is growing?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Is it a rule to require the same industry to pay an interest or profit on the surplus that it produces? For instance, you declare a dividend of $60,000 upon $900,000, and then you have, say $30,000 of surplus?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you require that same industry, another year, or do you expect it, to pay a profit on the $30,000 as well as on the fund upon which you declared a dividend and derived a surplus the last year?—A. No, sir.

By the Chairman:

Q. Unless you employ it in the business, and in that case it becomes a part of your quick capital, does it not?—A. We declare our dividends upon the fixed capital entirely.

Q. Without regard to the other?—A. Without regard to the quick capital or the earnings.

The Chairman. But if it is money employed in increasing the business, then there is no reason why there should not be a profit paid on it, like money at interest?

Mr. Pugh. Oh, certainly. That is an increase in the capacity to produce, and that must pay a profit, or ought to do it.

The Chairman. That is the way the Western Union Company built. It built almost wholly out of its surplus earnings.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Have you any other facts that you desire to state?—A. I do not know that I have. I have two friends here that are "old stagers," and perhaps you would like to hear them.

By the Chairman:

Q. How long ago did you commence manufacturing? I mean when did you begin to learn the business?—A. Thirty-one years ago.

Q. And you have followed it for the last thirty-one years?—A. Yes.

Q. Where did you begin?—A. In Rhode Island.

Q. How long were you in Rhode Island—about how long? I want to pave the way for some questions as to the condition of manufacturing elsewhere, as you observed it?—A. I was there for two or three years.

Q. Then where were you?—A. I then went to Fall River.

Q. How long were you there?—A. About six years.

Q. From Fall River where did you go?—A. To New Bedford.

Q. And from New Bedford to where?—A. From New Bedford I went back to my home and learned the machinery trade. This gentleman by me here [indicating Mr. Bourne, agent of the Stark Mills] was my master mechanic at the time.

Q. Then where did you go?—A. Thence into the Army.

Q. You learned to manufacture there, a little?—A. Yes; learned how to suffer there.

Q. Then where did you go?—A. Then I came back into mill life. On my return, I obtained a position as master mechanic, and then in managing mills, after two years' service in the shop. I spent nine years of my life at Rockport, Mass.

Q. What was your business there?—A. I had the agency of the Annisquam Cotton Mills, formerly the old Rockport Steam Cotton Mills.

Q. Were you anywhere else before coming here?—A. No, sir.

Q. From there you came here?—A. Yes. I spent three years in Clinton, Mass., and had the agency of the Lancaster Quilt Mills.

3—C 3—(5 LAW)
Q. Then you have become well acquainted with the cotton-mill industry?—A. I think so.

Q. Have you, in your time, had any practical knowledge of the apprenticeship system?—A. You mean as applied in the machine shop?

Q. In a machine shop or in factories anywhere, anything analogous to it in these various factories?—A. I have not had much experience in that line.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Have you any apprentices in your mill?—A. Yes; but not regularly apprenticed. We take those that are promising workmen, and faithful, and if they show any signs of mechanical talent we put them into the shop, and in view of the fact that they can be used in other departments in case we are short of help, we pay them a dollar per day. I think under the apprentice system they paid them 50 cents per day the first year, 75 cents the second year, and $1 the third year. That used to be the old rule.

By the Chairman:

Q. But the system has disappeared?—A. I think it has, sir.

Q. When had an operative the best chance to get a living—to get the comforts of life, and to get on and to get up in his business—when you began, or now?—A. That is a question I never gave much thought to. But, I should think, in view of the fact that the cotton manufactories and other manufactories are increasing so rapidly, that the present time certainly affords more openings.

Q. And as to the comforts of life—getting a living—when was the best chance for a man, then or now?—A. Now.

Q. You think that the wages an operative gets now, if he is prudent and economical, will buy him more than he could earn then?—A. Yes.

CONTENTMENT OF MILL OPERATIVES.

Q. Now, as to the general feeling among working people, as you know them—I mean wage-workers—are they as well contented with their lot as wage-workers were in the olden times; I mean generally?—A. I think they are.

Q. On the whole, do you think that that lot is improving rather than otherwise?—A. I think it is improving very much.

Q. In what regards? Give us some of the particulars in which you think wage-working people and their families are better off now than they were thirty years ago.—A. I think money will go farther to-day than it would then.

Q. A dollar will go farther now than a dollar would then?—A. Yes.

Q. You state that from your practical knowledge and observation?—A. Yes; and I know they get better treatment now than they did then more consideration.

Q. Who from?—A. From the employers, because it is for the interest of the employers. It is a mutual interest.

Q. What treatment does the employer get on the part of the operative; is there more willing and faithful service rendered than there was then, do you think, and the benefit made mutual?—A. I think it is more mutual.

Q. I am speaking in a general way. Of course there will be bad employers and bad employés, but I understand you to say that the employers treat their help better. Do the help reciprocate?—A. Yes; I think they do; here in Manchester, at any rate.
Q. Generally human nature does reciprocate, does it not?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. What are the relations between the employers and the employés here—the mutual feeling?—A. I can only speak for my own corporation. I think that my help realize that our interests are mutual, and that they must be as considerate of us as we are of them. In other words, I think that they appreciate kindnesses and consideration and attention.

Q. Is there growing up among the operatives in the different corporations any pride in respect to their corporations and for the success of their respective employers or mills?—A. Yes, sir; depending very much upon the management of the rooms in which they are employed, on the discipline maintained there.

**STRIKES.**

Q. You have had no strikes since you have been here?—A. No; nothing serious. I did have a hundred looms stop once for two hours.

Q. What was the occasion?—A. My weavers thought they did not like their section hand, and they wanted me to give them a new one, but they were the outs, and he was the in, and he remained in.

Q. It lasted two hours, you say?—A. Yes; that is to say, I had my mills all running in two hours, without any of my strikers.

Q. What was the thing they tried to do, and what led to that?—A. The section hand was instructed that if looms were stopped he should order the weavers to put them on. They took exception to that. Their desire was to put them on when they got ready; that is, to throw the belts on and start their looms.

Q. It was not any complaint as to their wages?—A. No, sir; simply a little matter of discipline.

Q. I suppose it would be entirely impossible for you to do business, if you could not control in matters of that kind?—A. I think they like it better to have some one to control in matters of that kind.

Q. What became of those weavers?—A. Some of them came back, and agreed to conform to our regulations, and went to work. I have been managing now for seventeen years, and that is the only strike I have ever had.

Q. Did you state the amount of your production?—A. I think not. We make 12,000,000 yards per year and consume 6,000 bales of cotton per year.

Q. Where has the material gone; where is your market?—A. New York, Boston, Chicago, and Saint Louis.

Q. Have you had any exportation?—A. Yes, I stated that; we exported some to China.

**THE TARIFF: ITS EFFECT ON COTTON MANUFACTURERS.**

Q. Do you think the tariff of much consequence in your business?—A. I believe in a protective tariff.

Q. How important is it to you in the actual prosecution of the business of your mills?—A. I have not given it much thought, but if foreign goods could be brought to this country like those which I make, and if they could be sold cheaper than we sell our goods, we would find ourselves simply without a market.

Q. Is there competition from rival manufacturers of the same class of goods in this country? There are many other manufacturers of the same kind of goods, I suppose?—A. Yes.
Q. Is there exportation of the same goods to any extent?—A. I think not.
Q. You have the entire American market?—A. Yes.
Q. Now, the point I want to ascertain is this: Whether or not the home competition is of sufficient activity to make it necessary for you to sell at only reasonable prices, or do you and other manufacturers make profits beyond the ordinary returns to capital?—A. Speaking for ourselves, we have not been able so far to do so, from one fact—that we are entirely new in the market, and it takes a few years to become established and get a reputation for one's goods.
Q. Do you know about the profits of other manufacturers in the same line of goods as your own?—A. No, sir; I do not, particularly.
Q. You are not aware whether their profits are larger than yours, to any extent, or not?—A. No, sir.
Q. Are there any of the same goods made in this city?—A. No; well, there is a very similar thing made at the Langdon Mills, but they do not conflict at all with ours, because they are all in the hands of the same selling agents.

WOMEN'S WORK AND WAGES IN COTTON MILLS.

Q. Do you think the women get as much for their labor as their labor is worth, compared with men?—A. Yes; I do. Our piece weavers, whether men or women, we pay the same wages to; there is no difference made in the mill, in any department, I believe, between men and women. But we prefer the women for weavers.
Q. What proportion of your help are women—say of the weavers?—A. Seven-eighths.
Q. How many weavers have you?—A. About three hundred and sixty.
Q. You have some work not done by the piece, I suppose?—A. Our picking and carding is day work. Our cloth-room work, handling the cloth after it has been manufactured, is day work. The rest is piece work.
Q. The great mass of your work is done by the piece, then?—A. Yes. Q. That is different from what it is in most mills, is it not?—A. I think not.
Q. Take the Amoskeag or the Manchester Mills—is a large part of their work done by the piece?—A. I think it is.
Q. As far as you know, do women get the same as men in Manchester, when they work by the piece?—A. Yes; there is no difference made between the sexes.
Q. And you think it is the general impression that women are more desirable than men as weavers?—A. Yes; that is my experience.
Q. Of what nationalities are the weavers?—A. About one-third of mine are Canadians. The others are English, English-American, Irish, Irish-American, Scotch, Scotch-American, German, German-American.
Q. By “German-American” you mean the children born here of German parents?—A. Yes.
Q. Have you any of the original American girls?—A. Very few. They go into the cloth-room.
Q. Why?—A. Because it is clean and light work.
Q. They prefer it?—A. Yes.
Q. It is a sort of aristocratic employment, is it?—A. Yes.
Q. Then our American girls are on top, are they?—A. Yes.
Q. Now, of these other nationalities—take the Canadian-French. In
some of the testimony before us there has been a pretty savage assault on them. I would like to know what they are, what possibilities there are in them as an operative population, and as prospective American citizens!—A. Well, I can only speak for myself, and for my mill. My Canadian help are very reliable, and when they have left us to go home on a vacation as a rule they have come back as they agreed to do. They like to go out in summer and to get back in the fall. Very few of my help go to Canada to stay or to make it their home.

Q. Do you think there is an increasing love for this country on the part of Canadians?—A. I think there is.

Q. They start with that Chinese sentiment of getting back home again after they make money?—A. Yes.

Q. Does that feeling decline as they remain here?—A. I think so; yes.

Q. How about their investing, to any extent, in real estate?—A. Here they are investing, in Manchester, and building little homes for themselves to quite an extent.

Q. How expensive homes do they get up?—A. I should judge the houses are all the way from $1,000 to $1,800 apiece.

Q. How much land will they have in connection with such a house?—A. They usually buy lots 50 by 100.

Q. What will that land cost?—A. From $8 to $16 a foot—on the other side of the river.

Q. They generally pay, then, from $400 up, for their lot?—A. Yes.

Q. Of course they earn that in the mills?—A. Yes.

Q. Then they get their houses up by the aid of a mortgage, or how?—A. I think as a rule they mortgage them.

Q. Their children, of course, get into the schools of the city?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you any Canadian-Americans, that is, Canadians born here in New Hampshire, who have become operatives, or have not their parents been here long enough for that?—A. I do not think we have any such.

The CHAIRMAN. I wanted to see what kind of boy and girl grow up here as part of our own institutions.

The WITNESS. I do not think we have any of those, but we have Canadian help who have been with us ever since we started.

Q. Three years.—A. For three years. And those that leave us, both voluntarily and involuntarily, would average, I should think, perhaps 5 per cent. a month.

Q. The Canadian help is most of it men, or is it women?—A. Women and children.

Q. They are in the majority?—A. Yes. They have very large families usually—the old-fashioned families.

Q. Do you have any trouble as to the hours of labor; do the people make any complaint of the eleven hours?—A. No; I never hear of any.

Q. They work by the piece, and, working by the piece, they want to work more time for the sake of the money?—A. Yes.

Q. What hours did you work when you began thirty years ago?—A. Fourteen or fourteen and a half hours a day.

Q. Was your work by the hour harder than the work done in any given hour now; that is, taking the day’s work all through, was it a harder day’s work, even if it had been no longer, or an easier one than you do now?—A. Well it was about the same, with the exception that we had some lifting then. Everything had to be carried by hand in the
old days. Nowadays it is transported on a truck. All the yarn and roving and bobbins.

Q. Do you think any legislation would be of any service, so far as the manufacturing business is concerned?—A. No, sir; I do not.

CHILD LABOR.

Q. Child labor is regulated as far as it need be, you think, for the good of the children?—A. Well, I should prefer the Rhode Island law here to our New Hampshire law.

Q. What is the difference?—A. They allow children to begin younger; at the same time they give them the benefit of schools; and, in a well-ventilated mill, for a child to alternate between the schoolhouse and the mill, I don't believe would hurt it, or stop their growth or injure them in any way, physically or intellectually.

SANITARY CONDITIONS AND CARE.

Q. Take the mills generally, including your own, of course, how is it as to the matter of ventilation and sanitary condition during the hours of labor?—A. They are very much better than they were in the old times.

Q. I suppose it is not quite so healthy as to work out of doors, in that regard, and cannot be made so?—A. No, sir; but it is just as healthy as any other in-door occupation.

Q. Is it as healthy as household work for a girl, do you think?—A. I should think it would be. Speaking of my own household experience, we do not average any more sickness in a mill than in a house.

Q. What provision is made, if any, with reference to medical treatment for operatives? Do the corporations, or the management, take any interest in them when sick, or do anything for them in that regard?—A. Whenever we hear of small-pox we vaccinate, and make it compulsory.

Q. You turn them off if they do not vaccinate?—A. Yes.

Q. You can make it compulsory in that way, I suppose, when you could not in any other way?—A. Yes. If our help are injured through any accident, such as getting their hands into the gearing or into any part of the machinery, and it is done in the line of their duty, we pay the doctors' bills; if it is done for a frolic, we let them pay their own bills.

Q. Does your help dare to speak to you on the street?—A. Oh, yes.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYED.

Q. We have had testimony somewhere that the bosses and agents maintain a sort of aristocracy, and never, under any circumstances, except by way of command, communicate verbally with their help, or their inferiors, as they are called. Are there any such relations as that between the employes and employers here that you have ever heard of?—A. I think not. Speaking for myself, I never do my talking to the hands; I do all my talking with the overseers.

Q. There is a matter of discipline involved there, I suppose?—A. Yes. On the street I talk with my people and recognize them.

Q. I do not suppose you feel obliged to visit their families, or give private recognition in that way?—A. No; but I think recognition is due to anybody.
Q. That is the sentiment you have about it—you look upon them as human beings?—A. Yes. I know I was human when I was a boy in a mill, but no more so than I am now.

Q. Where the employers and the empleys have that sort of relation is there, or is there not, likely to be any of this industrial clash that we read so much of in the way of strikes and such things?—A. I think one-half of the trouble could be avoided in other cities that have earned quite a notoriety in that direction, particularly Fall River.

Q. Do you know of any American city where there have been difficulties between employers and laborers to the extent that there has been in Fall River?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. So it is hardly fair to take that city and its condition as an illustration of the relations between the industrial classes and those who have the management of capital here throughout the Northern States, is it?—A. I think it would be very unjust to other cities. I lived in Fall River nearly seven years, and worked in the mills.

Q. How did you find things there then?—A. It was about the same condition then that exists to-day; there were frequent strikes.

EFFECT OF DIFFERENCE IN WAGES ON COTTON INDUSTRIES IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Have the American manufacturers any ground for fear of English manufacturers, except on the cost of labor?—A. Not the least.

Q. They are able to compete except on account of the difference in the cost of labor?—A. That is all.

Q. Well, that is likely to be a continuing condition in this country, is it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. There is no time in the future when that necessity will not exist?—A. I think we are far in advance of them to-day in a great many lines of work.

Q. I am speaking of the labor question. Do you think that that difference in the cost of labor will create any necessity for protection against it, as you say?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I understand you to say that the whole cost of labor in the cloth which you described as being manufactured by your mill was about a cent a yard?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is Mr. Atkinson's statement too. What is the difference in the cost to the manufacturer here and in England of the raw material that goes into a yard of cloth—what advantage have you, in the cost of the raw material, over the English manufacturer?—A. We have none that I can think of.

Mr. Pugh. Mr. Atkinson puts it down at a half a cent.

The Witness. Well, I never gave it any particular thought, and he is, perhaps, in a better position to determine that than I am. My thought was that the English manufacturer's opportunity was very much better than ours. They use so much starch in their goods in finishing—all the way from 20 to 50 per cent.

Q. Then what is the advantage you have of him on account of the cost of the transportation, there and back, of the raw material and the fabric?—A. I do not know. I am not prepared to answer that question to-day.

Mr. Pugh. That is fully a half a cent.

The Chairman. What was the question?

Mr. Pugh. The question is as to the cost of raw material and trans-
portation there, to make the fabrics out of, and then bringing the fabric back to the American market.

The WITNESS. We have a difference of half a cent in our favor, do you mean?

Mr. PUGH. Yes, in your favor. Now then, all the advantage they have over you is in the cost of labor, and you offset that by a half a cent difference in the cost of the raw material, and a half a cent in the cost of transportation. That I merely mentioned as Mr. Atkinson's statement, and he is a manufacturer of cotton goods for thirty years.

The CHAIRMAN. His statement is that we have as good a chance as they.

Mr. PUGH. Yes; and he mentions jeans, denims, and sheetings. He says that we are not only able to compete with them on the cost of production, notwithstanding the superior labor, but also in the superiority of the goods; that our goods are better, and that we are able to meet them anywhere in the South American markets, and in Brazil and China; and you say you do ship to China?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

Q. And you sell there over English goods?

The WITNESS. We send our surplus there.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 12, 1883.

CHARLES D. McDUFFIE examined.

By Mr. PUGH:

Question. You live in Manchester?—Answer. Yes.

THE MANCHESTER (N. H.) MILLS: THEIR CAPACITY, ETC.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am agent of the Manchester Mills, manufacturing department.

Q. How long have you been associated with manufacturing industries?—A. I began my life in the cotton mill, at the age of seventeen, in Lowell, Mass., at the rate of 50 cents per day. I have worked in a cotton mill in every department. I spent several years in Lowell; then I spent a number of years in Salem, Mass.; a number of years in Tannum; and a half years in Lawrence; and now I have been three years in Manchester. I have served in the capacity of workman in every department, carding, spinning, weaving, dressing, as assistant overseer, as overseer, as superintendent, and am now agent.

DUTIES OF OVERSEEERS, SUPERINTENDENTS, ETC.

Q. Define in brief, if you please, the duties of an overseer, a superintendent, and an agent. — A. An overseer has charge of one particular department, or perhaps three or four or five departments. It usually is applied to carding; he may have all the carding in the establishment; there may be a half dozen rooms. Not often is he an overseer in a carding and spinning department together, or in spinning and weaving. Overseers have one special training. The overseer that takes charge of a department has been engaged a long time in the business, and has a thorough knowledge of that which he takes to oversee. He is selected for his natural fitness for his position, on account of his having an equa-
ble mind, having some idea of the principles of equity, and the faculty of managing other people. All order and system must come from a good discipline founded upon justice, in order to have permanent success. The overseer’s duties are to be in his room early in the morning and remain in his room, looking after all the details. He hires all his help—hires his assistants, discharges them, gives them a time bill which they take to the office, on which to get their money from the paymaster. He is responsible for the results obtained from his room, and he is responsible to the agent or superintendent. He is a man that is paid on an average, in New England, at the present time, about $100 a month; sometimes a little less; sometimes one-third more. A first-class overseer must be a man who has a natural adaptation to the business of governing other people. I have a superintendent at my mills. That superintendent is at the mills in the morning the first thing, when the mills start. He is the supervisor of every department; every overseer is responsible to him, all through the departments, and throughout the details in carrying out the changes from one class of goods to another. In fact he is the supervisor of every department that there is in the mill.

Q. What are his wages, generally?—A. His wages are very variable; all the way from $1,500 to $5,000 per year.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. That is the superintendent?—A. Yes; and it may run more. I refer to the superintendent who is a superintendent for the agent where there is a local agent. In some cases there is no local agent, and the superintendent is then the agent for the manager.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Now what are the duties of the agent, and what is his compensation?—A. His duties, I should describe almost identically as Mr. Livermore described them to you this morning. He is responsible to the treasurer for the performance of his duties and the result to be obtained.

Q. The compensation of agents varies of course?—A. That varies very much indeed.

Q. You are the agent of the Manchester Mills?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And have been serving in that capacity for three years?—A. Yes; in this town.

Q. What is the magnitude of that manufacturing business that you superintend?—A. We manufacture about 18,000,000 yards of worsted dress goods, and about 13,000,000 yards of print cloths. We use about 8,000 bales of cotton a year, and about 3,500,000 pounds of wool.

Q. How many laborers do you employ to do that?—A. When fully running we should employ about 2,650. You are noting in this that I only represent one department of the Manchester Mills, Mr. B. C. Dean representing the printing department.

Q. You are speaking now of the number of laborers employed in your department?—A. Yes; and that only.

WAGES.

Q. State the average amount of wages you pay—I mean the amount of the pay-roll. A. Would you care to take details in relation to each and every class of hands that we employ, and the wages paid them, or would you prefer to take a general average, as given to you this morning?
Mr. Pugh. Well, we never have had any statement in detail, and I see that the comparisons made here and in other countries go somewhat into detail; they grade the laborers and tell what sort of work these laborers do and the wages they get in each particular branch. If it would not be too much trouble, it might be well for us to have such a statement. Can you furnish us with a statement of that sort?

The Witness. I can.

The Chairman. It would be very desirable if you would file such a statement. It would serve as a basis for a great deal of useful comparison everywhere.

Mr. Pugh. Yes; it would.

The Witness. When running in full our pay-roll will amount close to $800,000 per annum for labor.

Q. How do you itemize that expenditure?—A. That is labor alone inside the yard. By applying the average wages to each one I give you, you would make up close to $800,000 by taking the number of working days in the year. Our assistant paymaster will make out for you a detailed list of the wages, and anything coming from him will be authentic.

Mr. Pugh. That disposes of that question. Now, as to the houses that the people live in.

OPERATIVES’ HOUSES.

The Witness. Our rents run, for a tenement, at from $5 to $15 a month, and higher. Fifteen dollars a month includes a house large enough to keep forty boarders. The rents here, upon the street, as given to you by Mr. Whitman, are too low. We pay the water-tax in these houses of ours, but the tenants pay for the gas they use. The sanitary conditions of the houses are good. I have a superintendent of the yard and tenements, who visits and examines the tenements, and keeps up the repairs. Our income from these tenements would not be 2 per cent. on their value.

Q. Do you make any deduction on account of your low rent in the wages you pay?—A. No, sir; We do not.

THE TARIFF: ITS EFFECT ON COTTON INDUSTRIES.

In the absence of a question, I will introduce one. On account of the protective tariff, we were enabled to start making worsted dress goods—cotton warp and worsted filling. The English had that entire trade to themselves in this country before that time. Some mills started fifteen years ago. At that time a common piece of Bradford goods, 21 inches wide, cotton warp and worsted filling, would bring 21 cents and 22 cents per yard. Now that same piece of goods is sold at from 10 to 12 cents a yard, and the English goods are shut out. Suppose we had not been able to do that—suppose the tariff had been a little lower, so as not to warrant us in starting that industry, and learning to manufacture cheaply, the English would have held the market and we must have paid them their price of 21 cents. It is only possible for that to have been done through the tariff, and it is through that tariff that we are now enabled to make a piece of what is called Bradford goods and sell it at the present prices.

Q. You think there would be no competition among importers? You say the Englishman would get his 21 cents. You think competition among manufacturers in England and importers here would not have the same effect in America that American competition has?—A. Not to
that extent—not till they could supply the markets of the world. If they could supply the markets of the world, and had a surplus, then the law of supply and demand would come in, and must follow.

**PROFITS ON COTTON MANUFACTURE.**

Q. What profit did you make on the goods when you first commenced manufacturing under the tariff?—A. The Pacific Mills, which first began the manufacture of those goods, almost failed. They did not make any profit. It is only by learning to do a thing that we can hope for success.

Q. What profit do you realize now from the same goods?—A. The profit is variable from year to year.

Q. It is greater, though, than it was when you first commenced manufacturing?—A. It has been greater since then. The worsted business is in a measure a fancy business, and in certain years the manufacturers can make 10 or 15 per cent., and in other years they make nothing. The average in the Manchester Mills since they started (they once shrunk almost entirely, and reorganized) will, I think, be somewhere about 7 per cent. I was talking with one of the first owners this week in relation to this very matter.

Q. The dividend, you say, is 7 per cent.?—A. Seven per cent. per annum—3½ per cent. semi-annually.

**SURPLUS EARNINGS.**

Q. What surplus was left after the distribution of the dividend?—A. We have at the present time a capital of $2,000,000. We have a surplus of a trifle over $1,000,000.

Q. That is, accumulations from the industry after distributing the dividends?—A. That is the accumulations of the industry, or, in other words, that is the starting point when it was reorganized. The plant was bought for $1,000,000, and $1,000,000 surplus was put in, making the capital altogether $2,000,000. When they reorganized this property was sold for $1,000,000. They organized a company that issued stock, and made the capital $2,000,000, and that gave $1,000,000 of quick capital or surplus, whichever you call it.

Q. There was no increase in the capacity of the mills when you increased the stock to $2,000,000?—A. There has been an increase in the capacity of the mills since it was bought for $1,000,000, and the quick capital has remained intact.

Q. You have increased that from other incomes from the same industry?—A. The quick capital has remained intact, within less than $200,000.

**ALLOWANCE FOR DEPRECIATION OF PLANT.**

In relation to the question of depreciation of plant and machinery in its relation to earnings: These mills of Mr. Whitman's started new three years ago. They have a capital of $900,000. Their books are made up to a balance as between the mill and the stockholder. Hence the books have to balance and show a surplus, if there is any. But it is not charged off and sunk out of sight for depreciation. Hence, when he tells you what they have accumulated in three years, he gives you but a small sum for the depreciation of that property. The manufacturing business of New England to-day is exactly this: no mill without a surplus or the plant "marked down"—do you understand that term!
The Chairman. I do not.

Mr. Pugh. So that they do not have to borrow money.

The Witness. Mr. Whitman testified to a certain number of thousand dollars—if they had balanced their books to just $900,000 they would have shown no surplus.

By the Chairman:

Q. Marked it down, you mean, according to the depreciation which had taken place?—A. Yes. That is the proper way to do it, if they see fit to do it.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. You mean depreciation in the plant?—A. Yes; in the plant.

Q. What do you mean by depreciation? Do you mean in its market value or compared with its original cost?—A. I mean to say that at the expiration of twenty years—Mr. Livermore puts it at ten, but at the expiration of twenty years any way—that machinery is entirely gone. Then where is the money to buy more?

By the Chairman:

Q. That is, assuming that there have been no breaks—no casualties to the machinery, and that it becomes simply worn out?—A. It becomes worn out. That term, you may say, is the life-time of the machinery. Some of it will go in six years, for instance.

Q. That is what you mean by depreciation?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. That is, wear and tear?—A. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. But wear and tear includes breakage and such things, and not merely the natural wearing out.—A. It includes repairs for breakage, &c.

Q. Wear is one thing and tear another.—A. Yes; but "depreciation in the value of property" covers everything fully.

Q. From all causes?—A. From every cause.

Q. You say the depreciation is such that the plant, &c., will be exhausted in twenty years?—A. It will be.

RELATIVE COST OF MANUFACTURES IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

I should like to touch, in this connection—and that will be all I shall have to say in relation to Mr. Whitman's testimony—upon the position he assumed in the matter of the advantages we had as compared with Englishmen in the cost of goods. Now, to start with, money is the first factor. They have it cheaper; they have always had it cheaper than we have. The second factor, labor, is just as near one-half there compared with here, whether in coal mines or anywhere else, as you can possibly make it. Hence the cost of everything that enters into that—the cost of every day's labor that enters into it—the cost of every pound of iron that enters into it, is affected by that labor factor—which makes that plant stand in one-half the value it would stand here. Or, in other words, were I running a mill in England, like the Manchester Mills here, all I would want would be $500,000 fixed capital and $500,000 quick capital to make it just what it would be here on double the amount. Their coal costs them one-half and their gas one-half what ours costs us, and, in fact, everything you can touch in connection with English or French manufactures to-day is just about one-half what it
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is here. Your consul's reports confirm my position, with the exception of Mr. Shaw's. Drugs are just one-half; but we have got some relief under the present tariff.

Q. To what do you attribute that difference in the cost, outside of the cost of labor?

The WITNESS. The cost to the English.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

A. I attribute it first to cheap money.

Mr. PUGH. Mr. Sherman said in the Senate last session that the capital of this country did not need any protection from England at all. Now, years ago the fact may have been as you have stated it; but at this time there is as much capital in this country as can be employed anywhere on earth, and it is now going in New York at one-half per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. That is on call.

Mr. PUGH. Yes; and there are millions upon millions here, uninvested, in the savings banks.

The WITNESS. Well, do you believe in dry facts?

Mr. PUGH. That is what we want.

MONEY SEeks THE BEST INVESTMENTS.

The WITNESS. You must remember that money always seeks the best investments, and it is very strange to me that the English invest any money in this country if they cannot do better with it here than they can at home. I never heard of such a thing before.

Mr. PUGH. There is a great deal of English money invested in manufacture here.

The WITNESS. Precisely so. They brought it over here and put it into the South and other parts of the country; and it is very strange, if your position is correct, why their capital should seek this country. If that does not prove the fact that they do have cheaper money there than we have here, I cannot understand what they do it for.

Mr. PUGH. The "consols" in England are 2 and 2½ per cent.; our Federal securities are 3 per cent., and Mr. Sherman says he has no doubt that he could fund our present debt in 2 per cent. bonds running thirty years—our entire national debt—the debt coming due in 1930, amounting to $738,000,000. He has been Secretary of the Treasury, and he is familiar with that subject.

The WITNESS. Precisely; but I think I have heard you say that you did not believe all you heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sherman said that capital did not need any protection; but he did not say that capital did not get twice the rate of interest here that it gets over there, and that is its only protection. It needs no protection as long as it is able to get twice the interest here that it gets in England—even without any law in its favor.

The WITNESS. The paper of a solid company, with the additional name of the selling agent and treasurer, if put on the market, or discounted for six months, would run to-day for from 5 to 6 per cent.

INTEREST AND PROFITS, BOTH, ON BORROWED MONEY.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Do you think that consumers ought to be charged not only with the interest on capital, but also the interest on borrowed capital, so that, for example, if a man has to borrow money with which to go into an industry, the consumer should pay the interest which that man pays
and then pay him also the profit due to the capital itself!—A. I cannot see any otherwise, or why money should not have its return.

Mr. PUGH. I do not see but what that is the practical operation.

The WITNESS. It is.

Mr. PUGH. I am only speaking of the justice of it.

The WITNESS. It is in the clothes you wear, and the boots and shoes you wear, and the food you eat, and everything that applies to you, and has been so from the early days.

Mr. PUGH. I know that every capitalist charges what money costs him. If he has to borrow he charges the interest.

The WITNESS. Precisely. I presume we have a million, as I have said, or $900,000 quick capital, and yet I suppose the Manchester mills do not pay less than $100,000 a year interest.

Q. That is, to the stockholders?—A. That is, in the cost of goods.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You mean interest on borrowed money?—A. Money that they have to do business with.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Is it their own surplus that they pay interest on?—A. No.

Q. It is capital borrowed from other people?

SURPLUS CAPITAL NECESSARY FOR MANUFACTURE.

A. As I said, any manufacturing company that has not a surplus in New England cannot manufacture at a profit.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Why?—A. Because there is not a profit to be had. In order to start, first, they will have to borrow money to buy the cotton; then they have to borrow money to hold the goods—at every move they have to borrow money.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. How do they borrow money and pay 5 per cent., and still live and prosper?

The WITNESS. Five per cent, semi-annually or annually?

Mr. PUGH. I do not know; whatever the rate is.

A. That is the profit made on the goods manufactured.

Mr. PUGH. Here is one man owning his own capital, who does not have to borrow, and he makes 5 per cent. How is the man that borrows money able to do that?

The WITNESS. That is the very thing that makes him strong.

Mr. PUGH. All these people seem to live and prosper.

The WITNESS. Some of them do and some do not.

Mr. PUGH. There are very few failures that I ever heard of.

The WITNESS. There were some failures here to the extent of $800,000, some eight years ago, in the Manchester mills.

Mr. PUGH. But that was a very bad time; all the industries of the country were prostrated then.

The WITNESS. If you look into Rhode Island I think you will find the mourners in Senator Sprague's estate; you will find the mourners at the Atlantic Mills, who "scaled down" at 20 in 1876.

Mr. PUGH. Yes; right in that period under the operation of that money trouble.

The WITNESS. And in 1877, I think, you will find the mourners in the mills of Lewiston, notwithstanding a capital of $1,900,000.
Mr. Pugh. But that failure was not for the reason you state, but for a cause that prostrated the business of the whole country, whatever that was. People differ about it. There were many causes, I suppose, but that was the general condition of industries and enterprise, whether the capital was borrowed or not.

The Witness. I cannot see how that would be the general condition when one lived through it and another did not. The conditions, could not have been different.

Mr. Pugh. All ships do not go down in a storm. Some skillful navigators survive through the severest storms.

The Witness. I suppose luck and circumstances in life have much to do with it.

Mr. Pugh. Well, you can proceed with your statement.

WOOLENS: RELATIVE COST OF MANUFACTURE IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

The Chairman. You were giving the various reasons why American manufacturers had difficulty in competing with English manufacturers, and you were saying that certain things were higher here.

The Witness. Wool, for example, is much cheaper there. We have to pay more for the wool to the farmers of Ohio, West Virginia, Missouri, and Kentucky. I was saying that I looked into the matter of making French all-wool cashmeres, which take fine wool—XX and above. A piece of gray goods, weighing 4 yards to the pound, costing 21 cents in France, laid down, we will call it, at 42 cents a yard, 4 yards to the pound, would make it $1.68 a pound for the goods, which it would cost the American buyer.

By the Chairman:

Q. The French article?—A. The French article.

Q. That was how long ago?—A. That was two years ago. To-day the material in that piece of goods would cost us $1.20 a pound here.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Bought from the American raiser?—A. Bought from the American raiser in West Virginia, Ohio, or Pennsylvania. Now, if you take $1.20 from $1.68, it shows you what money there is left to manufacture a pound of those goods.

The Chairman. Forty-eight cents.

The Witness. Yes. We could not do it for that.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. What do you pay now for the wool from Pennsylvania, West Virginia, or Ohio?—A. I think 45 cents it is worth to-day.

Q. Instead of $1 and what, did you state?—A. For that wool we pay 45 cents, and allowing 56 per cent. for shrinkage, and something more for noils (which is waste), you will see that I come pretty near to $1.20 a pound that that material costs us bought from the Ohio wool-raiser.

Q. Bought when, now?—A. Bought now.

By the Chairman:

Q. You say you cannot manufacture for 48 cents?—A. I do not think we can manufacture those goods for 48 cents a pound.

Q. What could you manufacture them for?—A. I am not prepared to say at the moment, although I have an exact duplicate of the French system of manufacture.
By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Where does France buy her wool; the wool that she makes that cloth out of?—A. From England.

Q. Where do you buy your wools?—A. We buy some in England, and we buy some in Montevideo, some in Boston, in Cincinnati, in Philadelphia, Saint Louis, in Louisville, and in Canada.

Q. You buy your wool, then, some of it in the same place where France buys her wool?—A. Precisely.

By the Chairman:

Q. What do you think France sells these articles you speak of for?—A. I am telling you what the American buyer could buy it for in France. I am simply doubling it on account of the duty.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. You add the duty by doubling it?—A. Yes.

Q. The duty is about what?—A. The duty would be a little more than double. It depends on the kind.

Q. But you double the price on account of the duty?—A. Yes.

Q. And notwithstanding that, France takes possession of this market with those goods?—A. Yes; England cannot come in.

Q. To what do you attribute that?—A. I attribute that to a long experience in that line, with cheap labor and long hours.

Q. To superior machinery, is it not?—A. I have got some new machinery exactly like it.

Q. How do you understand that an English sheep-raiser, who pays from $15 to $25 an acre rent for the land on which he pastures his sheep, can sell his wool cheaper than the sheep-raiser of Texas, Colorado, California, and Oregon, where it does not cost them anything for the land?—A. Let me explain that the English do not raise any of this fine wool at home.

Q. They buy it from other countries?—A. It comes from Australia and from the coast. The Southdowns and the quarter-blood that they have would compare favorably with Kentucky and Missouri combings, being something in that line. Our coarse wool has all the protection that it needs now. It has protection to that extent that in a few years it will be as cheap here as there.

Mr. Pugh. I cannot understand why they cannot raise wool as cheap here as anywhere, having substantially nothing to pay for the land.

The Witness. The cost of wool depends on the feed of sheep largely, and the feed of sheep is a factor with the English more than it is with us.

Mr. Pugh. I have heard English manufacturers state that the American wools were stronger—that the fiber was stronger than the fiber of the foreign wool—and that the only wools that we had to compete with were the fine wools for making the finer fabrics.

The Witness. There is a fine wool, and as good wool, raised in this country as any I have ever seen. That is, I mean sheep’s wool.

Q. Where is that raised?—A. The best is raised in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Ohio.

Q. Does that need any protection?—A. Yes, it does.

Q. Against whom or what?—A. Against the whole face of the earth that raises that grade of wool.

Q. What do you call that sort of wool; has it got any name?—A. I give you the mercantile name, “XX wool, and above.”

Q. You say that these fine wools that we are able to raise need protection?—A. Yes.
Q. Well, they will always need it if they need it now, won't they?—
A. No, sir.

Q. How are they going to recover from the necessity of protection?—
A. They need protection until they can supply our demand. Then it
seeks its own level.

Q. They do not produce enough of that quality of wool to supply the
American demand?—A. No, sir.

Q. That creates the necessity of importing it?—A. That creates the
necessity of importing it; that impoverishes the country by sending
the money out of it, and it lessens the enterprise of raising it. The neces-
sity for protection does exist so that they may eventually be able to
supply our own consumption, and should be protected until they are
able to do it. We need protection in the manufacture until we can
manufacture as cheaply as they can manufacture.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is there not some American substitute already manufactured that
might be as usefully consumed as this French article?—A. The ques-
tion never comes up in relation to usefulness, but simply in relation to
what women want.

Q. I should like to hear you on that. Here is a production no better
than other American productions that are as good. Why can we not
manufacture and use the American article, and keep the French article
out? What principle is there in human nature which compels us here
and beats the tariff, and beats industry, and breaks down business,
ruins fortunes, and creates international complications?—A. Two years
ago there was a movement made in England to bring about the use of
the Bradford manufacture, and the discarding of the French. Society
usages in England are quite different from what they are in this coun-
try, and by concerted action several meetings were brought about in
the manufacturing districts and in the large cities to accomplish that
result. They failed, however.

Q. Why?—A. Simply because the people who buy would have what
they wanted.

Q. They had taken a fancy to have these French goods?—A. Exac-
tly.

Q. That was an un-English view, considering the national prejudice
to the French after a thousand years of conflict?—A. That didn't count.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. These styles of French goods you speak of are for luxuries, are
they not; they are for dresses?—A. Yes; they are for dresses.

Q. They are the finest quality of woolen goods?—A. They are the
finest quality of worsted goods.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Suppose you were to double the duties on that article; then what?
—A. You would have more duties, probably, for they would still have it.

Q. Would it not develop a similar kind of industry here?—A. It
would develop machinery here for the manufacture of those goods.

Q. What is the peculiarity of those goods you mention?—A. They
have a very soft handle, a peculiar handle, only got by the right pro-
cess of work in every case.

Q. They fit the mind as well as the body?—A. They fit the mind,
and are very easy to the body.
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Q. There is then a primary relation of clothing to the mental constitution?—A. I think there is.
Q. And that is a commercial element?—A. Yes; and when the mental constitution has the right clothing, it is in a far better mental condition than otherwise.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND IN WOOLEN GOODS.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. How does the supply of woolen goods now compare with demand?—A. The supply got beyond the demand, and caused the stopping of one-third of all the sets of woolen machinery in this country. I am speaking of woolens now, not worsteds.
Q. What class of goods covers that description?—A. Almost every class of goods made by woolen manufacturers.
Q. And out of what kind of wool?—A. Every kind of wool.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Underclothing, also?—A. Yes; underclothing has had a very severe falling off. I was talking with one of the largest manufacturers in this State not long ago, Mr. Smith, of Hillsboro', on that subject.
Q. How do you explain that excess in the supply over the demand of that class of woolen goods?—A. I account for it for the time being in this way—for such facts do exist—a want of employment of all the labor in the United States.
Q. So as to increase the ability of the unemployed to buy this sort of goods?—A. Yes; it is very easy to calculate how many yards per capita has been used in the past; but the capacity of the buyer to buy regulates the whole of it in the future.

WHY LABOR IS UNEMPLOYED.

Q. Why cannot these unemployed people get employment?—Mr. Livermore says that the labor supply is not sufficient in Lowell and Fall River.—A. That is quite easy to arrive at, I think. If you build a large amount of railroads, you employ a great amount of labor in the building of those railroads, and everything that goes into the construction of those roads to make a perfect railroad. Hence, when you stop building, what becomes of the labor. When the iron mill stops where are you going to send the men?
Q. The iron mills, though, are running now, and doing a prosperous business.—A. A part of them only. If the iron mills were running and doing a prosperous business, they would not be selling steel rails at $38 a ton.
Q. This condition of things you speak of is produced by laws that are not under our control, is it not?—A. They have always been in the past beyond the control of people.
Q. There are ups and downs in the supply of labor?—A. Yes.
Q. And ups and downs in the supply of products of all descriptions.—A. Yes.
Q. And those take place from natural causes and laws that we cannot control?—A. Yes.
Q. Then when that condition exists, it is abnormal; it is not natural; not legitimate, is it?—A. It is not, as we look at it. It may be necessary for existence.

Mr. PUGH. I was struck by a remark that some witness made (I think
it was Mr. Wright, of Massachusetts), that business never runs in a
straight line; it always goes on one side or the other, and the world is
trying to get it in a straight line; but it will not go there and will not
stay there.

PROSPERITY NEVER CONTINUOUS.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you mean that legislation has nothing to do with the condi-
tions of business?—A. I do not mean anything of that kind.

Q. What do you mean by natural law of supply and demand, and that
the thing must be taken as it is, and that there has never been any way
of regulating or affecting it. We have had our tariff law, and I thought
you were advocating such a law. Did that induce an abnormal condi-
tion of things?—A. You certainly can affect business by laws.

Q. Then what does this mean, that interference with natural law is
hurtful, or do you mean to say that?—A. I mean to say that in the past
the controllers of capital in the development of their interests, and the
statesmen who have ruled the country by their laws, have never been
able to make a continuous prosperity or a successful employment of all
labor. What they have not done in the past can we hope they will do in
the future?

Q. You mean to say that the evils that exist under a purely natural state
of things have not been wholly obviated by legislation?—A. Precisely.

Q. You think that legislation may be useful and beneficial?—A. It
cannot be otherwise; it must be.

Q. Then you would not accept the natural condition of things as in-
dispensable; you would try to improve it by human agency?—A. Of
course.

Mr. PUGH. We all understand that if the seasons are not favorable,
we will not raise an abundant crop.

TARIFF LEGISLATION: ITS EFFECTS ON BUSINESS.

The WITNESS. I will give you my opinion of the last tariff legislation.
If it had not taken place, we should have had a status of affairs at
present that many would regret.

Q. You mean the tariff of last winter?—A. Yes, you would have
done better then to give us almost anything than nothing. There was
a want of confidence in the business community, and among capitalists.

Q. What led to that want of confidence, the apprehension that some-
thing would be done, and nobody knew what?—A. It was the balance
between the two parties.

Q. What led to that lack of confidence; was it the apprehension of a
change, and no certainty as to what the change would be, or the ex-
tent to which it would be carried?—A. The average mind takes into
consideration the fact that there are two factors in politics and legisla-
tion; the Democratic and the Republican party. When either one of
those two factors can take advantage of the other by legislation or
otherwise to win even a State or a national contest, the average business
man takes into consideration the chances, and what had better be done,
whether the capital had better be withdrawn from this, that, or the
other. There was a very strong feeling in relation to this by the busi-
ness men of New England, more so I think than Congress or you New
England Senators or Representatives altogether realized.

Q. What was the feeling?—A. The feeling was that something should
be done.
Q. Well, did it make any difference to you what was done, provided something was done?—A. That would give its own answer, almost.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it so. Of course, we all understand what is going on here; but the testimony will go to the country, and I would like to have you elucidate your views fully on this point, otherwise you may be misunderstood, perhaps.

The WITNESS. Well, New England wanted and demanded protection. There are elements in New England in trade circles that do not want it; but not to have passed any tariff legislation would have thrown the question into the Presidential contest where it might have caused serious trouble, or at least the business community felt that way, and they felt that there should be action.

Q. With the expectation that what action should then be taken would be permanent, or at least exist for several years?—A. Yes; that it would be permanent or have a measure of permanence, and that that should go on for several years. It is not expected by the business men and capitalists of New England that the tariff will be tinkered with now for five or ten years. The moment that it is, it disorganizes almost everything that it touches.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that if you had been on the spot you would have known that the New England representatives did realize the home feeling, and that there was as much effort made to accomplish at that time as a host of manufacturers could have done in consultation together.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. What has been the condition of things under the operation of the tariff for twenty years without any changes?—A. There have been no ups and downs—A. There have been changes in the tariff for twenty years.

Q. Have there not been a good many?—A. Yes; quite a number.

Q. Then the tariff does not afford absolute safety to manufacturing industries?—A. No; because the tariff does not regulate, for instance, railroad building, or the application of a very large amount of capital from its legitimate uses to, you may say, illegitimate uses, enabling the construction of a long line of railroad, investing millions in that direction.

OVERPRODUCTION.

You attribute the fact of an overstock in production to the inability of the unemployed class to consume?—A. Precisely.

Q. Do you think that the general condition in this country that must afford prosperity to manufacturing industries will always give employment enough to the laborers of the country to warrant any amount of production, and that it will be met by consumption?—A. That will depend on the employment in other directions—on all other industries being employed. It could not depend upon any other issue.

Q. How can the tariff give employment to those unemployed people?—A. I did not say that it would.

Q. Then the manufacturer will be subject to this overstock and oversupply from unemployment produced by causes not under your control?—A. Precisely; but we should suffer very much greater if we had not any consumption at all.

Q. How much benefit do you get in the price of your protected articles from the tariff—I mean how much of profit do you derive from the protected articles that you manufacture?—A. I do not know that I can answer that question directly; I do not know that I understand it en-
tirely; not so much from the way you ask it as from the conditions it involves. For instance, to-day a piece of goods that cost 6d. in Bradford would cost not quite 1s. here. That piece of goods that could be bought and laid down here for 13 to 15 cents we can manufacture and sell for about 10½ cents. Hence you may say it is prohibitory. The question of where we get protection to our textile industries comes entirely in the amount of labor in the protected piece of goods. If there is but little labor in the piece of goods we do not need any protection, if there is much labor in it it enters into a large part of the cost of the piece of goods. We do, then, need protection or we must stop making those goods.

THE CLASS OF GOODS THAT REQUIRE PROTECTION.

Q. You need protection in that class of goods that require a greater amount of labor!—A. Yes.
Q. What class of goods is that? Is it not the finer fabrics?—A. Yes; in every case.
Q. The luxuries—the dress of the people—form the goods that you speak of that cost more labor, and that you need protection to make!—A. Yes; you may call them luxuries.

Mr. Pugh. I mean by that that it is a voluntary purchase—it is not a necessary of life—it is ornament to the person, to suit the taste and pride. The duty could go on that class of goods, and thus tax the consumption of that class who want dress, and gratify their pride and taste, and there is where I have always said the duty ought to go.

WHAT ARE LUXURIES!—WHAT NECESSITIES!

The Witness. Please tell me where the necessity ceases to exist and the luxury begins. Is there any known law that shall indicate that to me? I wish I could get at it.

Mr. Pugh. Well, we have a general idea of what is necessary.

The Witness. No two of us would agree.

Mr. Pugh. There are a great many definitions. Professor Sumner says that necessaries are absolute to the extent of food, clothing, and shelter, when you get them in a reasonable degree. Then you enter, beyond that, upon shelter, upon clothing, and upon food that may be entitled to luxury, if you want fine food, fine houses, or fine dress. Those are relative necessities, depending upon the taste of the people. Now, my idea of it is, in general, that those things that we are bound to have for our physical wants and conditions are "necessaries," and when you go beyond that you enter the field of luxury. If you build fine houses and wear fine clothes and eat fine food, that is a voluntary thing. You are not compelled to have them, but you purchase them voluntarily. That is the distinction I make between necessity and luxury, and I am for relieving the necessities that everybody is compelled to have, as far as it can be done, and putting the burden on luxuries.

By the Chairman:

Q. What luxuries are manufactured in Manchester?—A. I cannot understand where luxury begins.

Q. In the sense that Senator Pugh has explained, what luxury is there manufactured in Manchester—is there anything manufactured in your mill, or in any mill in this city, that you would classify in your mind as a luxury?—A. No, sir; I should say not. Somebody else might.
Q. Well, what is there manufactured in New England in the line of clothing, for instance, that occurs to you as a luxury—I mean on any large scale, such as in the great factories at Lowell, Lawrence, Fall River, Lewiston, Manchester, or other cities—what thing is there that is manufactured in New England that is a luxury?—A. I should not consider that there was anything.

Q. If then the duties are to be put on what are luxuries and taken off everything manufactured in New England which is not a luxury, but a necessity, in the line of clothing, what would be left to the manufacturing interests of Manchester or New England?—A. As I have said, I do not see where the lines come in.

Mr. PUGH. I understand you to say you do not need a duty on the class of goods that require very little labor to manufacture, and that you require it only in the finer fabrics.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not understand him to mean to be understood in a way to destroy those industries.

Mr. PUGH. But he said something about “taking the duty off.” I do not mean that; but to make the duty lower on necessaries than on luxuries—what I call “dress.” Now, if you take the working classes—the poor people—what sort of goods do they wear to protect themselves from the cold; what sort of goods form their necessary clothing for themselves and their children—their blankets, their hats, their boots and shoes? All that class of goods I call necessaries. When you come to buying broadcloth and fine worsteds, and that class of fine woolen dress goods for women and for men—underwear and overwear—I say those run into the class that I have named “luxuries.” In other words, a man is not compelled to buy them; he can get along without them, and if he buys them voluntarily because he is able to do it, that is the class of goods to put a duty upon. He can stand the burden better than the poorer people.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is generally conceded; but those articles you have mentioned do not make anything but a very small portion of the aggregate manufacture of New England.

Mr. PUGH. Mr. Whitman said that all his goods are drillings, jeans, and sheetings.

The WITNESS. The same kind of goods that Mr. Whitman mentioned, and is making, have been sent to Manchester, England, and sold there, not at large profit but without loss.

Mr. PUGH. That is just what I say; that it is only the finer quality of goods that require protection.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Would you be understood as advocating, then, the abolition of the tariff so far as the general manufacturing interests of this city are concerned?—A. No; I would not.

Q. Then will you not make yourself understood as to what you mean to say in regard to that? As Senator Pugh and you leave it I do not see but what the tariff is an unnecessary thing.—A. I do not think that that can be the impression that has been obtained from me by other gentlemen sitting here.

The CHAIRMAN. You leave it in this way in your conversation—that the things that Mr. Whitman is manufacturing do not need protection, because they can be sold in England, and then there is added an enumeration of what he is manufacturing, and most other things that are manufactured here.

The WITNESS. That is only by inference. There is nothing that I
have said that produces such results. You must not infer from the words he puts into my mouth rather than from the words that I use.

Mr. Pugh. He states the fact which is manifest, even without his saying so, because everybody knows it, that the finer goods require more labor to manufacture than the coarser.

The WITNESS. Certainly they do.

Mr. Pugh. And it is the labor you want the protection for?

The WITNESS. It is.

Mr. Pugh. And so, of course, it is on that class of goods taking the most labor to make that protection is most needed?

The WITNESS. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no controversy in regard to that.

Mr. Pugh. I have not been arguing about the tariff or anything of the kind, but I want to get at the facts. Now, in the adjustment of a tariff the question comes up—and that is where the trouble is—on which class of goods to place the duty? I am for placing it on the goods that the people who are better able to buy will consume, and are willing to, but the man whose absolute and unavoidable necessaries compel him to buy, and who cannot avoid the burden of taxation, that is the man I want to relieve if I can do so in the imposition of that burden by the tariff.

The WITNESS. I think he is relieved under the present tariff legislation.

Mr. Pugh. I think, as Mr. Livermore says, that it goes beyond that. He says a tariff of 30 per cent. would be enough, whereas it averages over 45.

The WITNESS. I think the duty on low-grade cotton goods is simply nominal. It is very light indeed.

Mr. Pugh. It is about 40 or 42 per cent., if you call that light, and I think it runs up over 60 on some articles, if my recollection is right.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know a single article of American manufacture as to which the parties engaged in it do not feel that the existing tariff is as low as they can live under, and upon many articles it is tending strongly to the ruin of their industries; and, so far as the principle that the tariff could be higher upon articles of luxury is concerned, I understand that that is universally conceded, and this is not the announcement of any new principle. They have been universally recognized and conceded in the tariff. Diamonds and costly silks, the consumption of which falls upon the rich, are those upon which the tariff is heaviest. That is the rule.

Mr. Pugh. I differ with my brother Blair as to the application of the duty.

The CHAIRMAN. But the practical question is this: What specific industry in this city, or anywhere in New England, do you know of that is overprotected, so that the men engaged in it, or the corporation, or the labor, gets a larger profit than is reasonable to receive. I do not know of any. The manufacturing industry at the present time is not getting a profit. As I reiterate, there is no textile manufacturer, unless he has a large surplus of money, that can make money.

The WITNESS. I agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN. And that covers the whole ground, because if there is no article that is overprotected, our whole discussion on the tariff question is out of the way, unless we can recommend that the tariff be lessened.

Mr. Pugh. I am in favor of a revision and reduction; but I am certainly not in favor of any revision that will affect the condition, the
prosperity, or the life, or health of our industries. I only differ as to the rate of duty and the application of the duty that will produce that result. I do not want to cripple our industries. I want to see them flourish and prosper.

The WITNESS. There has been a tendency in the manufacture of goods in this country since its formation originally toward better fabrics in cotton and wool. There is a demand by our people for those goods, for a better grade of goods, and the manufacturer is obliged to meet that demand or else stop his machine. He has to cater for the market. Hence, every manufacturer has drifted towards a better grade of goods. The South has begun with the common standard sheetings, or even lower grade. They are going to build mills and make still finer and finer goods, and it will be but a few years before they will be where we are, and the West will also go on that way.

Mr. PUGH. The Augusta and Atlanta mills declare a dividend of 18 per cent. per annum without reference to the interference of these laws that you say they cannot control; notwithstanding the depression of the cotton trade, they have gone on and declared that dividend.

The WITNESS. You heard of one here this morning, but it is an exceptional one, and is not the rule. All Southern mills did not do like the Columbus.

Mr. PUGH. The Columbia Mills, in South Carolina, and the Augusta Mills, as well as the Columbus Mills.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it that that circumstance is the reason why capital is going there.

The WITNESS. Precisely.

The CHAIRMAN. It naturally must be an ephemeral state, because capital will naturally run in.

Mr. PUGH. There are natural advantages there that do not exist elsewhere, and that can be appropriated by capital and labor, and will make them more independent than these same industries anywhere else, because we have the ability and the natural advantages to meet all the troubles that would overthrow industries in other States.

The WITNESS. I think that you will find that the earnings there have doubled the plant, which is one reason why they can make a dividend. Suppose a mill has bought from its previous earnings a double supply of plant, then if it pays 10 per cent. it is simply earning 5 per cent.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. That is, on the wear and depreciation that you mention? — A. No; I say if it has doubled its plant it has got double the capacity that it originally had when it had spent all its original capital to first start its plant; and then if from its earnings it has got a plant equal to its original plant, certainly it has got two hands to work with where it only had one.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the character of labor used in the South Carolina and Georgia Mills?

Mr. PUGH. It is white labor altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. What sort of white labor?

Mr. PUGH. A large portion of it, I think, is foreign labor.

Mr. BOURNE (of the Stark Mills). What are the hours of labor?

Mr. PUGH. Ten or eleven hours, I suppose; I do not know with certainty.

The WITNESS. They work twelve hours. I think nearly all the Southern mills work twelve hours.

Mr. PUGH. The natural advantages there are manifest in the presence of the raw material and cheap coal.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

RELATIONS OF CAPITAL AND LABOR IN NEW ENGLAND.

By the Chairman:

Q. You have considerable local knowledge of manufacturing interests in other cities and in this and other States of New England?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I would like you to state any other facts that occur to you with reference to manufactures and to wages and the condition of the laboring people in other cities and States of New England.—A. The status of affairs between capital and labor at the present time was never so quiet; and there never was so little ill feeling since I was a boy in nearly all industries in the New England section. I have not heard of a strike within four months. I have not heard of any trouble even in Fall River for some time.

Q. Is there anything like a demand for a reduction of existing hours of labor from any source among the laboring people?—A. No; I do not hear of any at all.

EDUCATION OF MILL CHILDREN.

Q. With regard to the children of the operatives, as a rule, how is it as to their education and their opportunities for education, and the actual extent of education which they receive in the common schools?—A. They are obliged to go to school, up to the fourteenth year, at least thirteen weeks in each year. The school committee for this city appoints a "truant" officer. The truant officer here is a man of ability, and gives attention to his duties. He visits our mills and goes through and ascertains the names of all children that may be violating the law. Great care is taken in that respect.

Q. As a rule, are their children as well educated in the schools as those of any other class of people?—A. I should say they were.

Q. They have the same opportunity?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you find that the parents who are foreigners are as anxious to have their children educated as the children of native parentage?—A. No.

Q. You do not find that so?—A. I do not.

Q. You have a few Chinese here, have you not?—A. Only as laundry people, I think.

Q. There is no prejudice against them, I suppose, as working people?—A. No.

FRENCH CANADIANS AS OPERATIVES.

Q. Take these French people. What should you say of them as a laboring class, or as an element in the community—thay are about one-third of the community here, are they not?—A. They are about one-third of the people of Manchester. They are very good people. I should not want to distinguish between them and any other class of people.

Q. Are they skillful operatives?—A. Yes; they can be made skillful operatives.

Q. With regard to the migratory tendency that we have heard ascribed to them—is that increasing or decreasing?—A. When you come to the question of citizenship—their money, as a rule, goes to Canada.

Q. Is there a growing tendency to permanency, or otherwise?—A. From my experience here, I should say there was; but from my experience of other places, I should have said there was no change. Nearly all go home for a time, some longer and some shorter.
Q. To what extent are they an independent element—do they have their own traders, their own clergymen, and their own institutions, so that if all other elements of society were taken away they would get along alone?—A. I do not think that is the fact. I think that a girl or man goes where they can buy the cheapest. It is quite a convenience to have their own kind, of course. Those who just come, who cannot speak English, have some place where they can buy everything they want by means of the French language.

Q. But they soon find out where they can buy cheapest, and go there?—A. Yes.

Q. Are they a thriving and saving population?—A. I should say they were here.

Q. How is it as to their personal habits and their consuming what we call luxuries, or extravagances?—A. They will consume “luxuries,” according to Senator Pugh’s idea.

Q. In the way of dress, &c.?—A. In the way of dress.

Q. But in the way of smoking and drinking, and that sort of thing, how is it?—A. I should not charge them with any serious trouble in that direction.

Q. On the whole they are an orderly and well-behaved population?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To remove the French Canadian element from New England industries would have what effect—taking them all out and sending them away, and letting no more come?—A. Well, the consequences are almost beyond what I could foresee. I could only have a theory in relation to it.

Q. Would you consider it a calamity?—A. Yes. It is not a case that I could reason from analogy—from anything that has taken place any where else before. I suppose the community would eventually adapt itself to it; but it would suffer at first very seriously.

Q. They are a most useful element in our population?—A. I should most assuredly say so.

Q. Is there a tendency among them to submit to lower wages than other working classes?—A. No, sir.

Q. They are as sharp for high pay as any of the other classes?—A. They are very sharp in relation to that.

Q. Then their introduction as a working element has not been really to the injury of any other operatives, but a development of industry so as to give employment to a larger number?—A. Originally it might have been a disturbing element; but it very soon adapts itself. They demand or receive the same wages as are received by all others.

Q. Is there, as a rule, any element of saving and economy in them?—A. Yes, indeed.

Q. To what extent does that go, and how is it manifested?—A. I think they are a very saving people. I think they are well adapted and know how to utilize to the most everything they have in the way of money. They can make a bargain as well as anybody, and they save a fair share of their earnings.

Q. What becomes of the savings?—A. The savings go with them if they return home.

Q. Meanwhile they place them on deposit in the institutions of the city, I suppose?—A. I am not familiar enough with that to answer you positively.

Mr. WHITMAN. I believe they do.
JEALOUSY OF ENGLISH MANUFACTURERS.

The Witness. When I was visiting England some little time ago, a prominent manufacturer there who had given me an invitation to visit his mills, upon presenting myself to take advantage of the invitation, said to me, "I shall have to withdraw the invitation I gave you; you Yankees steal our brains, work our mills, and our trade." I said to him: "Six years ago 80 per cent. of all the worsteds imported into the United States came from Bradford (England) and vicinity. Now nearly 80 per cent. of all the worsteds come from France—who then is the thief, the Frenchman or the Yankee?" And I added, "you have no patent on brains, and you do not own the workmen." He was quite short with me; barely civil, and nothing more. I spent an hour with him and he made no remarks in relation to his works in any shape or manner. A day or two afterward, as I was getting ready to go away, I called at his office and said to him, "I leave to-morrow, sir. Should you ever come to the United States, if you will come where I am, I will show you the courtesy of a Yankee." He says, "When are you going?" I said, "To-morrow morning." He said, "I am very sorry you are going away so soon. I did not think you were going so soon." Said I, "Didn't you?" He said, "No; but," he says, "if you should be up to-morrow I shall be glad to see you." He did not think I would put off my trip for an examination of his mill. Next morning I went up, however, and he introduced me to his brother. He took the precaution to tell me not to say anything to his brother about my business. He introduced me to the town clerk, who is pretty much the same there as the mayor is in our cities. He told me they paid him what would be equal to $7,500 a year. The instant I stepped into this gentleman's office he said, "You are from the States?" I said, "Yes, sir." "Well," said he, "you will have to give us fair trade." I said, "What do you mean by fair trade?" Then he went on to tell me what was going to take place in the States. He said, "The West and the South have been 'bamboozled' long enough by the New England people, and they are now going to upset things." When he got through I said, "Do you realize that we have such States as Illinois and Indiana?" He said, "Yes," I said, "Indiana went Republican on the tariff issue. All those States now have got water powers running through them, and where they have not, they have got steam power, and have introduced everywhere machinery for making coarse woolen goods, and that is going to go on until they become stronger protectionists than we of New England are." Then I said, "The people of the South are getting interested in the cotton manufacture; they are going on with that manufacture there now." I told him that a great part of our manufacturing interests must go South. They were surprised at the manner in which the cotton manufacturing business was spreading.

LABORERS' WAGES AND MANNER OF LIVING IN EUROPE.

But the manner in which people live across the water was beyond my comprehension. The American goes over there, is usually banqueted and feasted, and of course gets some information in that way. But my plan was to get into a third-class railroad car, which is not much better than our cattle car, and picking out an English workingman, and talking to him. In that way you can get at the bottom facts, and that is the only way you can get at them.

Mr. Shaw, the United States consul at Manchester, has given, in his
consular reports, the rates of pay of the operatives. He takes some particular mill engaged in some specialty, which is paid at a high rate. The rates paid in England, Scotland, and France are not quite one-half what we pay here. France is nearly as good as England. They live better there than they do in England. I have no confidence whatever in Mr. Shaw's reports on the wages paid in England. That is, I have no confidence that it is a general average.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What idea did you get of wages there?—A. I think the average would be a little less than one-half what we pay here.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Do you mean the amount, or do you discount any advantage they may have in the difference of prices?—A. No; I mean the amount paid. Then take into consideration what they live on. Your consul's report establishes very plainly that there is but very little advantage. Such a thing as living in the manner in which we live here, in connection with our manufacturing business, they have no idea of. The idea of having boarding houses for single people to live in, in the manner they do here, they are entirely unacquainted with.

Q. Your operatives here are mostly French?—A. A large percentage of them. But we have quite a percentage of Americans—as many here, probably, as anywhere in New England. This city is composed of about one-third French, one-third American, and one-third of other nationalities.

Q. What is the advantage of having these foreigners; can you not get Americans?—A. You cannot get Americans; we have to go to Boston to get our servant girls. All the best girls go into the mills.

Q. Why is that?—A. They prefer it.

Q. For what reason? Is it because you give better pay, or that the work is more agreeable?—A. They get better pay, and are more independent. When they get through with their day's work, they have nothing more to do, and they prefer that labor to working in the kitchen, or in a house.

WOOL: QUALITIES OF AMERICAN AND FOREIGN.

Q. How much wool do you consume in your establishment?—A. We use 70,000 pounds of wool in a week.

Q. Your establishment is the woolen manufacturing establishment of Manchester, is it?—A. Well, I am the agent of the Manchester mills.

Q. How about the quality of our wool for making fine wools?—A. The best grades of wool raised in this country are raised in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, and there is some very good wool raised in Ohio.

Q. Is it the stock of sheep that makes the difference, or what?—A. The stock of sheep and also the climate. The finest wool used is what we call “XX and above.” We are at present using Montevideo wool. The English use that, and the French use it. There is but little difference whether you use the “XX and above” or the West Virginia, Pennsylvania, or Ohio, or whether you import Australian or Montevideoan wool.

Q. Not much difference in the quality, or in the cost?—A. Not much difference in the cost. For instance, we are using Montevideo, and some of my brother manufacturers think I am making a mistake, and that I ought to buy some other. This is a grade of “XX;” it is an im-
Relations between Labor and Capital.

Ported one, but it is a low priced wool on account of its condition; it will shrink about 58 per cent. in washing. We use a large amount of Missouri and Kentucky wools. Those will reduce from 30 to 40 per cent. by shrinkage.

Q. What shrinkage is there in English wools?—A. Those go to clothing, and we are not in the clothing line, but in the "combing" wools.

Q. You do not know what the shrinkage of those are?—A. Well, from 30 up to 60 per cent., depending on the fineness of the wool.

Q. Then our wool here is just as good as anybody's!—A. Oh, yes; there is not much difference. Australian wool will shrink about 52 to 56 per cent., and Montevideo wool about the same. Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania about the same; there is very little difference in the shrinkage.

Development of American Wool.

Q. How about the development of wool-growing in the West and otherwise?—A. If that goes on as it has been going on there will soon be no necessity for duty. The production will equal the consumption, and the moment that is done the surplus will have to be put out of sight. It can be exported, of course.

Q. To England?—A. Yes.

Q. That would be in competition with those other wools which would meet us in the English market without any duty?—A. Yes. As we approached a gold standard for imports to China and the foreign trade the manufactures were only for home consumption, and manufacturers would pull together, but then they began to ship goods for less than cost.

Q. Because there was no sale for them here?—A. The consumption was not equal to the production. The law of supply and demand will hold.

Q. They could not carry these stocks of goods until consumption had affected the market?—A. Exactly. There is quite a difference in the English system in fancy goods. They don't make goods as we do; they make you samples; then you order your goods and the manufacturer makes them; but he does not make and store goods for the market.

Q. The English do that largely, do they not?—A. The English and French both do that very largely.

Q. How is it that they can do that and we cannot?—A. Their system of trade differs from ours, and their system of mills also. The cost of their mills is different. For example, here we are, a city; more water power was sold here than can always be delivered; the result is, it sometimes disorganizes the trade of the whole town, and the companies get abused. The English don't care about that. If they haven't anything to manufacture they shut down just when they choose, while with us public opinion would drive us out of the town if we were to shut down.

Q. You have to take care of your help?—A. Yes; Fall River comes nearest to an English town with its strikes, its help, and its class of people. Have you ever been in Fall River in the evening or of a Sunday?

The Chairman. No, I have not been there.

The Witness. Well, you would be astonished at the difference between that, town and this. There is no interest there to keep things up, and hence they suffer from those terrible strikes that they have there. The singular thing about it is that their people when on a strike come here, and the moment the mills start up they go back.
Q. Why is that? — A. Because, I suppose, there are more English people there, while here the people are more American.
Q. When the Fall River mills are going do they pay better prices than here? — A. No.
Q. Do they work less hours? — A. No; everything is driven to the utmost there; they force everything right to the very utmost. There is a spirit of antagonism that has existed in that town since they first began to import English operatives, and has existed all the time since, while this city—Manchester—never had a strike, I think, but once, and that only lasted a few days.
Q. And that was about thirty years ago, I believe? — A. Yes; Lowell once had a strike with the mule-spinners. That is the only strike I remember there.
Q. How long have you been in this city? — A. Three years.
Q. Where did you come from? — A. From Lawrence.
Q. You have been engaged in the manufacture of cotton most of your life? — A. Yes; most of the time until I came here.
Q. And now you are in wool? — A. Now in wool and cotton.
Q. That gives you practical knowledge of both branches then? — A. Yes; a good cotton manufacturer can cover worsteds very well. The principle of working will harmonize pretty nearly.

Nearly all the agents in Manchester, Lawrence, Lowell, Biddeford, Saco, and Lewiston were all mill boys. There is but one exception in Lowell, and that is Mr. Ludlow, the agent of the “Merrimac”; he used to be a mining engineer.
Q. How are the duties of an agent in a factory distinguished from those of the treasurer? — A. An agent of one of the New England mills is the manager of the entire manufacturing department. Of course, the treasurer is the executive officer of the directors. The agent is subordinate to the treasurer, but he has the right to buy in nearly every concern, and he buys all his own supplies. Cotton, drags, and wool, and such material are bought by the treasurer; the agent makes nearly all contracts for machinery, &c. He is responsible to the treasurer.
Q. He employs his help, &c.? — A. He employs all his help.
Q. And supervises them? — A. Yes.
Q. And discharges them without appeal? — A. Discharges them without appeal.
Q. Then the interests of the corporation are in his hands? — A. Yes; entirely. I was with a treasurer one that undertook to enter into correspondence with one of my people, and I told him that I would discharge the first individual that he entered into correspondence with—he should do his business with me.
Q. You would have been sustained by the directors, I suppose, if the issue were raised? — A. Very likely.
Q. But if a treasurer has a complaint to make about the agent, he would report to the directors, I suppose? — A. As a rule. Sometimes a treasurer has become so strong that he would act for himself and then report to the directors. But that is an exceptional case. In a case that I know of, recently, there was a directors’ meeting called, and the question in dispute was settled in a directors’ meeting. In the case of my coming here a subcommittee of the directors made their arrangements with me. In a recent case of change, the change was brought about and another man selected by the committee, a committee of the directors, and his appointment was confirmed by a meeting of the directors.
Q. How many agents are there in this city? — A. Well, Mr. Dean’s position is virtually the same as that of an agent. You will see him in
the directory reported as "superintendent." He is just as independent as any agent in the city.

Q. He is attached to the print works!—A. Yes. I have the superintendence of the manufacturing department. Then the other agents in the city are Mr. Livermore, Mr. Bourne, Mr. Whitman, and Mr. Killey.

Q. And yourself and Mr. Dean?—A. Yes.

NUMBER OF MILL AGENTS IN NEW ENGLAND.

Q. How many agents do you think there are in all the cities you have mentioned? You have spoken of some of them growing up from operatives.

The WITNESS. The percentage of practical men, do you mean?

The CHAIRMAN. No; I mean how many agents there are.

The WITNESS. In New England, as a class?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

A. It is a question that never occurred to me. I should say from one hundred and fifty to two hundred.

Q. You think the manufacturing interests of New England are under the supervision of one hundred and fifty to two hundred agents?—A. Yes. I think next Wednesday there is to be a meeting of the New England Manufacturers' Association. That does not take in any of the wool interests; simply the cotton manufacturers.

The agent is associated with the mill workers and knows their conditions, &c. A good manager can tell the condition of the mill people the moment he puts his foot in a mill, or should be able to.

Q. The manager, you say, is the agent?—A. Yes; for instance, I have a superintendent. I do all my managing through my superintendent. Then there are heads of all departments. One man can have several departments, but all our work is done through that head, and that man is responsible to the superintendent for his work and management.

Mr. PUGH. There has been a good deal of complaint about the treatment by the agents—the "bosses," as they call them—and the employers.

The WITNESS. That means the overseers. Those are different persons from the agents altogether.

Q. The overseers are the class of persons from whom they receive the harsh treatment of which they complain?—A. I suppose so; I have been an overseer. I have been a workman from the beginning, and know the whole thing from the boy that I was when I went into a mill through all the stages up to my present position.

Q. How many men have you under you now, including bosses, &c.?—A. We have about thirty thousand spindles stopped at the present time.

Q. But I mean when you are running?—A. When we are running we have twenty-seven hundred hands.

Q. You employ either more women or more men when running than you do now?—A. Yes; the exact percentage I could not give you.

CHILD LABOR IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Q. Do you use child labor?—A. Some; though we keep inside the law.

Q. What is that law?—A. That they shall have thirteen weeks' schooling for all the children under fourteen years of age.

Q. And they can work the rest of the time?—A. Yes,
Q. Is there any limitation to the hours that children can work?—A. Not in this city. I think the law applies to a child under twelve years; you cannot use a child under twelve years.

Q. You cannot use any child labor under twelve years of age at any time?—A. No; the aim is to get out of the whole thing—not to employ anybody of less than fourteen years of age. There is no agent that wants to do it.

Q. Why is it done?—A. It is often done in a contingency like this: here we are stopped for five weeks, and sometimes, in labor, the question of supply and demand comes in. If the supply were equal to the demand we would not be required to employ child labor at all. Sometimes one of the severest things I have had to deal with, as overseer, has been the discharge of children. I have had to send the parents to the police.

Q. They would remonstrate with you and try to get you to keep the children?—A. They would in every way they could. I do not mean to say they all do it, but I mean to say we have those cases. The Amoskeag corporation of this city is the largest in the country, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. I think there is one larger.

The WITNESS. I don't know of any that employs over 6,000 operatives. They employ 6,000 operatives; they run 4,000 looms.

Q. How many spindles to a loom?—A. It depends on the goods—from 34 to 50.

Q. From 34 to 50 spindles to feed a loom?—A. Yes; it would depend on the cloth made—the fineness of the number. There would be many questions coming in to determine that.

Q. Have you mule spinners?—A. No.

There are either 260,000 or 360,000 people in Manchester, England, and I presume there is more money on deposit by the people in this town in the savings bank than there is in that town.

Q. How many operatives have you in this city, in round numbers?—A. Eleven or twelve thousand.

MUTUAL AID SOCIETIES.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Have you anything here in the shape of a charity association for persons thrown out of employment?—A. Not in connection with the mills. When I went to Lawrence the Pacific had an aid society to which they, all the mills, paid in so much a week. They had it in connection with other concerns. Some of my heads of departments came to me and wanted me to adopt that same principle. I said “No, I have no right to take the money of the man that takes care of himself and give it to those who do not take care of themselves.” I think there is a personal right violated in that, so far as it is connected with the mills. If they see fit to form an independent association outside like the Odd Fellows or Knights of Labor, or anything of that kind, that is all very well, but I think that in connection with mills you would aid and abet in that way habits that are not good, such as laziness, feigned sickness, &c. When the Odd Fellows started the plan of giving aid men got in and nearly broke up almost every concern—used up almost all the finances they had accumulated. I don't mean to say that if the treasurer of our company should establish a system of that kind I would not aid it if I had either to do that or get out, but I would never do it of my own accord, because I have seen the bad effects of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Some establishments, like Steinway's piano factory
and Brewster's carriage factory, have done it, but they are private concerns, with only two or three men managing the whole thing. It is with them, however, an established system, so that every man going into the employ of the concern understands what he is going into.

The WITNESS. Exactly. If you make a bargain with a man that a portion of his wages—the wages of the man who takes care of himself—shall go to another man who does not take care of himself that is another thing. I have seen a good deal of that sort of thing, however, and have my own views of it, and I differ from a great many people on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. I think myself it is better for the public to make some sort of arrangement by which those people should be taken care of. Charity should be chargeable upon the whole community rather than upon special parts of it.

The WITNESS. In that way you will get the highest type of manhood. There is one thing that we do here. If an accident occurs we pay the doctor's bills, whether we are responsible or not—whether it results from carelessness on their part or otherwise, or whether we have used the utmost care and they have not used any.

Q. If a man dies do you do anything?—A. No; nothing.
Q. It stops with his death?—A. It stops with his death.
Q. I suppose in cases of exceptional distress of his family you would do something?—A. I have rarely, if ever, run across a case of destitution that has not been brought about by their own act.

You asked me awhile ago in regard to something else. There is a hospital here, managed by the Ladies' Aid Society. The building was given by the Amoskeag company, and they have given it considerable money—I should not want to say how much. We give them $200 a year. Any person that is sick or injured can go there. At a fire opposite here a little over a year ago some four or five girls jumped out of a window from the third or fourth story. They went to this hospital, and I think two of them staid there nearly a year. The medical attendance and care is superior to anything they can get elsewhere. If a case of contagious disease or sickness occurs in one of our boarding houses it is immediately taken care of. I keep a physician retained specially for that, and in ordinary cases of sickness these ladies take care of them.

Q. This is sustained by the corporation?—A. Yes, and it receives contributions from citizens.
Q. It is for the benefit of the whole city, then?—A. Yes, for the whole city. The benefits of the hospital are not entirely confined to the corporations. The companies manage the thing, however. Lawrence also has a hospital in connection with its employing concerns.
Q. Are you pretty well acquainted with the manufacturing business over in Maine?—A. Yes, I have been employed in Lewiston, but I have only a general knowledge of its business. In fact, however, about the same system extends all over New England.

By Mr. PUGH:
Q. Do you know anything about Lowell?—A. It is about the same at Lowell as here, and about the same at Nashua and Lawrence.

By the CHAIRMAN:
Q. You have worked in all these places?—A. I have worked in Lowell, Salem, Taunton, Lawrence, and am now in Manchester.

5—c 3—(5 LAW)
Q. From your knowledge of the whole, which is after all the best manufacturing city in New England, everything considered, taking into consideration the place, the comfort, and wages of the operatives, the profits to the companies and all else?—A. Well, Lowell is the largest; Lawrence is a few thousand larger than this place, perhaps two or three thousand, and those three places, Lowell, Lawrence, and Manchester, are three of the most desirable places there are in New England for operatives.

Q. You mean actually so, as compared with other places?—A. Actually so as compared with other towns. The rule is that the prices at which labor is paid in those cities approximate, but still there are exceptions. Wherever you find fancy work there you find greater skill and the rate of wages will rule higher even on lower grade work carried on in that same city than elsewhere.

Q. In that city where there is much fancy work?—A. Yes.

Q. In such cities the higher prices of fancy work have an influence on the wages of the poorer work?—A. Yes.

THE SHARE OF THE OPERATIVES IN THE PRODUCE OF THEIR LABOR.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. The operatives complain that they have not got a fair share in the results. What is your idea of the percentage that the laborer gets of the value of what he produces—in other words, how much profit does the manufacturer make out of his laborers?—A. The only way that we can arrive at any just conclusion in relation to that would be to take the entire capital that has been invested in all the manufacturing cities of New England and arrive at the earnings of that capital.

Q. When you do that have you got any watered stocks to deal with, or any such thing as corporations have been doing with Western Union and railroad stocks?—A. Our business is not a gambling business.

Q. They say you inflate the cost of the plant and get a big advance on what it actually costs?—A. Why, if you take a plant that is worth a certain amount of money and start a company, without any capital, and let them pay the rates of wages ruling in Manchester to day, there is scarcely a grade of manufacture that could live and pay a return on its capital. For instance, the Manchester mills, as you will see by the treasurer's reports, have a capital of $2,000,000. They have a plant that is worth considerably more than that. They have $1,100,000 surplus capital. That stock sold at the last sale that I heard of for 126—and that was of but a little of it.

Q. Where does that surplus capacity come from—from the business?—A. It comes from gradual earnings—a conservative plan of the work. Four years ago the stock brought 170. The treasurer felt well, and he thought it ought to pay 5 per cent. dividend. He paid it. To-day the stock is not worth par. It was worth then over 170; now it is not worth par.

By the Chairman:

Q. And he only paid 5 per cent. dividend?—A. That is all.

Q. Then what made the reduction?—A. Supply and demand, production and consumption. Three years ago this coming winter the Manchester Mills stock was selling at 200; it seemed that the days of anything we could possibly make were about numbered. We were carrying large stocks and selling goods at less than cost;
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By Mr. Pugh:

Q. When was that?—A. A little over two years ago.

Q. What was the comparative production as compared with consumption?—A. Production had to be economized.

Q. Was your capacity to produce as good then as it is now?—A. Yes. But you see the women of the country say what goods shall be sold. So we either have to pile up our goods or sell them at less than cost until the women get ready to take them. When they get ready to take them they will pay a profit on them. This question of settling the percentage or what the operatives will get can never be determined, because there are angles in it. The question is one of supply and demand, which regulates the price of labor and gold and men and every commodity.

MANUFACTURING POWER OF NEW ENGLAND.

Q. What has been the percentage of increase in the manufacturing power of New England, in your experience?—A. In my experience it has been wonderful, because it runs back to 1848. Lawrence (a city of forty thousand inhabitants) has risen since then.

Q. But in recent years how is it?—A. For the last three years there has been very little growth. With the exception of little additions to the present corporations, I don't think capital will make any increase for years to come, because they all recognize the fact that it has to go South.

Q. How does the ability to produce compare with the consumption of this country, with the home markets? Take the woolens, for instance, or cottons, do you export any?—A. Oh, no; we cannot export until we bring our people to the condition of the European laborer.

Q. You do not export any of your products?—A. Except a low grade of cotton goods; that is, where labor represents the smallest factor in the cost of the goods. Wherever labor represents a large factor in the cost of the goods we cannot export it.

Q. Has there been any unhealthy growth in the manufacturing industries of New England?—A. No; I should say not.

Q. I don't mean depreciation produced by any laws of supply and demand or the inevitable laws of trade, but I mean any undue investment in those businesses. It has been universally said that investments have been stimulated on account of the tariff until they have just now reached inflation. How is that?

The Witness. Suppose that a mill starts under favorable conditions to run a certain line of goods for the market, and by the time it is running a while the women say they do not want that line of goods, and the concern has to change and put on something else, you would say they had not been acting according to the law of supply and demand. I will give you one of the most remarkable experiences of fluctuation. The Pacific Mills of Lawrence at one time after they had got organized suspended, and their stock sold for about 20 per cent.; the shares were $1,000. Three years ago this winter they were $2,680, or 265 per cent. This last summer, I think, they have sold one hundred shares at par for $100,000.

OVERPRODUCTION.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Are not the woolen manufacturing industries here suffering from an excess in the production?—A. It is always so when the consumption wanes.

Q. What do you charge that to; is there any explanation of it?—A.
Oh, yes, indeed. You successfully employ all the labor of this country and you will discover that there is not producing capacity enough. The consumption would be greater than the production.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Because the laborer has something to buy with?—A. Yes. The iron interest for the last ten months has been depressed; it is not fully employed, and we feel it in a moment.

Q. Do you now reason that it is out of employment because having been previously fully employed it got money and consumed immediately the power of production?—A. No; we did not consume beyond the power of production; that is, production could have been increased to meet consumption, but as soon as labor ceases then you stop consumption.

Q. But why does labor cease?—A. That I cannot tell you.

The CHAIRMAN. There will always be labor so long as there is consumption; consumption is demand, and production takes place to meet that demand. Now, if the more you increase production the more you increase consumption, and in still greater proportion, why the result would be that consumption would increase production with acceleration, and it seems to me that the result of overproduction leading to idleness could not follow!—A. You were asking me a question about the textile industry. I simply touch it in a reference to the non-employment of the iron interest that is suspended. That would lead me out into railroad building and into divers speculations which, I suppose, you gentlemen are far more competent to deal with than I should be.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Do you think it is to the interest of the manufacturer to have all the labor employed because it increases its ability to consume?—A. Certainly it is to the interest of the manufacturer to have labor employed in every department. It is to the interest of the manufacturer that there should be a good cotton crop and a good grain crop.

Q. Is not everything that favors consumption existing now in a very high degree everywhere in this country?—A. Yes; so far as the grain crop, I suppose, of this season is concerned. In relation to railroad interests, and speculation in that line, I cannot say.

MANUFACTURING OUTLOOK IN NEW ENGLAND.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I should like to get your idea as to the future of the manufacturing interest of New England. You have stated that for the last three years you thought there had been no substantial increase in capital invested, and that New Englanders, as a people, and as manufacturers, were recognizing the fact that such capital must go South, and is going South, into manufacture. What is the probability of the continuance of the present manufacturing industries in this part of the country?—A. That would simply be a guess. If you should bring to me the brightest man in the New York trade, who is giving the largest study to this question, or bring from Boston the man who has had the greatest experience with capital employed, or of selling on profits, and he should go on and give you his opinion, I would put just as much confidence in the opinion of the first boy passing this door as in his. In 1857 I remember that there was a very learned calculator who made a calculation of how many yards there are per capita of stock in the United States, saying that if there was not another yard made for such a number of months it would be eighteen or twenty months that there would
be a large stock on hand. In the spring of 1858 the merchants were so crazy for goods that there did not seem to be enough to go around. Take simply raw cotton. The New England cotton buyer would go to work and put in his supply and speculate in cotton. You might be just as safe by having a dice in your hand.

Q. But still you recognize this as a fact, that the tendency of capital is elsewhere?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. And there is no increase of its investment in New England?—A. No.

Q. And have we become proportionately less in manufacturing interests?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, as capital is invested in the Middle, the Southern, and the Western States, where the raw materials are produced, and transportation can be saved by the performance of the work where the raw material grows, would not the tendency be more and more to diminution for a time in the standards of our work, and then would they not be likely to diminish gradually our manufacturing supremacy until we became largely inferior or became appurtenances to the manufacturing industries of the Southern and Western portions of the country, and perhaps ultimately cease to be manufacturers?—A. The demand for goods in the progress of the country, or the increase of the people of the country, will be greater. Of course the people have got to increase to a certain extent. If they consume the results fast enough to keep up with the production we are all right. If the South increases faster than the consumption increases by an increase in population, then we are the first ones that have got to feel it. There is a mill in New England that manufactures a certain line of goods. I think they have run a thousand looms steady on that year in and year out. One of the Southern mills recently took that same organization of cotton goods and made the same grade precisely and sold them in Chicago. Freight are terribly against manufactured articles from New York to Chicago.

Q. As they develop manufacturing in the South they will probably go beyond their immediate wants and sell to the West; but the West is our market at present, and if we do not increase our capital we can retain our present market, and there will be opportunity for the South to sell very largely in the West by reason of the increased consumption?—A. Certainly.

Mr. PUGH. We make a better article of drillings and sheetings now than the English, so I am told.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Mr. PUGH. There is an establishment now in Alabama manufacturing goods and shipping them to Canada—common cotton goods, drillings, sheetings, and shirtings. I have heard that the New England manufacturers export 25 per cent. of their products.

The WITNESS. No, sir; I don't think they do.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. England does not sell much cotton over here, does she?—A. Very little. We have got them pretty well fixed. There is a terribly bitter feeling among Englishmen on this subject. The Platt Brothers own some twelve or fifteen engines, and make their own iron and steel, and employ some 7,000 to 9,000 men. I said to Mr. Platt that I would like to see some of the machinery that he had built if I could, and I said to him that if it was working well I would give him an order for machinery. I wanted to see the machinery, which was in a small mill in Manchester, England. He said to me: "I have not got influence enough to get you into that mill."
By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Where did you get your machinery?—A. I have some that I bought in France two years ago, and some that I bought in England.

Mr. Pugh. I am surprised that we cannot make machinery equal to that in England and France; that is the way they excel us—in fine goods—is it not?

The Witness. The French have their own system in manufacturing merinos, cashmeres, &c. The English have never worked their cashmeres that way. I was talking with Mr. Law, of Manchester, England, this week, and he told me they were increasing that kind of goods. Now, in order to get that machinery Platt Bros. sent a man to France. He said there a year and brought a complete set of this machinery to England, and set it up, and made his pattern from that machinery, and went to work making machinery on that system. Take a sharp dry-goods man and he can pick out a piece of English cashmere from the French in a moment by the difference in finish and quality. I got acquainted with a gentleman, a New York buyer of dry goods, who was in Bradford for ten years. He went on to tell me how much better off the English workmen were than the same class of men in the United States. He showed me, as he thought, how that was. But look at the conditions of living here. Take a meat dealer here for example; you would naturally suppose that he would buy quarters, or sides, or whole carcasses of meat, but he cannot do it; he must buy the best. The people won't have anything but the best.

WEEKLY VS. MONTHLY PAYMENTS.

With reference to weekly, fortnightly, or monthly payments, I have personal friends, three brothers, connected with the Arlington Mills, in Lawrence, and they adopted weekly payments. The mills there are the Pacific, the Atlantic, and the Everett Mills. I asked Mr. Shattuck how the people paid up—whether he made as many bad debts out of the system of weekly payments as under the old system? He said that they did not pay as well—that they made more bad debts under the new system than under the old.

The Chairman. They generally claim that by the frequent-payment system they would be able to buy for cash.

Mr. Pugh. Yes; and that they could get things much cheaper for cash. That is the fact, I have no doubt.

The Witness. I was connected with a concern a number of years ago, and we paid on Friday and Saturday. I was the superintendent of the concern. I urged the owners to change the pay-day. I told them that the people would pay their bills better; there would be less drunkenness and less money spent for rum. They changed it and begun to pay on Tuesday, and got through paying on Wednesday. That was a little thing, but it made a remarkable change in the state of affairs.

By the Chairman:

Q. What was the change made?—A. Simply from paying towards the latter end of the week to paying the first part of the week.

Q. You mean there was no opportunity for idleness, and to misspend the money?—A. Yes; and they went on and paid their bills instead of going on a spree.

Q. Instead of having a "good time" on Saturday and Sunday?—A. Yes.
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MANCHESTER, N. H., October 12, 1883.

CALVIN A. JONES sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Letter carrier.

Q. How many letter carriers are there in this city?—A. We have nine, now.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that there is some grievance of which the letter carriers of this city and other cities complain. Won't you explain it to the committee.

NEED OF ANNUAL VACATION BY LETTER CARRIERS.

The WITNESS. One grievance we have is this: We understand that the Department gives a month's vacation, but letter carriers here have never had it. We have always to pay a man $2 a day when we are off on vacation or even when sick. We work eleven hours a day, seven days in a week we might say, for we have to come down and work an hour and a half on Sunday.

Q. That is, you have to work the whole year round, Sundays and every other day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Including the 4th of July?—A. Yes.

Q. What pay do you get?—A. Two dollars and fifty cents a day.

Q. Are you permitted to be absent from work for a little recreation, or anything of that sort?—A. Not without hiring somebody in our place.

Q. Do you hire them at your own expense in such cases?—A. Yes, sir; and we pay $2 a day. We have to pay that to get the men.

Q. But it must be done at your own expense?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you hire an outsider?—No; we have to hire one who has had some experience.

Q. And he has to be sworn in, I suppose, for the time being?—A. Yes.

Q. You understand that the existing law requires this service of you?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Is that a regulation of the Department or an existing law?—A. It is a regulation of the Department.

Q. It is a mere regulation of the Postmaster-General?—A. Yes.

Q. You think it is something that he, perhaps, could rectify without any action of Congress—or do you not know about that?—A. We do not fully understand about that. It may need some action of Congress.

Q. It is a regulation and applies to letter carriers elsewhere?—A. All over the United States, as we understand it.

Q. It is only the employés at Washington that get a month's vacation?—A. Yes; letter carriers all over the United States do not get it. The clerks in the Department at Washington do.

Q. What would be the effect upon the business of letter carrying of allowing what you claim—how could the regulation be changed?—A. By having auxiliaries to take our places and to be paid by the Department, and not to have it taken out of our pockets.

Q. You want the Department to bear the expense of the substitute?—A. Yes; the same as they do the Department clerks.

Q. You want a month's vacation and pay during that vacation?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. If you took the vacation then other letter carriers would have to be employed for that month—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would not that produce great confusion in the delivery of letters?—A. No. We should have one that is competent to fill our place as we have now.

Q. Would you expect this vacation to be granted to the entire force at the same time?—A. No, at intervals throughout the year.

Q. So as not to produce any great disturbance?—A. Yes. There is hardly any letter carrier here that wants more than a week or two weeks vacation at a time. When I was in my usual health I never asked any more.

Q. Are not the letter carriers generally healthy men?—A. Yes, sir. I have been in the business eighteen years up to the first day of last August. I broke down last January, and have lost since then more time than I ever did any one year before. I lost seven weeks up to the 13th day of last June, and have only worked two weeks up to September 14.

Q. What is the reason for this month's vacation—on what ground do you claim it?—A. Well, we claim that a man that works so hard needs to recuperate.

By the Chairman:

Q. How is it about the severity of your labor. You say you work eleven hours a day. How hard is this work that you do?—A. Well, a man could judge better if he should take 15, 20, or 30 pounds weight on his shoulder and go up several flights of stairs in and out of houses.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. What length of time are you employed in the day?—A. It is nearly eight hours that we travel, and the other hours we are packing our letters, which is very hard work—standing up and packing—only that for that part of the time we get rid of that burden across our shoulders.

Q. You take a weight of about 15 or 20 pounds out with you?—A. Yes, sir; an average of that.

Q. You distribute the mail received and at the same time gather in that which is to be carried out?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It gives you a burden both ways?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. Pugh. Of course it is a very responsible employment; it does not do for you to lose many letters.

The Witness. No, sir; we don't calculate to lose any.

Q. Is there any movement in the direction of petition, or anything of that sort, for the holiday you speak of by letter carriers generally?—A. I received a circular from Washington, some two months or more ago showing that the letter carriers there had made a movement.

Mr. Pugh. They had a committee there that waited on the Post-Office Committee. I know they presented a lot of circulars to me, and made statements about the matter, and then they had a delegation appointed to wait on the Post-Office Committee. That is the committee to which your grievance ought to be addressed. That committee has special charge of the Post-Office business.

The Witness. There is one thing more that I should like to mention: Last spring when I was off, I lost seven weeks by breaking down. In January I had an attack of pneumonia and pleurisy, and then I lost two weeks in February by getting out too quickly for duty. The doctor told me I must not get out too soon. I have an old army complaint; heart disease, which is made worse by this. I met an old army acquaintance, and he says, "You have been pretty sick. I suppose you are under half pay." I says, "No; I pay a man $2 a day when I can't
be on duty." He says, "In Canada and in England they get half pay
when disabled that way"; and he says, "How long have you been in
the business?" I said, "Eighteen years up to the first day of August."
"Why," he says, "they retire them there when they break down like
that on $1,000 or $1,200 a year." He said that this is a singular gov-
ernment in the United States that would not do better for a man who
breaks down in its service.

By the CHAIRMAN:
Q. I take it you have no particularly bad or expensive habits—you
do not look like a vicious man.—A. No, sir.
Q. You have been employed eighteen years?—A. Yes.
Q. And have lived here in this city all the time?—A. Yes.
Q. Have you a wife?—A. Yes.
Q. And children?—A. No children.
Q. Your expenses, then, have been those of your wife and yourself,
and perhaps some housekeeping expenses as you have gone along?—
A. Yes.
Q. Now, to what extent have you, from your earnings, been able to
save money?—A. When I had $1,000 a year I laid up a couple of hun-
dred dollars every year, but when they cut us down they made such a
howl—the Democratic party made such a howl on the principle of "re-
form," that we were cut down to $800, and I have not been able to lay
aside anything since then. My rent has been from $17 to $22 a month;
I am not paying quite that much now. I am fortunate enough to get a
cheaper tenement, but I have been paying for the last ten or twelve
years from $17 to $22 a month rent.
Q. You have not been able for quite a number of years past to save
anything?—A. No, sir.
Q. And now your health is broken?—A. Yes.
Q. Have you been in any other business any of the time in addition to
your Government work?—A. No, sir. I could not do anything else; I
was not able to.
Q. Do you attribute the breaking down of your health to this employ-
ment, or to your Army difficulty?—A. I recruited, I suppose, after it,
but the doctors told me that it was the overburdening and increase of
business on my route that broke me down.
Q. In connection somewhat with the old weakness?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is your work harder than that of the other letter-carriers of the
city, or about the same?—A. I consider it as heavy as any. Some of
the officers on my line think mine is fully as heavy as any of them. The
post-office is open on the 4th of July the same as any other day, except
that we close after 12 o'clock, but we have to make up for that the next
day, and if we should be off half a day we should have to pay a man to
take our place.

THE LANGDON COTTON MILLS.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 12, 1883.

WILLIAM L. KILLEY sworn and examined.

By Mr. Pugh:
Question. Do you live in this city?—Answer. Yes, sir.
Q. Are you connected with any manufacturing industry here?—A. I
am with the Langdon Mills.
Q. How long have you been in their service?—A. Since 1860.
Q. In what capacity?—A. As agent.
Q. What amount of manufacturing is done by those mills? What class of goods do you make?—A. Fine shirtings and sheetings.
Q. Cotton?—A. All cotton.
Q. How many hands do you employ?—A. About four hundred.
Q. How long have those mills been running?—A. The first one started in 1861, the other one in 1870.

WAGES OF OPERATIVES.

Q. What wages do you pay your operatives?—A. There are different classes of operatives. Would you like to have the prices right through of the different grades?

Mr. Pugh. Yes.

The WITNESS. In the packer-room our prices are $1.15 a day; to card-strippers we pay $1.15 per day; card grinders, $1.55; double-tender (a boy, like), 85 cents; drawing-tenders (girls), 75 to 85 cents, the average being about 80. On the roving-frames they make all the way from $5.50 to $7.50, depending upon how smart they are.

Q. They work by the piece?—A. They do on the roving-frames. Some of them make $1.25 a day; that is, $7.50 a week; but not many of them make that. More of them make about $1. In our warp-spinning room girls of fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen years old make about 90 cents a day; spool-tenders, 75 cents (a small class of girls); warp-tenders, $1 a day (a larger class of girls). Mule-spinners make on an average about $10 a week; back-boys, 45 cents a day.

Q. What do they do?—A. They set the roving back of the mule. That is the principal part of their work. Then they sweep up the floor around their mules.

Q. Are these mills well ventilated and kept clean?—A. Well, we try to keep them clean.

Q. Are the operatives healthy?—A. Very healthy. We have some difficulty about making them always keep clean. We lose a great many hands because we make them keep clean. They go off somewhere else, where they don't have so much cleaning to do; very often we find that the case; and, on the other hand, we have had hands come to work for us, saying that they would not work in the mills where they had been because they were so dirty.

Q. What sort of houses do these operatives live in?—A. We don't have anything but boarding-houses, except for our overseer. We have boarding-houses for the hands.

Q. What board do they pay generally?—A. Girls pay $2.25 a week. We rent the houses at very low rent, so that people can afford to take them and board the hands pretty low. The weavers have pretty fair wages. In one mill the girls average about $8 a week.

Q. You manufacture mostly shirtings?—A. Yes; fine shirtings.

Q. Do your laborers seem to be satisfied with their condition and wages and mode of living?—A. I don't hear any complaint.

STRIKES.

Q. Have you had any strikes?—A. We have never had any general strike. We had a strike of mule-spinners once, because the overseer left. He did not conduct things as I wanted him to, and I thought it would be better to have another man, and on account of his leaving the mule-spinners struck.

Q. You have never had a strike for higher wages?—A. No.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NATIONALITY OF OPERATIVES.

Q. Your operatives are of mixed nationalities, I suppose?—A. Yes; probably about one-third are Americans; possibly a little more.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. That is unusual, is it not; it is a larger proportion of Americans than other mills have?—A. Well, I think we have a larger proportion of Americans than any other concern in the city.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Where do you sell your goods?—A. They are sold in Boston and New York.

Q. Do you sell in the American markets altogether?—A. Yes. Our selling house did ship a few to China and a few to Liverpool a few years ago. I don't know that they have shipped any for several years, though.

Q. You find a market here at home for all you manufacture?—A. As a general thing. Sometimes we get some goods on hand, but generally we sell them out after awhile.

Q. Have you ever been compelled to discharge laborers on account of overstock in manufactured goods?—A. No; never.

Q. Your mills have never stopped running?—A. In the beginning of the war our mill stopped. We had but one mill then.

Q. It has not stopped since the war?—A. No, sir.

Q. It has been running all the time?—A. Ever since; yes. We stopped in 1862, I think it was, for about a year and a half, and then started up, and have been running ever since.

HOURS OF LABOR.

Q. Your hours of labor are ten and three-quarters?—A. Yes; very close to that. It is sixty-four and three-quarters hours a week, so that it falls a little short of ten and three-quarters, but comes so near it that we call it ten and three-quarters.

Q. The workers do not want the time reduced?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. They have never made any demand for that?—A. No, sir.

NO LABOR UNIONS IN MANCHESTER, N. H.

Q. Have you got any labor unions here?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do any of your employés belong to labor unions?—A. I do not know that there is any here. It is unknown to me if there is.

Q. Your laborers are satisfied and you are satisfied, I suppose, and everything is working on pleasantly and harmoniously?—A. I don't know of anything to the contrary.

SAVINGS OF OPERATIVES.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do your laborers save anything?—A. Well, a part of them do, and a part of them, I think, spend it as fast as they get it, and faster too, in fact. They spend their money before they get it, and they often get it trusted.

Q. Would that class be likely to do any better if they were paid more?—A. No; I don't think they would. I think it would all go in the same way. But there is a class that save their money.
Q. You find the rule among them to be the same as it is among other people, I suppose, some are thrifty and saving and others not so!—A. About the same.
Q. Upon the wages paid them, is there any difficulty in making a comfortable living?—A. I should think not.
Q. How about maintaining a family—wife and children—and educating the children upon the money they receive from you?—A. There may be cases of married men working for $1.15 a day who have families of small children. Such men could not maintain their families in very good style.
Q. Are many of your operatives married people with families?—A. I think there are some, but none I think working at that price. They are higher priced men, those who have families, as a general thing.
Q. How old are these operatives as a rule—between what ages are most of them?—A. They vary from twelve to sixty-five years.
Q. What ages are the majority of them?—A. Probably from fifteen to thirty-five would take in the bigger part of them.

MARRIED MEN AND WOMEN IN MILLS.

Q. How many of that four hundred are married men?—A. I could not say exactly. As to many of them I do not know whether they are married or not. We do not have any tenements excepting for our overseers, and they are all married men. We have boarding-houses for the girls, and the rest of them hire tenements around in different places in the city.
Q. Do men and their wives work for you in many instances?—A. Very few.
Q. Do women work for you whose husbands do not?—A. Yes.
Q. There are married women who work for you?—A. Yes; a number.
Q. Many?—A. I should not think there were a great many of them.
Q. You spoke of some working by the piece?—A. Yes.
Q. Is there any work done by the piece which employs both men and women—the same kind of work?—A. The weaving is all done by girls. They work by the piece, and our roving-frames are all worked by girls, and they work by the piece—by the "hank" we call it. Our mule-spinners work by the pound.
Q. The mule-spinners are men?—A. Yes.
Q. Are there any women mule-spinners at all?—A. No.
Q. That is the hardest work, is it, that is done in the mill?—A. I don't think that it is hard, only it keeps them on their feet more. It is not heavy work, but they have to be on their feet most of the time.
Q. I want to know whether you make any distinction between men and women where they do the same work.—A. We have not any that do the same kind of work, but there are some of those in other places—weavers.
Q. You do not have any of those?—A. No.
Q. You say one-third of your people are Americans—girls.—A. Girls and men; and a large proportion of our overseers are Americans.
Q. How does it happen that so large a proportion of your people are Americans?—A. We have always tried to get Americans.
Q. Why do you do that?—A. We think they are better help.
Q. Do you pay them any better price than others?—A. No, but as a general thing they make more pay.
Q. Working by the piece?—A. Yes.
AMITY AMONG DIFFERING NATIONALITIES IN MILLS.

Q. Are the American help willing to work alongside help of other extraction?—A. I never heard of any complaint, but as a general thing while we have both we keep them as much separated as we can.

Q. Why is that—is it because you care or they care?—A. It is the overseer's notion.

Q. What does he say is his reason for keeping American girls by themselves, or the other girls by themselves?—A. One overseer has two rooms that he has charge of, and he puts all the French girls into one room. He says they will assist each other more; that is, when they are weaving right side by side, if one has a break-out, as we call it, the next one to her will help her, while if the Americans and French are side by side probably they would not.

Q. They do not assimilate then—the American girl and the French girl do not naturally associate and become friendly about their work?—A. Not so much so as French girls with French girls.

Q. In what respect do you think the American girls are the best?—A. They are smarter at their work, and will as a general thing do better work, and they are neater about their work and are more reliable. If the French take a notion, they will go off without any notice whatever. As a general thing, if the American girls are going away they will give you notice of it.

Q. This French population is a pretty large element here, is it not?—A. Yes, I should judge it is.

Q. What is the next largest element in the working population of the city, Irish, German, or American; I mean the factory operatives?—A. I should think the American would come next.

Q. Next to the French?—A. Yes.

Q. Then the Irish?—A. I don't know how that would be. We do not have Germans; they are more in the Amoskeag works. They have a great many of them. I don't know what proportion there would be of Germans.

Q. Do you ever hear discussions among the operatives as to whether they are better off in the old countries or here?—A. No; I have never heard.

Q. Have you known many instances where operatives coming from abroad to this country have returned because they could do better in the old country than they could here?—A. I have never had any to my knowledge that have returned.

Q. If they can, they stay, do they?—A. They stay, as far as I know.

Q. Where do you sell your goods?—A. They are sold in Boston and New York. They are sold through our selling house.

Q. Does any matter occur to you that it would be useful for the committee or the country to know?—A. I don't know of anything myself, but I am willing to answer any questions you ask.

Q. Do you employ children?—A. Yes; mostly boys.

HEALTH OF OPERATIVES.

Q. How healthy or unhealthy is the work in the mill?—A. I don't know but that it is as healthy as any work can be.

Q. What is the general health of the operatives?—A. As far as I know, they are very healthy.

Q. What diseases break out among them?—A. I haven't heard of any particular disease.
Q. They have fevers and consumption, I suppose, now and then, like other people!—A. Yes; I suppose so.
Q. Do you think they are as healthy as the other population of the city?—A. I should think they were fully.

OPERATIVES’ BOARDING-HOUSES.

Q. You give some attention, I take it, to ventilation and sanitary precautions!—A. We intend to do so through our mills, and see that our boarding-houses are kept in good condition.
Q. Do you have boarding-houses for most of your operatives?—A. We have boarding-houses, yes, to accommodate all that wish to board, and more too. They take in other boarders.
Q. From other mills?—A. Yes.
Q. Won't you describe those boarding-houses to us?—A. We have six, and they are all of one pattern. They are intended for forty boarders each. On the first floor is a dining-room, a kitchen, a sitting-room, and pantry (or cupboard).
Q. How large is the dining-room?—A. I think 34 feet long by 16 wide.
Q. That is designed for the whole party?—A. Yes; that will seat forty.
Q. How large is the sitting room?—A. I think, 18 x 20.
Q. That is common to the whole house?—A. That is open to all the boarders that wish to sit in it.
Q. How is that furnished?—A. Most of them have a sofa, chairs, table, and some have a piano.
Q. There are six of these, you say—how many of them do you think have a piano?—A. I don't know. I don't go in there very often, but as I pass by I hear a piano playing very often.
Q. Played by the operatives, some of them?—A. I think so.
Q. Is the sitting-room carpeted?—A. I have been into some of them that were, and some that were not.
Q. How large is the kitchen?—A. It is a good-sized kitchen. I could not tell you exactly.
Q. What other room is there on the lower floor?—A. That is all. That occupies the lower floor—the kitchen, dining-room, halls, and pantry.
Q. What is there on the second floor?—A. On the second floor a hall runs all through the length of the house. On one side there are rooms that are called the family-rooms, a small sitting-room or parlor, and two lodging-rooms. They are intended for the family who occupies the house. On the opposite side of the hall there are four lodging rooms.
Q. For boarders?—A. For boarders.
Q. How large are they?—A. I think, about 13 x 14 or 15.
Q. And how many are accommodated in a room?—A. Two. One bed in a room.
Q. That would take care of eight.—A. Yes; then the next story has four rooms on each side of the hall.
Q. The same size as the others?—A. The same size as the others.
Q. That makes sixteen; and how many stories?—A. There is then the attic story with the same number of rooms.
Q. That makes how many?—A. That makes twenty rooms for boarders.
Q. The upper rooms are the same as to size, I suppose?—A. Yes.
Q. And as to height?—A. They are not quite as high. It is a “hip”
roof, so that they get the same sized room, but I think the stories are not quite as high as the others.

Q. Are there any means of warming these rooms? — A. The girls that occupy them — most of them have a stove of their own — they furnish their own stove.

Q. And fuel for it? — A. Their own fuel.

Q. Most of these houses owned by the corporation are brick, are they? — A. I think they are. I don't know but the Stark Mills may have some few buildings — I think they have — of wood, but the great mass of them, as I see them, are brick, and our own are brick.

Q. When were these built? — A. The first was built in 1864, the next in 1870.

Q. How about the drainage to those houses; are they healthy in that regard? — A. Yes, there is a sewer that runs the length of the building through, into the canal.

Q. Take these houses and compare them with houses in other parts of the city that are occupied by people who get their living by working; how do they compare as to convenience and healthfulness of location and their general construction? — A. Well, I should think they were better than the average of tenements that are built here to rent.

Q. What is one of those houses worth; suppose it was erected to day; what would it cost, in your judgment? — A. In one of those houses there are three of those tenements that I speak of.

Q. Then a block will accommodate one hundred and twenty persons? — A. Yes.

Q. What is one of those blocks worth? — A. The first one we built was by contract, and we paid $14,000 for it.

Q. That is for the house itself? — A. Yes.

Q. What do you think it would cost to put up a like structure now in the same way, exclusive of the lot of land? — A. Well, probably, it could be done for somewhat less now.

Q. Is brick cheaper now? — A. Yes; labor is cheaper. The first one was built in 1864, I think, and prices had got up pretty well. The last one we built by the day, and we didn't keep any exact account of the cost of it.

Q. Those tenements are rented by you, are they, to a boarding-master or mistress? — A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they usually kept by men or by women? — A. More by women.

Q. You rent them to them? — A. Yes; we rent them at a pretty low rent. We charge them just about enough to keep the repairs up, $12.50 a month ($150 a year), and it costs us about that to keep them in repair.

Q. You have taxes to pay, too? — A. Of course.

Q. One hundred and fifty dollars will pay the taxes and repairs, will it? — A. It will not do more than that. I don't know, in fact, as it would do that, but it certainly would not do any more.

COST OF OPERATIVES' LIVING.

Q. Now, what does it cost the operatives to board there? — A. The girls pay $2.25 a week.

Q. That includes their general or common washing? — A. Yes.

Q. And the men pay how much? — A. Various sums, but we don't have any control over that. I think they pay about $3.

Q. What will that man get for his week's work who pays $3 a week for his board? — A. All the way from $1.15 a day up to $2 a day.
Q. He may get $6.90 or he may get $12!—A. Some mechanics we pay $2 a day so that are boarding in one of these boarding houses.
Q. What will that mechanic's washing cost him?—A. The boarding-house folks do the washing.
Q. For the men as well as the women?—A. Yes.
Q. What will these women get per week in wages who pay $2.25 a week for their board?—A. All the way from $5.50 to $8 a week.
Q. You say some of them save a part of their earnings?—A. Yes, a large part of them do save their money.
Q. Is there any difference in the matter of thrift between the Americans and the other help?—A. Well, there is. I think the Americans and the French are more saving of their money than the Irish are. The French will go to work a few years and save their money and go back to Canada.
Q. They are the most saving of any, are they?—A. They are the most saving of any of the foreign people, as far as my knowledge goes.

HOURS OF LABOR.

Q. Do any of them grumble because you work them too many hours?—A. I don't hear any complaint. Those that work by the piece would like to work more hours.
Q. Have you heard them say so?—A. Oh, yes. When we are short of water, or anything of that sort, they have to make up lost time, and they are always ready to work—to get in all the time they can.
Q. You think that where the piece-labor system prevails, there is no inclination among working people to have the hours shortened?—A. No, I think the majority would rather work more hours who work by the piece.
Q. Do you believe that if they worked by the day as a rule, it would come to be the case that, in 10 hours, working people would do as much as they now do in 11 or 12?—A. Not in a cotton mill.
Q. Would it be in some more laborious employments, perhaps?—A. Probably it would in a different kind of work.
Q. How many hours do you work a day?—A. About ten and three-quarters.
Q. In the mill?—A. Yes.
Q. Do you have to think about your work at any other time?—The WITNESS. Do you mean myself?
Q. The CHAIRMAN. Yes, yourself.—A. I do not get there so early, unless there is something specially to call me there. I sometimes go to the mill a quarter after 7, sometimes half past 7. If there is anything particular to be attended to, I go earlier.
Q. But you have this matter on your mind all the time probably?—A. Of course it is on my mind, even if I am at the house.
Q. But you probably do as much work to wear a man out as anybody who works for you?—A. I think I do, although it is not what is called laboring work.
Q. That is, it is not muscular work?—A. No.
Q. How much is there of this quitting of operatives and their being discharged? Is your help migratory, coming and going, or does it stick by you pretty well?—A. The French help are changing a great deal.
Q. Is it because they get dissatisfied and want to go to another employer, or how is that?—A. I can't say.
Q. What reasons do they give, as a rule—you have to turn some off, I suppose, but the people that quit of their own accord, what reason do
relations between labor and capital.

they give; are they dissatisfied about anything! — A. They say they are going "home" (to Canada), as they call it, or they will sometimes say that they can get more pay at some other place. That is another of the excuses that they give.

Q. Is there or is there not a surplus of help or of operatives here, so that if there are vacancies it is easy to supply them? — A. There is, most of the year. Take it through the summer time, though, it is not so. Through the warm weather a great many of the girls go off; they go home—American girls, to be gone a month or six weeks, or two months.

Q. Do the operatives "marry off" much? — A. Yes.

Q. What sort of housekeepers do they make? — A. I don't know. I don't hear much on that subject.

Q. There has been a good deal of complaint before us that girls—operatives—of whatever nativity, do not know how to work or to carry on a house very well. Have you any means of judging how those operatives, aside from the Americans, are brought up at home? — Are they taught to work by their parents—the Irish or French? — A. I don't know how that is.

Q. How about the French parents sending their children to schools? — A. Well, as far as I know, I don't think they are very punctual in sending them to school.

Q. They do not seem to be impressed with the importance of schooling very much? — A. No.

Q. Are they willing to get their children to work in the mill, if they can get them in? — A. Yes; they are always very anxious to do that.

Q. If there were perfect freedom in that matter how early would the parents put their children in the mill? — A. I should think that some of them would put them in at eight years old if they could get them in.

Q. Is there work in the mill that an eight-year-old child could do if the law would permit it? — A. They could do it after a fashion, but it would not be done properly. We should not want them in there to do it.

Q. You would look upon it as a sort of systematic murder of the innocents, I suppose? — A. Yes; that age would be too young.

Manchester, N. H., October 12, 1883.

George B. Chandler sworn and examined.

By Mr. Pugh:

Question. What business are you in? — Answer. I am connected with the banking interest. I am cashier of the Manchester National Bank and treasurer of the Amoskeag Savings Bank.

Savings Bank Deposits in New Hampshire.

Q. We would like to know what you know about the deposits that are made in the savings bank and the class of people who make them. The witness. You mean the deposits as I see them in our business? Mr. Pugh. Yes; the deposits in the savings bank, and where they come from; the class of people who make these deposits.

A. We have in the Manchester Savings Bank something over $10,000,000 of deposits, and of that $10,000,000 I think from $4,500,000 to $4,800,000 is deposited by our citizens here in Manchester—nearly $5,000,000 of it.

6-C-3—(5 LAW)
Q. Nearly $5,000,000 deposited by the residents of Manchester?—
A. Yes.

Q. What business are those people in that make these deposits?—
A. We get a very large deposit from the operatives.

Q. What amount comes from that class?
The WITNESS. What per cent. of our whole deposit?
Mr. PUGH. What per cent. of the deposit of the citizens here comes from the operatives?
A. Well, we do not keep it so as to tell that, but I could make an estimate of it. I should judge that fully one-half of our deposit is from operatives and from laboring people.
Q. People employed in the manufacturing business in this city?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. How long have you had that amount of deposits from the city—has that amount varied from year to year?—A. Yes, sir. The savings bank is an institution of later years, you know, any way. In 1848, we had, I think, $1,000,000 only in the State, whereas to-day we have $40,000,000.
Q. In the savings banks of the State of New Hampshire?—A. Yes, sir. Ten years ago, I think, we had less than $50,000,000.
Q. It has increased ten millions within the last ten years?—A. I think so; yes.
Q. Does the amount deposited by individuals increase—or how is that?—A. Oh, yes; we are open one evening in the week for the purpose of receiving deposits from laboring people or people who are engaged so that they cannot come to the bank during the day hours. The evenings after the days of payment by the corporations here are very busy evenings with us.
Q. Do they check out their deposits much?—A. They will draw in small amounts a good deal, but our deposit is all the time exceeding our withdrawals, so that we are increasing all the while.
Q. What is your idea of the average amount of deposits by individual operatives?—A. The average through the State (and I think our average in Manchester, so far as I can judge, is perhaps a fair one) is about $330 to a depositor.

NUMBER OF DEPOSITORS IN MANCHESTER, N. H.

Q. What is the number of depositors in this city, in your best judgment?—A. I think we must have somewhere from twelve thousand to fifteen thousand deposit books. The people of this city hold from twelve thousand to fifteen thousand deposit books to-day.
Q. The depositors are operatives in the different mills and industries, employed by different people?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. All the mills furnish depositors, more or less?—A. Yes.
Q. The other five millions of deposits come from different parts of the State?—A. Yes.
Q. And from what class of people?—A. Well, we get deposits very largely from all the towns. I think that we have more than two-thirds of the towns of the State represented by deposits in our bank alone, and of course the towns lying immediately above us will have a pretty large deposit.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps Senator Pugh does not know how numerous towns are in our State. There were 238 towns the last time I heard of the number, and there may have been another added since, which would make 238, perhaps, now.
Q. You think you have two-thirds, perhaps, of those?—A. I think we have rather more than two-thirds of the towns of the State.

Q. Do you think you have 175 of them?—A. I think so; all the towns in the lower part of the State, almost without exception. Of course, in the extreme northern parts of the State we do not get so many.

Q. Are the towns subdivisions of counties?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Our townships are six miles square frequently—sometimes a little larger and sometimes considerably smaller.

Q. The class of depositors throughout the State is made up largely of operatives—laboring people?—A. No; in the towns about us here there would be but very few operatives, excepting some of the operatives of the mills here, living in towns, but who might possibly give their residence at home instead of here in the city.

Q. This is the largest manufacturing city in New Hampshire?—A. Oh, yes; and I was going to say larger than the other three cities of the State.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Perhaps you might state the population of the city.—A. The population of Manchester is nearly 40,000.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. That was by the last census?—A. Yes; and I think we have gained a little since then.

Q. Then your town is on the increase in population?—A. Yes. There is something a little singular about deposits, which we notice with our Thursday evening deposits. Last night, after the chairman of this committee spoke to me, I took pains to run over the deposits for a half dozen Thursday evenings, and I found that one evening we had about sixty deposits, I think it was, and the average for that evening was about $40, which is about the average deposit of a Thursday evening. That evening I think we had but one depositor that deposited as much as $100. Another evening we had one hundred and twenty-seven different deposits, and that evening I think we had six or eight that were $100 or more; but the average of the whole deposits was only about $40, and I think there were nearly fifty deposits of $20 and less that evening. Those were deposits made almost universally by laboring people.

Q. What is the largest amount, do you remember, that any of these operatives have on deposit?—A. Well, we discourage large deposits. We don’t like a deposit of over $2,000, so that when an individual carries a large deposit, they naturally open an account with some other bank. We don’t like to have the deposits too large; but it is nothing unusual for girls to have deposits of anywhere from $1,000 to $1,200.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. In one bank?—A. Yes.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. How do males and females compare in the matter of deposits?—A. I should think that not more than 40 per cent. of our deposits are of adult males.

Q. Of the laboring males?—A. Yes.

Q. And 60 per cent. you think are females?—A. Well, we have a good many deposits of minors, or persons under twenty-one.

Q. Do you pay interest on deposits?—A. Yes.
INTEREST PAID BY SAVINGS BANKS.

Q. What interest do you pay?—A. Four per cent.
Q. Do you pay that annually?—A. Yes.
Q. You credit them with the interest at the end of each year?—A. Yes; without any regard to their bringing their books. The book may not be in the bank for ten or twenty years. I think recently we had a book which had been so long out that when we credited the interest it was nearly three times the amount of the original deposit.
Q. You add the interest to the principal, and then give them interest on that total amount?—A. Yes; practically it makes compound interest.
Q. Then you pay compound interest on the deposits?—A. Yes.

SAVINGS BANK TAXES.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Perhaps you might state the amount of tax you pay to the State government?—A. The tax is 1 per cent. The savings banks of the State pay in taxes about $400,000. That is a heavier tax than is paid by savings banks of any other State in the Union. That tends to lessen the rate of interest.

FARMERS AS SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITORS.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. What is your estimate of the different classes of people outside of laborers who make deposits—I mean manufacturing operatives—how about the farming class?—A. Well, we get very large deposits from all the farming towns about us. We are in the midst of a farming community.
Q. The market of the farmer is found in the manufacturing villages, towns, and cities?—A. Yes.

FOOD CROP OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Q. What is your estimate of the food crop of this State compared with the consumption?—A. That is a department that I do not figure up, but it is generally understood that New Hampshire does not raise nearly the corn and wheat that it consumes.
Q. More than half of what you consume comes from other States?—A. Without doubt.
Q. What other industry furnishes these deposits besides manufacturing and farming?—A. Well, it is derived from the general prosperity of the people of the community. I suppose our own industries in New Hampshire are agricultural or manufacturing industries. Those two are paramount. The railroad interest is a large interest and employs many men, but they are accessory to the others.
Q. The farmer finds a market here for all the surplus agricultural products that he raises, does he not?—A. I think so; yes.
Q. That is principally from those employed in manufacturing industry?—A. The development of the manufacturing industry is the salvation of the farmer, of course. It makes him a home market.
Q. What do these farmers raise generally?—A. In the neighborhood of a center of this kind, the dairy product is a large product—the amount of milk that comes in—and, of course, vegetables and small fruits are considerable.
Q. Is there much grain?—A. No, sir; I think not. In fact, I think that the farmers above, within a radius certainly of a dozen miles—are very large purchasers of grain.

Q. The farmers themselves are purchasers of it!—A. Yes; I think a great many of them do not raise the grain that they consume. They feed their cattle with "shorts"—meal, and such like. That is a matter, however, with which I am not very familiar.

Q. Is there much stock raised in this State?—A. Not very much, I judge. I have this idea, that the farmer would hardly raise much stock, for when he wants a cow he can get one without trouble.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Yet these same farmers are making deposits in your bank?—A. Yes. Instead of raising a cow, if a farmer wants one he will buy a heifer that will produce him milk.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. He cannot run a dairy without cows?—A. Not very well.

Q. You have to keep your cattle here under cover for how many months in the year?—A. Well, it is a good while since I lived on a farm, nearly thirty years, but I should say that you would have to keep them under cover from the middle of November until nearly the first of May. I think that it gets somewhat into May before they turn them out into pasture, usually about the 20th of May.

Q. They have to keep them under cover for six months?—A. Yes. If the farmers are producing milk it is profitable, I understand, to feed the cattle on grain and shorts.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What do they get a quart for the milk?—A. My impression is that the milkman's price is 6 cents, and I think the farmer's price is about 4 cents a quart.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. What is the price of butter?—A. Butter is retailing now for, I think, something like 30 cents. It wholesales, I think, at from 25 to 30 cents for fine butter.

Mr. PUGH. We can make a food crop in my country every month in the year, and we have no deposits to put in the banks, though we do not have to shelter anything there.

The WITNESS. As small a State as New Hampshire is, I believe we are the fifth State in the Union in the deposits in savings banks.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are these deposits drawn from other States to any extent?—A. No, sir. I think the chances are that there is a very much larger amount of money carried from the State than is brought into the State.

Q. And deposited elsewhere?—A. Yes; all along the southern portion of the State. The deposits of the towns along the southern portion of the State go out of the State.

Q. This is a question that I could not answer, but perhaps you can: Does New Hampshire have the benefit of more foreign capital invested in the State than she herself has invested out of the State, considering her western investments and all?—A. I should not think she did. The question comes in a new shape, however; I had not thought of it before.

The CHAIRMAN. It does, I think, if we take into account all the capital invested in railroads and corporations of every kind and everything else.
The WITNESS. I think so.

Mr. McDuffie. I think we would have a balance left on that settlement.

The WITNESS. To give you an idea of the deposits of the laboring people, I presume we have perhaps in the Amoskeag Savings Bank two thousand depositors that will average at least a half dozen deposits in the year—they make during the year at least a half dozen deposits—many of them eight or ten—some three or four; but I should think that we have at least two thousand that would make these little deposits during the year, at least half a dozen of them. The entries run down a whole page, and then a second page, and then a third page, and very often we give them a new book, transferring the balance. They fill them up with deposits.

Q. But for the market afforded by the manufacturing industries of the State to agriculture, what would be the chance of the farmer getting a living now, with Western competition and all the conditions of modern life as they are, do you think?—A. Oh, I think if it was not for the manufacturing interests of New Hampshire the State would be on the retrograde very rapidly. I cannot conceive how it would be otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know whether it is generally understood, but it is the fact that one-half of our population only is engaged in agriculture. The rest are in manufactures and mechanical pursuits and the professions, which, of course, take but a small number, and they make the market such as the farmer has.

The WITNESS. It seems a strong statement to make, but I believe that in twenty-five years New Hampshire will have $100,000,000 in the savings banks.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. These savings banks offer a great inducement to people who have a little money not to waste it?—A. Yes; those banks have about $25,000,000 belonging to Manchester people, and if it had not been for the savings banks it would have been squandered.

Q. The savings banks have been the means of enabling these people to save.—A. They have been the most beneficent institutions in the country or in the State.

INVESTMENT OF SAVINGS BANK FUNDS.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where is all the money? You have been intrusted with that money. You pay 4 per cent. and pay the State 1 per cent.; that makes 5 per cent. Now, you must be able to invest that money somewhere and avoid a loss. Where are the deposits generally made? I do not mean, of course, to make any invidious inquiries.—A. I understand. The law of New Hampshire does not hold us to so narrow a line as the law holds the savings banks in other States. We can take the bonds of any first-class city, for instance, and the savings banks have done so largely. I think the savings banks in New Hampshire are holders of first-class city bonds, and they can take first-class railroad bonds, which they hold very largely also; and the State does not restrict us, but so that we can hold first-class bank stocks and a great many mortgages.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. What is the security to the depositor?—A. The security is based on the deposit; that is, the invested property belonging to the bank.
By the Chairman:

Q. Is there any way in which a particular depositor can pursue the security that covers his own deposit?—A. No.

Q. He looks to the bank?—A. When his deposit goes in it goes in with the general deposit.

Q. But in the winding up of the affairs of the bank there might be trouble. The court marshals all the deposits for the general benefit—A. Oh, yes; if the bank had to be closed up, and if, after paying 100 per cent. to the depositors, there were a surplus, the division of the surplus would be made pro rata.

Savings Bank Losses.

Q. Won't you state the actual security that has existed, as matter of fact, for the depositors in the savings banks of this State? Do you know of any losses?—A. The losses have been very small. I hardly know what they have been. There have been a few banks that have met with losses by investments which turned out to be poor ones.

To guard against a contingency of that kind we have a law whereby commissioners will take possession of the bank and appraise the assets and put them in the hands of a receiver, and close up the bank, and pay the depositors pro rata. There have been a few banks in the State that have suffered somewhat. There have been, I think, two or three that have been allowed to scale down, perhaps 10 per cent., and the banks have gone on. For instance, if a depositor had $100 in the bank, then by decree of the court in such case it would be scaled down to perhaps $90. Then he could withdraw it if he wanted to, and he could deposit it in some other bank. And afterwards, very often, the bank has restored the deposits, and they have paid the full 100 per cent.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. The banks are required to make an annual showing of their condition?—A. Yes; and not only that, but a few years ago we passed an enactment requiring them to lay aside (to establish a guarantee fund) a percentage of their earnings annually until it should amount to 5 per cent. of the deposits. In the Amoskeag bank we have laid aside at present $165,000 as a guarantee fund.

By the Chairman:

Q. That guarantee you keep drawing interest on?—A. Yes.

Q. It is an undistributed fund?—A. Yes. We do not set aside our assets particularly, but our books show that that amount belongs to the guarantee fund.

Sources of Savings Bank Profits.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. What is the general source of profit to savings banks?—A. Well, I don't know of any better answer that I can give you than to say that we loan the money out for a little more than it costs us; that is all. We have no exchange, no currency, no business of that kind. We simply take the money and loan it out at a little more than we pay.

Q. And are you limited in the rate of interest you get?

The Witness. You mean our legal rate of interest in this State?

Mr. Pugh. I mean for the use of money on bank loans.

A. The legal rate is six per cent.
Q. Are you authorized to discount bills and notes?—A. The law does not prohibit us from doing that, but the savings banks do very little of that. The savings banks do not do that unless they are located in a village where there are no other banking accommodations. Then they might perhaps act as a bank of discount—as a business bank for that community.

INTEREST ON LOANS.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I wish you would state to the committee from your knowledge, not of New Hampshire banks alone and the rate at which they make investments outside the State, but of other States (the whole business of lending money in the country), at what actual rates of interest money is loaned that is invested in business of all kinds. I do not mean where it is lent in risky businesses and under special circumstances, but where it is lent to be used by traders, manufacturers, and men who purchase farms and place mortgages upon them for a portion of the consideration, and so all the way round where capital is used in the business of the country. —A. As far as our rates are concerned, in this immediate community our legal rate is 6 per cent. In making mortgages and legal transactions we generally get 6 per cent. At the same time if an individual here has a first-class note secured by first-class collaterals, and he can raise the money in Boston for 5 per cent, he won’t pay us 6. He will take his collateral to Boston and get his loan on it there. Of course the rates which we get are measured very largely by the times. We can’t get much above the market rate, except in taking a mortgage, which is regarded as a long loan and is not to be charged at the end of three or six months. We usually have an agreed rate of 6 per cent. on mortgages.

Q. What amount of your deposits run on loans—go out of the savings bank on personal security or mortgage?

The WITNESS. The amount of the savings banks of the State?

The CHAIRMAN. The amount of deposits that you lend out.

The WITNESS. Do you mean on personal securities—collaterals and such like?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. What amount has the bank out on securities of any sort as loans?

A. Well, we have, for instance, $40,000,000 perhaps; and though I had not looked that point up, but I should presume that perhaps more than half of that $40,000,000 is on bond and mortgage and stocks.

Q. Is that confined to this State or does it reach other States?—A. We have to confine ourselves pretty largely to the State—although New Hampshire is not to such an extent a borrower as that the large banks are driven out of the State for many of their investments; but the smaller banks, I think, as a rule, make their investments in the State.

The CHAIRMAN. The question I had in my mind was one, the answer to which would give us an idea of what capital costs.

The WITNESS. You mean in the country at large?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; in the country at large.

The WITNESS. Of course in the West people pay more for money than they do in the East. It is regulated by demand and supply. I think 7 per cent. in the West is a common rate.

Mr. PUGH. I think some of the States go as high as 9, and in the South some are perhaps as high as 10. I think that in Louisiana there is some money loaned at 10 per cent.

The WITNESS. A great amount of money is borrowed at somewhere from 5 to 6 per cent.
By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. That is on comparatively short time?—A. Yes, that is, the great volume of it.

Q. One of the witnesses stated that one company hired $100,000 in quick capital. In such a case as that what rate of interest would you expect a corporation to pay?—A. That would be a pretty creamy note—perhaps 44 per cent.

Q. That would be on unquestionable security?—A. Yes. That would be on the same idea as a man that buys a Government bond and pays a premium on it.

Q. But as to a man or corporation starting a new manufacturing establishment in a part of the country where it was a new business, would they be likely, being a new concern, to get the capital at such a rate as that?—A. Oh, no, except on an established credit; a new corporation must have a strong backing.

Q. Should you think it would be reasonable to expect to get it in such a case, where the business itself would be, to some extent, an experiment, and have to take the chances of national legislation which might destroy it in the estimation of the men who were going into it; men who believed in a protective tariff, for instance; should you expect that a man or a corporation could get that money to start a new concern for less than 6 or 7 per cent.?—A. No, sir; and in all probability a corporation would be obliged to furnish an individual indorsement on the note.

Q. There would be that difficulty in the effort to establish a new manufacturing interest in a part of the country where it does not already exist or is not established?—A. A new corporation or an untried industry would have great trouble in borrowing its money at 6 per cent. unless it had excellent backing in the way of personal indorsement.

Mr. PUGH. Mr. Howard, down here at Fall River mills, said the manufacturers there made 20 per cent. net, and that they could afford to pay 5 per cent. if they had to borrow money.

The WITNESS. They borrow money very largely; they operate on an entirely different plan.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I have had occasion to observe and have known recently of good substantial manufacturing companies with very good signatures of the treasurer and the selling agent's indorsements to be accepted for 5½ per cent. on six months; I have known that within ten days.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any other recent instance that occurs to you?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I have known several at 5 and 5½; some have been discussed at 6.

Mr. PUGH. Where they pay that rate of interest to start a new industry or sustain an old one they must expect large profits under the operation of the tariff, do they not? They would not go into that business with borrowed capital at that rate unless the tariff allowed them to make large profits from the consumers.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Does it make any difference whether a man invests his own money, which he might lend to others at a rate which he ought to expect to receive from his investment, or whether he hires somebody else's capital to put in the same investment?—A. Well, I think a man would naturally invest his own capital when he would not borrow money.
Q. But would he invest it with the expectation of getting a less return than he would by borrowing money? — A. Well, he might.

Q. If you can let your money for 6 per cent, will you take your money and put it into a manufacturing establishment in which you cannot expect more than 5? — A. No. The greater the risk the greater the compensation to be expected.

Q. Then, does it make any difference whether he has the capital of his own in going into a manufacturing establishment or hires it of somebody else? He will not go in unless he can realize as much as he could get from somebody else? — A. I think there is a difference there. A man will put capital of his own sometimes into an investment when he would not borrow money to put into it. I was speaking to a gentleman the other day, and he said he should either have to sell his own securities or borrow money to go into something, and he said he didn't want to sell his own securities and he certainly should not borrow money, but he would put his own money into it.

Q. But he would not take it from a good security unless he thought he would get more from the risky adventure than he was getting from the safe one? — A. If I understand your point it is that a man would not do with his own capital what he would not do with borrowed capital; but I think he would.

Q. But would he not expect to make more out of the risky investment than he would from the safe one? — A. Oh, yes.

Q. When you come to build up manufactures or establishments of that kind in new enterprises, it is a question with the investor whether he can make more by that than by leaving his money where it is? — A. Yes.

Q. And he won't go into it unless he can see his way to a better profit? — A. Capital is naturally timid, and won't go into investments which it is not reasonably sure of unless it can see the prospect of a large reward.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Might not the owner of capital be satisfied with less profit than the man who runs on borrowed capital and pays 5 or 6 per cent. for it? — A. I think he would be satisfied to risk his own money when he would not risk other money.

By the Chairman:

Q. But the point is this, as it arises in the minds of some people, that if a man has the money to put in himself he is not entitled to the same return, that he should not expect the same return for his capital put into manufacturing or other investments, that he would have a right to expect if he hired the money and paid 5 or 6 per cent. for it. But what difference does it make?

Mr. Pugh. I will state the point differently, if you will allow me. The man who pays 5 or 6 per cent. for borrowed money has no right to charge that to the consumer and also the same amount of interest that a man would be able to make in the same industry who was using his own money. So that at last the point I want to get at is that the owner of capital can run a business on less capital than the man who has to borrow the money to do it on; the man who borrows capital has no right to make his interest out of the consumer, and then make in addition to that the same amount of profit that the owner would have if he had the money himself.
The Witness. I see the point you make, but I think, as Senator Blair suggests, that if a man is going to borrow capital to develop an industry he won't do it unless he sees a large profit in it.

Mr. Pugh. That is exactly what I say, and therefore he does see in this industry a large profit after paying this large interest on the capital he borrows, and hence it must come that that much profit must come from the operation of the protective tariff, and then I say that that amount of protection cannot be justly demanded, because it enables men to make large profits who borrow capital on these high rates of interest, or what you call high rates; I do not call them high rates myself.

The Chairman. The question is, after all, whether without the protective tariff you could develop the industry at all.

The Witness. You would not develop it without a reasonable assurance or a certainty, as you may say, of a reasonable return from it.

Mr. Pugh. Certainly; I understand. With me it is only a question of degree of profit.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is there anything else that you would like to mention to the committee?

Laborers Becoming Capitalists.

The Witness. If I understand your duty, it is to get at some of the difficulties between capital and labor, and as I understand it from my position in a savings bank, it seems to me that in the present position of a laborer our laborers are rapidly becoming capitalists; by capitalists I mean persons who have money at interest. It seems to me that out of the twelve thousand to fifteen thousand savings-bank books which are scattered around in this town there must be at least two or three or four thousand of them that are the property of the people who are laboring people. Now, just the moment they have a book and have money at interest they take interest in something outside of themselves, and the transformation has commenced from a mere laborer, with nothing but his muscular force, to a capitalist; or, in other words, the depositors who represent so large an interest in the savings banks here are having a great interest in capital as invested by those savings banks here.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. In England and France are there any places protected by law where deposits can be made?—A. I do not know what the English system is.

The Chairman. They have their postal savings banks.

The Witness. Yes, but that is rather a recent development.

Q. You do not know what the amount of deposits are there?—A. No; but savings banks are new even with us. The first savings bank was established in 1816, and we have now a $1,000,000,000 of deposits.

The Tendency of Laborers to Buy Homesteads.

By the Chairman:

Q. With reference to the tendency among these depositors, when they have enough to do it, to make real-estate investments—as in a
homestead here in the city—to what extent does that sort of investment take place?—A. That is going on very largely. There is a peculiarity in the French element which is rather new to our community. I do not think we have had many French here until within six or eight years. They have not yet acquired very much property, although within the last two years, since the land was opened on the other side of the river by the Amoskeag Company, they have been buying land and putting homesteads on it.

Q. That is, the French population?—A. Yes, but that is new. The Irish, however, have done a good deal of that, and there is one peculiarity about them, that when they buy land they never sell it. They take in the piece next to them, and they keep on adding when they can. They are becoming quite considerable real-estate owners.

Q. The Irish are?—A. Yes.

Q. How about the Germans?—A. They are getting hold, also, and have erected a good many houses, and have quite a little community, and have their own recreations and amusements, and a hall, &c., and are generally building up.

Q. How about these various races getting on harmoniously together? Do they coalesce and get on in a friendly way, or do they keep up hostility or national grudges against one another?—A. From any evidence that I have had I should think that our population here is a very harmonious one.

Q. They intermingle?—A. Yes.

Q. Is there any tendency, for instance, to give patronage in the way of trade to dealers of their own race or nationality?—A. Well, I should think there would be very little of that, with the exception, possibly, of the French. They are so new with us and in the community that I should think they do it, perhaps; at least, I have an opinion that they are rather clannish.

Q. I suppose there is as yet very little intermarriage among the different nationalities?—A. Not between the French and the Americans, but the Irish and Irish-Americans are as smart and bright as anybody. We have French lawyers and French doctors.

Q. I asked as to whether there was any tendency to intermarriage?—A. Not between the races, I guess, though I hardly know how that may be.

The CHAIRMAN. That has to come gradually at some time, you know. We have got to be one people, and it will come after awhile.

The WITNESS. Well, yes. It comes in this way. For instance, among the Irish the lawyers of their race here stand well with the profession.

Q. Americans would employ a doctor of Irish descent as quickly as any?—A. My impression is that that is so. I think we can safely say that, for a manufacturing community, we are rather a model.

Mr. PUGH. I have no doubt of it, sir. I find the manufacturing industries here in the highest state of development and perfection.

The WITNESS. Our people are all busy and working harmoniously together, and all working hard, and our city is developing finely.

Q. At what time do the operatives disappear for the night?—A. When the bell strikes 9 the streets in a few minutes will be comparatively quiet.

Q. What time do they get up in the morning?—A. At about quarter before 6, I suppose. They have breakfast at 6 or a quarter past.
MANCHESTER, N. H., October 12, 1883.

OTIS BARTON sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. How many years have you been a resident of Manchester?—Answer. I commenced in 1850, thirty-three years ago.

Q. What department of trade is yours?—A. Dry goods and carpets.

Q. Have you a general knowledge of the prices of provisions, groceries, and the necessaries of life generally during this time?—A. I don't think I could give you a very accurate account of them, because it has been outside of my business, any further than supplying my own family.

PRICES OF DRY GOODS THIRTY YEARS AGO AND NOW.

Q. You may state with reference to your own trade, then—dry goods and carpets—how they were about the time you commenced and how they are up to the present time. I do not mean wholesale prices, but such as you would have sold them for to customers at retail. I do not suppose that, being called in this abrupt way, you could be so accurate as by reference to your books.—A. Well, our business is such a variety business that I hardly know what articles you refer to. If you refer to the common domestic goods, such as go into the consumption of families generally, I could tell you those.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I mean—the purchases of people who have little money or carry on business in a small way for themselves.

The WITNESS. The styles of goods you should bear in mind are various, and the names of goods during the last thirty years have changed. When I came into business here thirty years ago what we called prints were used, and the fabric made of cotton and wool was called delaine. These were the goods that went into general use for common and household wear. At the present time one of those articles has entirely disappeared, and the other is much cheaper now than it was. The common retail price of a print was from 10 to 12 cents a yard, while now it is only about half that.

Q. And the delaine has disappeared entirely?—A. Yes.

Q. What did that sell for about that time?—A. About 17 cents.

Q. There is some cloth used as a substitute for that, and about corresponding to it, for the purposes for which it was used?—A. Yes.

Q. What is that cloth called, and how does it sell?—A. The article that takes the place of that sells for about 12½ cents—a better article than sold for 20 cents then.

Q. Suppose you are making a fabric of the same usefulness and working qualities—the better article sells for 12½. Now suppose you get the same amount of wear out of it, what do you think it would be sold for—I mean if it were depreciated enough to get the same wearing usefulness out of it?—A. Well, I think they would get as good a fabric to-day for 12½ cents as they got for 25 cents when I came here.

Q. Has there been a general tendency to cheaper prices in such qualities?—A. American goods were in their infancy in the manufacture of this country thirty-odd years ago. There has been great progress made in manufacturing low priced dress goods in this country in the last fifteen or twenty years.

Q. What do you mean by dress goods?—A. What ladies and girls wear for dresses; I mean for outside garments on the street and about.

Q. Such as wear delaines and prints?—A. Yes.
Q. Do you think that a reduction in price of one-half would be a fair statement of it? — A. I think fully one-half. We used to depend largely upon foreign goods, and now we furnish a domestic article for one-half what the domestic used to cost—a better fabric, too, I think.

WAGES OF LABOR THIRTY YEARS AGO AND NOW.

Q. Can you state to the committee whether the wages of the laborer or of the ordinary worker or producer during this length of time have increased or diminished in their actual purchasing power; or, first, have they increased or diminished in their nominal amount—is it easier to earn a dollar now than it was thirty years ago? — A. I could not give you the figures, because I only know by general report what laborers get in the mill to-day and what they got twenty-five years ago.

The CHAIRMAN (to Mr. McDuffie). Can an operative earn a dollar as easily now as he could thirty years ago?

Mr. McDuffie. In 1850, and along to 1855, a good average mechanic was getting $1.33 to $1.42 per day—$1.25 to $1.42, perhaps, would be the range. Those same mechanics to-day would be getting from $1.75 to $2.50.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, how about operatives in factories?

Mr. McDuffie. I remember a trip I made through to the East. I went from Salem and took in Newburyport, Biddeford, Saco, Lewiston, Great Falls, Exeter, Manchester, Nashua, Lowell, and back to Salem, in 1852. Card room help which, according to the report I make to you, would be $1.02 and $1.05 per day, was then $2.50 a week; $2.75 was the outside for that same class of operatives. Weavers that were then earning (early in the “fifties”) under a good status of things $4.50, would be now earning $5.50 to $8. At that time, when the first large mills were built somewhere in the “fifties,” the overseers’ wages ran from $2 to $3 a day—Very seldom did a man get $3—and there were very few of them. Where they then got $2 to $3 they now get from $3 to $5. There has been an advance all along the line, and there has been a considerable advance in the very low grade. What was then $4.50 a week is now about $6.50 to $7.

The CHAIRMAN. And during this time, while wages have increased largely in all cases, and in some cases doubled, the commodities which laboring people consume in the line of cloth, to say the least, have diminished at least one-half.

Mr. McDuffie. It would cover all textiles and pretty nearly all.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the cause of this change in the increase of wages and in the decrease of prices, which is, of course, an enormous increase in the purchasing-power which the wage-workers have?

THE TARIFF.

Mr. McDuffie. As I view it, it is the result of the tariff that protects us until we get to a point where we can manufacture and pay such wages.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not mean to bring up the tariff. I did not know but what you would attribute it to machinery largely.

Mr. McDuffie. There is something to be attributed to that, but we must have a starting point. We could not have done it without such protection. I do not say that there are not other factors entering into the question.

The CHAIRMAN. But at that time, as I recollect it, there was less to
be attributed to the favorable effect of the tariff than since then. Since
1858, wages have increased largely, and the great manufacturing de-vel-opment has really come since that time, has it not? Of course, very
largely under the increased stimulus of the tariff, but these rates of
wages—were they the same, substantially, up to the war?
Mr. McDuffie. Yes; they held very nearly up to the war. In 1857,
nearly one-third of the mills in New England shut down in August,
September, and October, and they started again early in the spring of
1858. When they started in 1858, the people had gone out of the man-
ufacturing business. The prices paid for labor had got so low that they
preferred other things, and then began an advance, which will be seen
upon the books of almost all corporations then existing.

THE TENDENCY OF PRICES DOWNWARD.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the tendency now—whether is it to an in-
crease or a diminution in the purchasing-power of the wages of working
people?
Mr. McDuffie. The tendency is to lower prices.
The CHAIRMAN. Lower prices for commodities?
Mr. McDuffie. For commodities of all kinds.
The CHAIRMAN. Then the purchasing-power of wages is increasing?
Mr. McDuffie. The purchasing power is holding its own, at any rate.
The CHAIRMAN. Are wages, in nominal amount, tending to increase
somewhat?
Mr. McDuffie. I do not think there has been any tendency to reduc-
tion for two or three years, as a rule. There has been considerable ad-
vance. I have made an advance twice in three years in quite a number
of different departments since I have been here.
The CHAIRMAN. During this same time have retail prices increased
or diminished?
Mr. McDuffie. I should say they have diminished, but Mr. Barton
can tell you better.

Q. What should you say, Mr. Barton, as to the tendency of commod-
ities that you have dealt in, and generally what is the tendency of
prices, to increase or diminish?—A. The tendency is to a diminution of
cost. I do not wish to say that everything is sold at half of what it was
sold for thirty years ago. I speak of those two articles that I have men-
tioned. Some other articles, perhaps, would not be more than 10 or 20
per cent. less. I make that explanation, because it might seem incon-
sistent with somebody else’s testimony. Take, for example, gingham,
which is manufactured largely in this city and throughout New Eng-
land. The price, that used to be 12½ cents, would range now from 8 to
10 cents.

THE TENDENCY OF WAGES UPWARD.

Mr. Pugh (to Mr. McDuffie). You say that the price of labor in 1850
and along to 1856 was what percentage of wages?
Mr. McDuffie. I did not put it in percentages, but I put it in prices
that I knew of. I gave the wages of mechanics at that time, and I gave
the wages of mechanics to-day.

Mr. Pugh. What do you mean by mechanics?
Mr. McDuffie. We have a force, in our repair shop, of sixty men,
carpenters and machinists, and the average, I think, of their wages
would be somewhere about $1.91 or $1.92, including all the low grades
at the present time.
THE TARIFF.

Mr. Pugh. How does a protective tariff benefit a carpenter?

Mr. McDuffie. Well, that is a question that comes in a little different form from what I put it, but if we should go back again, I should say that the possibility of the tariff permitted us at the time to encourage these enterprises in manufacturing. I have reference more especially in this, to the time since I have been in Manchester and on the other side of the water, investigating the cost of worsted goods, and take in the old clines, and what Mr. Barton gives to-day as the thing that sells for about one-half the price (which confirms the testimony I gave you this afternoon on that very point). It helps the carpenter, because it helps to originate and start this enterprise.

Mr. Pugh. It benefits the carpenter as it benefits the farmer, in making a demand for his labor; that is the way the benefit comes.

Mr. McDuffie. Certainly.

Mr. Pugh. Do you say now that the price of the manufactured article at that time (perhaps it was Mr. Barton, though, that stated that) was nearly double what it is now?

Mr. McDuffie. I stated so to-day.

Mr. Pugh. What was the difference between the tariff at that time on this class of goods and what it is now?

Mr. McDuffie. That I could not answer, but I should presume the same, or very nearly the same.

Mr. Pugh. So it could not have been the operation of a protective tariff that produced the result you state, because the protection was just as great then as it is now, if rates of duty furnish the protection.

The Chairman. But the principle is that the longer the theory operates the better are its effects.

Mr. Pugh. That is an effect. I am talking about the rates of duty that existed then and now. It could not have been tariff laws, because they were in operation the same then as they are now.

The Chairman. Some witness suggested that the general system of protection and free trade must be judged by its effects during a long series of years. I think Colonel Livermore spoke of that.

Mr. Pugh. All that I wanted to say was that the tariff on that class of goods was the same then as now, or that the difference is very inconsiderable.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Where do you purchase your goods, Mr. Barton?—A. Mostly in Boston and New York.

Q. You do not buy your cotton fabrics here?—A. They all go through the Boston and New York houses.

Q. Do you buy the goods in Boston or New York that are manufactured here?—A. Well, mostly; I sometimes buy goods direct from the mills; that is, I make the contract so as to get them that way. For instance, if I buy Lowell carpets, I buy them from the house of George B. Richardson & Co., which is the selling agent. These manufacturing establishments, you know, have all got selling agents, but the goods may be shipped direct from the factory at Lowell to me. The purchase, however, is made through the agents.

Q. Do you import any of your goods?—A. No, sir.

Q. All your goods are purchased in the American market?—A. Yes; that is, we sometimes give orders to an agent in New York for certain classes of goods that come out for us, but they all come through the
New York agent. That is, if a manufacturer in Lyons or any foreign house has an agent in New York City, he sometimes takes orders in advance, for instance, for kid gloves or something of that kind. They come out to our order and are shipped direct to us.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. From Lyons!—A. No; shipped to the New York house and then shipped from there to us.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 12, 1883.

H. K. SLAYTON sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. How long have you resided here?—Answer. I resided here in 1861 and ’62, and came here again in 1863.

PRICES OF PROVISIONS THIRTY YEARS AGO COMPARED WITH THE PRESENT.

Q. Please state any knowledge you have in reference to the prices of groceries and provisions—the materials of food—from that time until the present time, or at all events comparing the prices then with those now, and stating the means of your knowledge.—A. I have been thirty-five years handling provisions at wholesale and retail. Between 1850 and 1860 dressed poultry was from 8 to 12½ cents a pound, dressed hogs were from 4½ to 6½ cents a pound, butter ranged from 12½ to 20 cents.

Q. Those are wholesale prices?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. After you shall have stated those, I would like you to state the retail prices—what they cost to families and consumers.

The WITNESS. Yes. I will not speak of flour, because I think the prices then and now are very near the same. Corn was dearer then than now. Beef was then from 5½ to 7 cents a pound at wholesale. Now the prices of the same articles have been since 1880, poultry, from 15 to 20 cents; butter, from 15 to 35 cents, according to grade and different times of the year. Cheese, I think, in 1850 was very low. I think it ranged then from 6 to 12 cents, but since 1881 it has ranged from 10 to 14 cents. Eggs between 1850 and 1860, to the best of my recollection (and I am very sure I recollect aright), were from 8 to 14 cents a dozen for the season through, and the average now for the season is about 22 cents.

Q. You are speaking of wholesale prices still?—A. Yes. The price for eggs to-day is 26 cents a dozen. There has been a very great increase in the price of food since 1866. I don’t know what it was previous to that time, but there has been a very great increase—or, indeed, you may say since 1860, because it was very high during the war. I have had some experience in dry goods. I used to keep a general store in the country.

Q. Before coming to that I would like to have you state the retail prices of all provisions and food.—A. They are sold so very close by dealers that you can add 10 or 15 per cent. of the wholesale price and you will have the retail price pretty fairly.

Q. Over what extent of country do these prices obtain?—A. Well, around Lowell and Boston and here.

Q. Your purchases were made as a wholesale dealer; what extent of
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country did they cover?—A. Vermont and Northern New York for butter, cheese, and poultry; Chicago and Iowa for pork and dressed hogs, and some cans of butter that were never a very great success until within a few years. Since the creamery system is adopted the Western butter has been so that it could be used here.

Q. Then those prices represent the prices that could be realized by producers of provisions plus transportation?—Q. Yes; and a commission of 3 to 5 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. You were going to state something about dry goods.

The WITNESS. Well, my knowledge of dry goods was in a retail way from 1850 to 1860, and more in a wholesale way since.

Q. How would your knowledge compare with that of the statements made here by Mr. Barton and Mr. McDuflie?—A. I could confirm them. Perhaps they state it a little steeper when they say the prices were one half then what they are now. I remember that Lancaster gingham sold for 10½ to 12½ at wholesale, between 1850 and 1860, and the gingham in the Lancaster Mills and Amoskeag Mills (which are about the same grade) are now from 7½ to 8½, and the farther range was 10½ to 12½.

FOREIGN MARKETS FOR AMERICAN MANUFACTURES.

Q. To get at the larger question in reference to the opening of foreign markets to American manufacturers, I would like, and I know Senator Pugh would like, to hear your views in that direction.—A. My views in that direction are my own. They are not the views of the Republican party nor of the manufacturers, but are my own views, acquired from observation and attention.

Q. What attention have you given to the matter?—A. I have made political economy a matter of study for some fifteen years.

Q. You have written largely on that and the currency question. We do not care to go into the currency question, but the other is an important matter for us. By the way, your views on the currency are those of a hard-money man?—A. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We have made a sort of rule not to go into that, but I wanted Senator Pugh to understand the standpoint from which you look at these subjects generally.

The WITNESS. I look at it from this standpoint: that the nation that has the best dollar has the advantage over a nation that is poorer, and that prices are somewhat regulated by the value of the legal-tender dollar. My idea in regard to legislation for the country is in the first place that business demands a stable dollar of intrinsic value as a base on which to issue bills, backed as they are by Government bonds. What I mean to say is, that they are redeemable in a dollar of intrinsic value and of stable value. That gives steadiness to business, so that the business men of the country can forecast what their profits or losses may be. It makes a steady base of value—a steady value to labor, and business can be done with foresight.

While the country was young I believed in a protective tariff, a tariff high enough to protect the men who put the capital into that industry, for the reason that in the old countries, taking England, France, Spain, Germany, and Italy, and those western nations of Europe, which would compete with us, the land there, though not worth so much now as ten years ago, yet was worth from $100 to $150 and $200 an acre, land here being worth from $10 to $25 and $30 an acre ten or fifteen years ago. If there was no protection the laborer would leave the manufacturing cities and go to farming, because they could make more money in conse-
quence of their lands being so much cheaper than the lands on which
the food is produced in foreign countries.
I am looking forward to-day to the time when this country shall
emerge from its childhood into a vigorous young manhood, and with
wise legislation shall look forward to the day in which we will become
one of the leading commercial nations of the world. Land is gradually
growing dearer here by immigration into the country, and gradually
growing lower in the old countries by emigration from those countries.
The strong competition from the cheap lands in this country has reduced
the price of land in some parts of Europe from 20 to 25 per cent., and
rents more than that. I think the competition of this country in food
products is the cause of all the troubles in Ireland to-day.

AN AD VALOREM TARIFF.

I say that wise legislation should look forward to the day in which
we can become a leading nation in the world’s councils. In order to
attain that position we must produce goods and products of as good
quality and at as low a price as the western nations of Europe, who
would be our chief competitors in the manufacture. And I am looking
forward to the day when, from these natural causes that are going on
through immigration, &c., labor will be somewhat equalized between
this country and the old country—that labor will gradually fall here a
little and go up there a little, and although I live in a manufacturing
city, yet if I were a member of Congress, I would vote for an ad valorem
tariff, and have everything based on value with a view to taking off 4,
5, or 6 per cent. yearly on all goods in which labor was a small share in
the cost, and 2½ per cent. yearly where labor was a large per cent. of the
cost, so as not to drive people from these manufacturing industries onto
farms, and overturn existing industries. I would have it done gradu-
ally, so that the laborers and mill owners would gradually adjust
themselves to the condition of things.

My own opinion is that we can never be a leading commercial nation
until these things are brought about. We can export raw products
raised on the farm owing to our cheap lands. We can export any im-
portant manufacture that we are skilled in, but I mean in the great
generality of manufactures, if this nation wishes to become a leading
nation we have to contend with the markets of the world by producing
the best goods at the cheapest rates. And my opinion is, from many
years’ study, that we cannot attain that position, except by a most valu-
able legal-tender dollar and by a gradual reduction in our tariff, though
not so as to hurt existing industries or overturn them.

Q. Making the duties ad valorem instead of specific—A. Yes, and
watch things and see how they work. If I saw that the plan was work-
ing wrong, I would make a slight change, but the theory would be to
make it a little less by degrees. I think the stagnation that we had for
four or five long years, though it was not much experienced in this city,
because the corporations were strong and could pile up their goods—
mainly occurred from the losses of the war, an inflated currency, and
high tariff rates, all three combined.

So far as the laboring people of this country are concerned, I do not
know that they can be much helped by regulating the hours of labor or
by undertaking to make a scale of wages. Competition will regulate
all that, but I do think that the legislatures of the States and the Con-
gress of the United States can benefit the laboring people of this nation
immensely by putting them on an even footing with those of foreign
countries, as England, for instance, which does not have monopolies.
For example, we have a telegraph system in this country, the proba-
bile cost of which is some $25,000,000; 10 per cent. income of that sum
would be $2,500,000. With it watered, as it is to-day, up to $80,000,000,
they say in the papers the company receives a net income of $7,000,000,
and proposes to have it $8,000,000 as soon as they can, which will be
10 per cent. on $80,000,000. The difference between two and a half and
eight would be a tax on the industries of this country, and put at a
great disadvantage all men who labor, and all capital which is used
in the farming and manufacturing, and other legitimate industries of
this country.

INTRICACY OF THE LABOR AND CAPITAL PROBLEM.

The connection of capital and labor and the intimate relations of laws
and governments thereto have been a study of political economists for
ages, and it is safe to say that the more a man studies these questions,
the more he can see by the light obtained from history and the experi-
ence of a business life, that it is almost impossible to properly adjust by
law the proper relations that each should bear towards the other. No
two nations are alike in agricultural, mining, or manufacturing re-
sources; they also differ greatly in the wealth and skill of their people.
The more one knows in regard to these questions, the more certain he
is that he does not know all the intricate points that enter into this
problem.

While entertaining these views, I am still of the opinion that the suc-
cess and prosperity of our people can, to some extent, be promoted by
wise legislation.

A sound currency, based on a legal tender of intrinsic and stable value,
is essential to the business interests of any country. The nation which
can produce the best goods and products at the lowest price can com-
mand the markets of the world.

STEPS TOWARD CHEAPENING PRODUCTION.

A first step towards cheap production would be accomplished by a
law stopping the coinage of silver dollars, unless all the leading com-
mercial nations come to an international agreement to use silver with
gold as a legal tender.

Second. An ad valorem tariff, with all raw products free, and a grad-
ual reduction on dutiable goods of 2½ to 5 per cent. yearly, so that our
industrial establishments and the makers of our goods could, with fore-
sight, adjust themselves to the situation, and a lower plane of values
be reached without overturning our industries and without detri-
ment to capital or labor. An inflated currency or a high tariff are li-
able to bring on in one or two decades an overproduction of goods at a
high cost, which cannot be sold at home or abroad without ruin to the
owners. This stops employment of labor, and long years of suffering
and loss of wealth by the non-employment of labor ensues, as from 1873
to 1879.

Third. Stringent laws against the watering of telegraph, telephone,
coal, railroad, and other corporate stocks should be enacted. The co-
lossal fortunes made and being made by stock-watering is against a
low cost of production, is a burden on labor, and puts at a great disad-
vantage the farmer, the manufacturer, and all the capital which is used
in the legitimate business of the country which has to compete in the
world's markets with goods and products made by the people of nations
who do not allow the managers of corporate capital to overtax the indus-
tries of their people. There is probably $1,000,000,000 of watered stock
in this country. If charges are made to pay 6 per cent. on this stock,
the amount would be $60,000,000 yearly.

If there is no legal remedy by which $50,000,000 of watered stock can
be squeezed out of the $80,000,000 of telegraph stock, so that charges
can be reduced to the public to a basis of 10 per cent. dividend on
$30,000,000 of stock, perhaps it would be best for the Government to
control the telegraph as they do the mails of the country.

All purchases at wholesale of grain, flour, pork, lard, or other mer-
chandise have now to be made by telegraph. No large purchases or sales
are made by mail. Cheap telegraph messages are therefore as essential
to the business prosperity of the country as cheap mail facilities. The
same objections would apply to the Government carrying the mail that
would apply to the running of the telegraph business by the Govern-
ment, and I think the business interests of this country demand that
Government should either fix low and reasonable rates, based on honest
cost of plant at 6 to 10 per cent. dividends, and allow existing private
companies to do the business, or, if they fail to do the business prop-
erly, the Government should build their own lines and send messages
at cost, as they do the mail.

CORPORATIONS IN ENGLAND.

We ought to learn from other nations. There is a nation across the
Atlantic which has a vast lead in the world's commerce. Their popula-
tion is small; they are a fifth-rate nation in territory, but, owing to their
superior financial and business legislation, they control the commerce of
the world. Their people are by far the richest; all other nations owe
them. The interest-money due them amounts to over $450,000,000 per
year. The people of that nation control their corporations and do not
allow the corporations to control them. They run the telegraph at
about one-half the rates charged here. Corporations, if subject to com-
petition, and well managed, confer a great benefit to the communities
where located, but as monopolies, managed so as to build up immense
fortunes for the managers instead of their stockholders, and a part of
their income used to corrupt and control legislation in their interest,
they are a menace to the stability of our form of government.

AMERICAN SHIPPING.

This nation has such immense resources, and is getting so large, that
there is a longing and looking forward by all the business people in the
country to obtain a larger share of the world's commerce. You have
seen that feeling cropping out. You have felt it yourself. Mr. Blaine
has felt it, and others have felt it—that they want our flag to float on
all the seas of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. I guess I made the first speech on that subject that
has been made since the war.

The WITNESS. Well, I think it would be well to put some new lines
on to new countries. Still, I don't think that's the object. The only way to attain the object is to make the best goods at the
lowest rates.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no doubt about that, though we need, of
course, the capacity to take our goods across the water; that is, we need ships.

The Witness. No doubt about that. That, I think, is the idea of France. Instead of doing as, perhaps, some would who wish to build up a great navy, I think if we were to build ships that might be used for carrying troops and food—"transport," ships—we might give them a large bonus to run to Mexico and Brazil, for instance. Of Brazil we buy $60,000,000 worth of coffee yearly, and we sell them a little cloth. We do not sell them much manufactured goods, however. Until within a few months our letters to Brazil had to go by the way of Liverpool.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. I see that you have thought very deeply and correctly on some of these subjects. I would like to know your views as to the necessity for a restoration of our merchant marine. Have you given any attention to that subject?—A. I have, considerable; I have attended the national ship convention at Boston and New York, and have conferred and talked with gentlemen interested in the subject.

Q. What is your idea of the remedy; the best mode of getting back our carrying trade across the ocean?—A. Our carrying trade will come whenever those goods and products can be sold by us at a less price than other nations, or at as low a price. We can sell food and do so now.

Q. Where will we get the ships to carry our commerce to foreign countries?—A. We can build them whenever that time comes, and we will build them. It will create a demand. But in the mean time I think it would be very well to encourage them by paying them heavy rates for carrying the mails, especially to those countries that we buy so much of. For instance, we buy an immense amount of sugar in Cuba and sell but little there except a little flour. We buy immensely of Brazil and sell them only a little flour.

Q. You would have to open mail contracts and let the lowest bidder take the mails, of course?—A. Well, of course, then, foreign ships would carry them because they hire their sailors at a great deal less, and they are used to somewhat less wages, and their clothing costs them a good deal less than it does our people. I traveled in Europe in 1873, and instead of traveling for pleasure, I made it a custom to get the statistics in regard to the cost of every commodity imaginable. I found our Brussels carpets selling there at 62½ cents a yard, which were selling here then at from $1.62 to $1.67. A suit of custom-made clothing that you would get for $11 there would cost here at that time $25. A suit that would cost in London $18 would cost here $35. The difference in the cost of making is more than the difference in the cost of the goods themselves. They put up their custom-made clothing cheaper than it can be done here.

Q. If you give a high price to one line of ships to carry the mail, does not that inure alone to the benefit of that line, and simply drive off all others? It sustains the line that gets the pay, but how is that going to increase our shipping?

The Witness. I do not believe in high subsidies.

Mr. Pugh. I do not believe in subsidies at all; but you say that we ought to pay high prices to carry the mail.

The Witness. Yes; to American ships.

Mr. Pugh. But they have to be carried to one port by one line.

The Witness. Yes.

Q. Well, now, that line with the advantage, of the compensation for carrying the mails, would drive all other ships off that line, would it not?—
A. I would give the carrying of the mail to the line that would do it the best and cheapest.

Q. And to the lowest bidder?—A. Yes.

Q. As with other mail contracts?—A. Yes, but still I would give it to those who would do it effectually and quickly, because dispatch is one of the greatest requisites to get business.

Q. Is it not true of the manufacturing capacity of this country, with our raw material and with all our other capabilities for those industries, that it is impossible for the population to keep pace with our power to develop these manufacturing industries? How could production, if it is limited to the American market, be consumed?

THE TARIFF—RAW MATERIALS SHOULD BE FREE.

A. I think there is a general desire of the people of this country to obtain foreign markets. I think there is a looking forward by a great many men who give thought to the subject to the day when our tariff will be less and our exports of manufactured goods a great deal more. In this tariff I would have all raw products and materials which enter into manufacture, such as dyes, &c., free; all products of every kind and nature whatever that enter into manufactured articles on the start I would have free, then the rest I would have so that we could make a gradual reduction without overturning the manufacturing industries, or so as to drive people from manufacturing to farming. If working well for ten years, then I would let it remain, but if not I would change it. But I would not change it every year.

By the Chairman:

Q. I want to understand you in that respect. You mean that you would remove the tariff absolutely and at once from all raw materials which enter into manufactures which are to be exported?—A. Yes.

Q. Or into manufactures which are not only to be exported but also those which are to be consumed in this country?—A. Yes, the whole—everything. Our people, in order to enable them to make goods cheap, have, in the first place, got to have these raw products, so that they can work them up to advantage.

WHAT ARE RAW MATERIALS?

Q. And you look upon all commodities as raw material which, whatever manufacturing process they may have passed through in a foreign country, would be brought here to enter into the composition of our American manufactured article?—A. Well, I mean to include in that, for instance, wool. I do not know any reason why a man on land which can be had at $25 an acre cannot compete with a man raising wool on land that costs $50 an acre, or $150 an acre.

Q. Take dye-stuffs and chemicals, for example?—A. All those I would have free, soda, ash, and everything that enters into the bleaching of goods, and everything that enters into the manufacture of goods.

Q. Take the foreign iron used in this country now in many commodities, such as locomotives and the like; what would you do with that?—A. Well, iron is a manufacture; that is, it is made from the mines.

Q. (Interposing.) That is the distinction I want to draw your mind to, and to see just how far you want to go—so much labor has entered into the iron already when it comes to us.—A. Yes; I don't believe in adjusting a tariff so as to overturn existing industries, but gradually and slowly to adjust the country to a situation in which they can take a leading share in the world's commerce.
REBATE OF DUTY ON IMPORTS ENTERING INTO MANUFACTURES FOR EXPORT.

Q. Have you considered this point—whether there might be a distinction made between foreign articles or commodities introduced into this country to be worked up in connection with the American materials, and the same foreign commodity or raw material brought in to be incorporated with American goods which are designed for the foreign trade—whether there could be a general rebate upon all such commodities as come here to be manufactured by American labor and then exported, as there is now allowed on certain specific articles?—A. As there is now, say, on salt that is used to cure pork to send to foreign countries?

Q. Yes, or certain agricultural implements, axes, &c.—A. Yes; these are questions that I would not care to say much about. Of course every legislature would look to these matters.

Mr. PUGH. They belong to the details?

The WITNESS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Yet there is a much more important question there than might seem at first sight. Make that rebate general which is now special—confined to certain articles—place the American manufacturer, so far as he might seek foreign markets, upon exactly the same level as the foreign producer in his own market where we want to sell—so that we could compete with him; then, with the same cost of raw material that he would be subjected to in his own country, that rebate would enable us to seek the foreign market upon just exactly the same conditions as the producer there sells in his own market. That is the point you want to reach. Can we not do that in that way, and so reach our foreign markets sooner than if we should wait until by the more gradual process you speak of we have enabled ourselves to produce everything so cheaply for the home market as to be able also to sell it in the foreign market?

The WITNESS. Well, so far as regards our selling in the foreign market manufactured cotton goods, for instance, my experience shows me that they have mainly been sold in times of overproduction or surplus in this market, excepting some goods in which labor is a very small part of the goods, like heavy drillings that have been sold to China and India somewhat.

The CHAIRMAN. Take cloth for instance, or anything manufactured in this country of a textile character, into the manufacture of which dye-stuffs or other material imported from abroad enter. Now, if the identical article, containing imported material, is exported by the American manufacturer, and you let him have his rebate of customs, I think there is hardly anything that you cannot then sell in the foreign market as cheaply as they now sell it themselves.

The WITNESS. Well, I think a rebate in what is going to be re-exported is a good idea.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the point I mean. If that were done we could hold our home market, because the foreign producer bringing his commodity here would meet our tariff; he could not sell in this market in a way to be ruinous to our producer. We could be protected to the extent of nine-tenths of all our products, even including breadstuffs. At the same time, the American manufacturer getting his rebate on what he brings from abroad and putting into manufacture, would sell then on the same conditions as the foreign manufacture there.

The WITNESS. Yes. I wish to say another thing, that it must not
necessarily be implied that our laborers must work at as low a rate as they work in foreign countries. They have this advantage over any other foreign country, in the fact that they raise on cheap lands the fibers—the cotton and the wool—that make up the fabrics of the world. They also raise the food which feeds these operatives on cheap lands, with skilled agricultural machinery, beyond that of any other nation in the world, at a rate at which it can be exported at a profit. So, therefore, the laborer here, in our manufacturing industries, would have the advantage of the freight and the insurance and the time of transit of the food to the place of taking the goods and the shipment back, and all the expenses incident thereto. And I think that by the laws of immigration labor is equalizing every year that we live.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Leaving to our labor its natural advantages?—A. Leaving to our labor its natural advantages of the resources of the country, and that is all we can get for it in the end. And if a man wants to depend on anything, he will see that he must not conduce to over-production, for when there is an overproduction we have to wait for consumption to come. If production comes too fast it will be ruinous and discourage the employment of men by employers.

Q. If we continue to raise our revenue by tariff taxation, or imports, of course that gives us a large amount of production unavoidably.—A. Yes.

Q. And that is another advantage that the manufacturer and laborer of this country would have as long as we raise our revenue by tariff taxation?—A. Yes. I would not have a tariff for revenue only. I think that was a very unhappy term. I would have a revenue sufficient to carry on the business of Government, and have it so adjusted as to be largest on goods in which labor was the larger share of the cost.

Mr. Pugh. And have that principle of adjustment to run through the whole system?

The Witness. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Irrespective of whether it was an article of luxury or of prime necessity.

The Witness. Exactly—well, now, there is a question, too.

Mr. Pugh. The articles of luxury always employ more labor to make them, and hence the tariff would necessarily be higher on articles of luxury when you run that rule through.

The Chairman. Well, if we were to testify, it is a question whether that is so, when nine-tenths of the labor of the country is employed on articles of admitted necessity.

Mr. Pugh. I did not say that there was no labor employed on articles of necessity, but witnesses have said that the necessity for a tariff was that articles requiring the most labor to produce should be protected, and that the articles of luxury were those requiring most labor to produce, or at any rate those are the facts, and if they did not state them they are facts just the same.

The Chairman. A diamond does not take a great amount of labor, though it may be invaluable.

The Witness. The views I have presented are my own convictions. They are not those of my party (I am a Republican), nor of the manufacturers. I think, however, the largest manufacturers, like Edward Atkinson, and the men that are making the largest amount of denims and sheetings, are looking in the direction I have indicated, slowly and gradually and so as not to hurt.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

THE BOOT AND SHOE TRADE IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 12, 1883.

FREDERIC C. DOW sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You are a boot and shoe dealer in this city?—Answer. Yes.

Q. How long have you resided and done business here?—A. I have done business here since 1866.

Q. How extensive is your business in that line; I want to know whether you do a large or a small business as compared with other dealers in the city?—A. I think it is generally conceded that I do as large a shoe business as any one in the city.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Do you make your boots and shoes?—A. No.

Q. You sell them?—A. Yes.

Q. You do not manufacture the goods which you sell?—A. No.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. But you have some grades and qualities manufactured purposely for your own use, do you not?—A. Yes.

Q. And stamped as the "Dow boot," &c.?—A. Yes; a great many of them.

Q. I wish you would state to us the retail prices of boots and shoes, clothing for the feet, and also, perhaps, rubbers, during the period that you have been in the trade, especially in the way of instituting a comparison between those prices at the time you began, 1866, and the present time.—A. A calf boot that I sold in 1867, and along up to 1872 for $7 a pair at retail, we now sell for $5.50; that is, a sewed boot. A pegged boot that we then sold for $6 we now sell for $4.50. In 1872 prices were about at their highest while I have been in business, and they then commenced to drop, and for five years they kept lowering a little. Since 1880 leather goods have not varied much; that is, in buying a case of boots for the last few years, there would not be a variance of a dollar a case in the same class of goods. I am paying the same price now that I did in 1880 on the same class of boot.

Q. How about the leather wear of ladies?—A. Ladies leather wear of all kinds is a great deal cheaper. There has been a great deal of cheap work introduced within the last ten years.

Q. Work with less wear in it?—A. Yes. There has been a great deal more boots and shoes made by machinery for the last ten years than ever before, consequently the goods have been got up at a great deal less. The raw material is not much less, but the reduction comes in the manufacture of the goods.

Q. The goods are of inferior make?—A. Well, even the same quality of goods have been got up for less—substantially as good a quality—but besides that, there has been a great deal of inferior goods manufactured, particularly in ladies' wear, for the last ten years, more in ladies' than in gentlemen's. There has been the least reduction on the best goods. In 1872 we used to manufacture calf-skin boots from French skins that were imported at $1.65 per pound; the same stock is now $1.15.

Q. What is the tendency now, and what has been the tendency of the of the last two or three years, upward or downward prices?—A. About
all the difference there is, is in the cheapening of the goods. The prices are substantially the same for the same qualities of goods.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think I quite understand you.

The WITNESS. The same qualities of goods to-day are about the same price as they were a few years ago.

Q. But there are cheaper grades of goods?—A. Yes. It is impossible to keep them up to the standard. They are always cheapening. There is so much competition that every man is trying to make his boot cheaper, when it really is not as good.

Q. Then that would indicate that there is an almost unnatural and excessive competition among makers for the home market here, would it not?—A. Yes. I do not know any class of goods where there is such sharp competition in manufacture as in boots and shoes. Of course, I am better posted in that line than in any other.

The CHAIRMAN. I have not before heard any complaint that there is an effort to hold the market by cheapening the goods as you now say.

The WITNESS. Well, they do not pay so much for the goods.

Q. Will buyers buy two pairs of shoes, at $2.50 each, rather than one pair at $5, that will last longer?—A. Men are obliged to do it. A man comes in to me and says, “I want a pair of boots.” I ask what price. Then he says, “I have got to have a pair for $2. I have only got $2.” In fact, they sometimes say, “I have only got a dollar and a half.” And when I tell them that I cannot give them a good pair of boots for that, and that it would be throwing money away, and that 50 cents added to it would give them a good boot, they tell me they cannot help it, that they have only got a dollar and a half.

Q. How is it with your customers, are they largely of the operative class?—A. Well, no; I have a large country trade. My evening trade, however, is principally operative trade.

Q. How many pairs of boots and shoes do you sell in a day, on the average?—A. I could not really tell you. Some Saturdays we sell double what we will on other days.

Q. Saturday is your biggest day?—A. Yes; because that is the day that the operatives do their trading mostly. Hardly any trade comes in to us Saturday nights excepting the operatives.

Q. What is the general condition of the operatives here as to clothing and the comforts of life?—A. They are as good a class of customers as we have to buy and pay for their goods. They almost invariably buy for cash, and they are as easy a class as we have to suit.

Q. I would like to know how the boots and shoes made in this country by machinery compare, if you know, with the boots and shoes made abroad—as to the quantity made in both places, and the relative difference in quality.—A. I never have had much experience, excepting in some few French goods. I have sold some few French goods. They are brought here and retailed for about ten to twelve dollars a pair. If you go to Boston and get a pair of boots made you have to pay $12. For such a pair as I have on you would have to pay $11. Those boots cost the dealer, I understand, $6.50. But then he has to pay the duty, and the duty and profit make the boot almost double in price.

Q. Are those boots and shoes you refer to made by hand or by machinery?—A. By hand.

Q. Most of our boots and shoes are made by machinery?—A. Yes; but I am giving these prices on our hand-sewed goods. I am not reckoning on machine-sewed goods.

Q. You sell what kind of goods yourself?—A. I suppose seventy-five per cent. of my sales are machine-sewed goods.
Q. Is not the manufacture of boots and shoes by machinery in this country ahead of any in the world! — A. I think so; yes, away ahead of any. There is no doubt about that at all.

Q. Do you know Mr. Walker, at Worcester, a large shoe man? — A. I know who he is.

Q. Is he not a large boot and shoe manufacturer? — A. Yes; though I think he buys a great many goods that he sells. The one that I knew does, C. J. Walker.

Q. Where does the leather come from out of which your boots and shoes are made? — A. It is tanned around here in different parts — New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. This Westcott calf-skin is tanned in Connecticut. Westcott tans very fine skins. And there are some skins tanned in this city.

Q. How do the prices of leather tanned in the West and here compare? — A. There is not a very great difference. I think the leather tanned here costs quite as much.

Q. Does it not cost a great deal more? — A. Well, yes; it does cost more. I don’t know just how much more, but I know it does cost more.

Q. Where do the hides come from that are tanned here in New England? — A. They are raised around here.

Manchester, N. H., October 13, 1883.

Frederick Smyth examined.

By the Chairman:

Question. Where were you born? — Answer. In Candia, 10 miles from here.

Q. Where have you spent your life? — A. In Manchester, since I was twenty years of age.

Q. That is how many years ago? — A. That is about forty-four years ago.

Q. In what business have you been engaged during your life-time? Give us a little of the story of your life. — A. Well, I was brought up on a farm until I was seventeen years of age. Candia is a very rough, stony place. I had only the privileges of the winter time at school. At eighteen, I got a school to keep, at $12 a month; and with that money the next season, I went to Andover to school. In the summer of 1838, I got out of money, and thought I would come to Manchester and work a while, to get money to finish my education. I let myself for $125 a year to a man named George Porter, who kept a store here.

The Chairman. You may go on with your personal and business history, because it is a part of the history of the city of Manchester.

The Witness. Manchester was then a perfect sand bank. I think one “Stark” mill was running, and another was building at that time, though I cannot be exact about that. Elm street was laid out. There were but four or five buildings on this side of the street. There were no buildings in Manchester excepting the Stark Mill and a few boarding-houses, but they were building the second mill, I think.

Q. That was in 1839? — A. That was in 1839. I know one mill was running at the time. There were then three or four stores on Elm street, and the store I was in was a grocery and dry goods store, this store of Porter’s. As I have said, I let myself for $125 a year, as a
clerk. I used to get up early in the morning and work until 11 o'clock at night, on an average, and sometimes till 12. For the whole year, it would average that. I had only $4.50 when I came here, and had no relatives, nor anybody on earth to help me. I had a certificate from my minister, saying that I was a "pretty clever boy," as he put it. I worked that year intending to go back to school, but at the end of the year my pay was raised to $250; and the third year it was doubled. Then I went into business for myself, and was in that business ten years. Then I was elected city clerk of Manchester, and served in that office three or four years. I was then elected mayor, and re-elected three years. That was my official record up to about 1855. I then went into the banking business. In 1864 I was elected mayor of the city again. Up to that time I had always been a party man, and was still; but in 1864, I was elected without any opposition from either party. In that same year—in war times—I was nominated for governor, and elected in 1865 and re-elected in 1866. Since that time I have held some Government offices which I suppose it is not necessary to name.

The CHAIRMAN. You might name the offices; we would like to know what they were, so as to show your identification with the interests of the city and your qualification to speak with regard to it.

The WITNESS. I was manager of the Soldiers' Home for fourteen years. I have had the general management of the First National Bank in this city, and the Merrimac River Savings Bank as general manager, treasurer, and cashier since 1855; since I went out of the office of mayor for the third year.

Q. As you have traveled more or less in this and other countries in a way to give you considerable knowledge of the laboring classes and their condition here and abroad, will you please state what opportunities you have had in that direction?—A. In 1861 I traveled in Europe, through England, Germany, Italy, Holland, and Belgium. Six years ago I went abroad again with my wife and traveled through Egypt, the Holy Land, Syria, Turkey, Greece, coming home through Italy. Last December we started again and went to Marseilles and through Spain, Gibraltar, Tangier, and Northern Africa; thence to Malta, Alexandria, Cairo; spent six weeks on the Nile, and came back through the battle field of Tel El Kebir and other famous fields in that vicinity; through the canal a second time to Port Said, then to Joppa and a second time to Jerusalem. This time we only went to Jericho, the Dead Sea, and Jordan, and then came back and went up the coast to Tyre and Sidon, Beyrut, thence to Damascus and to Baalbec; then up the coast to Antioch, Tarsus, Alexandretta, and Cyprus, stopping at the Island of Rhodes; then to Smyrna and Ephesus; then to Constantinople, through the Dardanelles and Black Sea to Bulgaria, from there through Hungary, and Austria, to Paris, and thence home. Two years ago we paid a visit to Mexico. Of course I have been in all the States of the Union—having been three times in my life to California.

Q. Now tell us what has been your identification with industrial matters, either here or in foreign countries.—A. I have taken a deep interest in industrial questions, and have always kept my eyes open, looking at labor, wherever I have gone. I have particularly observed laboring people everywhere.

Q. How is it in regard to your identification with some of the large industrial exhibitions here and abroad?—A. I might have said that when I went abroad, in 1861, I was a commissioner to the international exhibition. I had been selected as United States commissioner to the international exhibition in London, and spent two or three months there.
Q. Were you present at any of the international exhibitions on the continent at any later time?—A. I attended many of the agricultural exhibitions, very many of them; and every time I have been abroad I have made it a rule to attend all the exhibitions of every kind that I could find.

Q. Where were you at the time of the World's Fair in this country, that was in 1851 or 1852, I think?—A. I was not connected with that. I ought to have said that for ten years I was a trustee of the United States Agricultural Society, whose president was Marshall P. Wilder, and the secretary, Ben: Perley Poore. We held several fairs—it was before the war—one in Richmond, Va. one in Louisville, Ky., for a whole week, (one of the best exhibitions I think I ever saw on earth), one in Cincinnati, one in Philadelphia, and one in Chicago. I was at all those fairs.

Q. You say that Manchester was a sand-bank almost when you came here!—A. Yes; it really was.

Q. What made the difference between Manchester as it was then and as it is now?—A. Labor. Of course capital was in the mills, but all the work that has been done here has been generally by men who came here poor, as I was. The first year I came here I did not know a single resident of Manchester who was worth $2,000. There might have been one, but I think they were all like me, worth nothing. We came here with only our hands and heads. The place owes its prosperity, first, to capital from Massachusetts; that established the mills here, and from that the people who came here have built the city on this side of the street (of course, the corporations built the other side), as you see it to-day, with their own hands and heads, not with capital; and those who have been industrious, who were not imprudent, have accumulated a comfortable competency. I do not know that I can show better what Manchester was when I came here than to relate an instance in my experience to show you how sandy and dry it was. You could not see a tree anywhere except on Elm street; not a single tree. In the parks there was not a tree to be found except on this park right here by the Manchester House. It was such poor soil that it immediately dried up after a rain. Elm street was so deep with sand that the girls who worked in the Stark Mills, as they crossed Elm street and got to the store steps, would sit down and take their shoes off and turn the sand out of their shoes.

Q. How extensive was the surface of that character?—A. It was everywhere dry, sandy soil.

Q. It was utterly worthless, then, as agricultural soil?—A. The first year I was mayor I had a city government that worked with me, and I thought it was a good thing to plant trees, but the majority of the people said that it was a foolish thing. They could not agree with me. They said it was all nonsense, but in order to prove my faith, I took hold, and these large trees that you see on Elm street I set with my own hand, in about 1855. Those trees that you see in the parks around here were set about that time; and, wonderful to relate, I have never seen trees grow so rapidly.

Q. What is the diameter of those trees?—A. Some of them I should say would be 2 feet in diameter.

Q. Those were set when?—A. In 1854 and 1855. Many of them no larger than your wrist. As I said, the people thought the place was so poor that the trees would not grow. But the trees and the place have grown wonderfully. I had given a good deal of attention to agriculture and horticulture and felt sure the droppings of animals would make them grow rapidly.
Q. Then you attribute their rapid growth to the fertilizing material!—
A. Yes; that is, to those droppings.
Q. Not to the natural character of the soil!—A. No.
Q. For what had this place, which is now Manchester, been used before the improvement of the water power?—A. It was exhausted farming land. People would sow rye on these plains and get a small crop; but there were good farms—as there are now—I mean in the county. There were good farms in what is now the old part of Manchester.
Q. But the location of the city itself!—A. It was on a sand-hill.

ACCOUNT OF THE CITY OF MANCHESTER.

Q. Won't you go on and describe the gradual growth and development of the place, the construction of new mills, and the order in which their construction took place, as nearly as you can remember, so as to give us an account of the history of the place!—A. Since our first rise we have had sometimes rise, sometimes progress, and sometimes standing still. For several years after I came here they continued building mills, but it was ten or fifteen years, I think, before any buildings were on the other side. I was one of those hopeful fellows who thought we were going to have a town here, but the majority of the people were probably of a different opinion. I remember hearing a question asked by somebody, "Do you suppose there will ever be any buildings on the left side of Elm street?" And I immediately said, "Yes; and you will live to see it." The answer to such remarks generally was that they would not live to see it. But finally we got one building over on this side, and that started them. The people who came here at that time were a different class to those now. The "Stark" Mills, of which Mr. Bourne is agent, were running, and I do not think there was a foreigner in them; possibly there might have been, but all the foreigners that we had then, I think, were Irishmen, who were digging the canal. The operatives were Vermont and New Hampshire blooming girls. Perhaps, being a young man of about twenty at the time, I may have appreciated them a little more; but I remember, as we kept a dry-goods store, after the mills let out in the evening, they came to our store, and it was crowded with them. And all of our men, so far as I know, were Yankee men. There being so few places about, the store was the only gathering place.

There was no post-office in Manchester then, nor a church nor a school-house. We had to go to another town to church and to the post-office, as well as to singing-school. The singing-school was two miles away, and we had to come home in the dark, and we always had, of course, to escort the girls home. That was the condition at that time. The post-office was three miles away, and the church further down. I think that what I state now is not generally known. There was a paper established here called the Amoskeag Representative, and that paper was determined to call this place "Amoskeag." The streets were laid out, however, and the editor was determined to call this street Broadway, and for one whole year in all the advertisements he spoke of this place as Amoskeag, using the name of the place on the other side of the river; but the people did not really like it. It was a whole year drifting round, however, as to whether they should call the place Amoskeag or not. I remember that old Judge Bell came along one day and numbered the houses with a piece of chalk, and said that future times would thank him for it. Everybody worked in the mill then except a few carpenters.
and the Irishmen who were digging the canal. The three stores formed really the exchange, and in the evening the people would come up to the stores and sit around the steps, and the general impression was that we would be some day five or six thousand. But we got along by labor entirely. No capitalists ever came to Manchester, so far as I know, except the capitalists of the mills. The merchants who came here came poor; the mechanics came poor. I think it has been the most industrious place in the world. It is seldom that, during my life of forty-four years here, I have, during labor hours, seen a man standing on the sidewalks, except on holidays and evenings; I have very seldom seen anybody "holding up posts," or loaing around the streets. We have all been at work, and have all been busy. There may be a few more idle men than there used to be, but for many years there were none, and wages were low, too. I got $125 a year when I first came, and I saved $120 of it. I will not trouble you by a recital of the circumstances under which I came to save that much. Hundreds came here and got about $100 a year and saved it all except five or ten dollars.

Q. How was that—it might be interesting to know?—A. Well, I will tell you. I got $125. Now, how did I get my clothes? I clothed myself. I mended my own stockings; my employer used to give me a pair of socks sometimes. We had no new clothes as boys have nowadays. During that whole year that I was first in this place I never paid one dollar for a carriage, nor did anybody else: spent no money for cigars; no money for rum; we had no amusements, no holidays. I never heard of such a thing as a vacation for ten years. That is the way we grew up here—by constant labor, day after day. I think the prosperity of the place is more due to that than to anything else—with the starting of the capital in the mills, of course. Labor is the foundation of our prosperity. Now, if you will point me to anything which you wish to know perhaps I can come back to some regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you are doing very nicely. In this way you can give a more vivid account of the growth of the city than in any other way. So please continue.

The WITNESS. I remember that when I was getting $125 a year my friend Parker here was attending a boat-house. All these men of the place were working hard then.

The CHAIRMAN. You have alluded to Mr. Parker; will you please state what his position is now?

The WITNESS. He has been the president and treasurer and cashier of the oldest and I may say altogether the largest savings bank in the State, with something of deposits now between four and five millions. And he has also had the management of the Manchester National Bank, and he has always paid his debts. That fact perhaps ought not to be alluded to, but it comes to my mind in connection with the industries of Manchester.

There is another thing here that I have not observed anywhere else: We do not know what you call an aristocracy, unless there is a little of it now. I think that within the last few years a little of it has cropped out once in a while, but it cannot live. I remember a man who was an educated man, and a fine gentleman, who came here thinking that he was a little smarter than the rest of us, and I suppose he was. He wanted to get an office, the position of city clerk, but his aristocratic tendencies were the death of him. The moment a man shows his hand in the way of aristocracy here it is the death of him. The girls in the mill were just as good as the ladies of Washington—as a Senator's wife—to us. The idea that a girl in the mill was not as good as any-
body would astonish us. I remember Mr. Gillis, of the Amoskeag Mills, and such people, would invite me, a poor boy, working for 50 cents a day, while they were agents of the mills and had control of all these people—would invite me to their houses, and would invite the factory girls to their houses at a reception or entertainment. I do not say but what there is a little more aristocracy now, but I think we owe our prosperity in a great measure to the fact that all the men in Manchester have worked together. These men that we call rich men here to-day—look over the city and see our best residences—call the roll—and I don't think you will find a man among them that is not a worker. There is not a harder working man in the city than Nathan Parker. We are all working hard to-day, perhaps not as hard as we used to do, but there is not a day that we are not attending to our business. I suppose I could find now and then a loafer among the wealthy, but very few. I have never seen anything of the kind in any other part of the country. Men generally, when they get rich, retire.

You have asked me if I have traveled, and I have been a good deal from home, but when I am at home I do not know a day that I haven't worked as hard as anybody else. And when I speak of myself I wish it distinctly understood that I represent a considerable class of people. There are very few extravagant men here. You will seldom see a man in Manchester that keeps a span of horses. I suppose friend Parker and I could keep them if we wanted to, but we do not do it.

Now, to come to the ladies; the first ten or fifteen years of my life in Manchester I could hardly find a family that had a servant girl. For the first twenty years of my married life my family had no servant girl, and although we had not as large a family as some we had no servant for all that period. And that would be true of all the men who have lived here as long as I have, and have from their labors got a comfortable competency. But I am speaking more of the older days than of the present. Of course, as our ladies got older we did not want them to work hard. I would say that their working, however, was not from compulsion; our women preferred to work. I am taking into account now my neighborhood all around, and I know that our wives preferred to do their own work. I think that is true to a larger extent here than in any place in the world. I have nowhere seen that state of things as I have here. I do not mean to say that as a fact it is now true, but that is the way it used to be.

Q. That is the way Manchester came to be built up?—A. Yes; it came to be done by strict economy.

I did not quite get through explaining to you how a man that got $125 saved $120, and I must explain that. I never saw a person dance until I came to Manchester, when I was twenty years of age, and then a military company came here one evening and had a dance, and I was invited in. Of course, I should not have paid for entrance. There were no theaters then, or entertainments of any kind, excepting occasional lectures.

There is another thing that I ought to mention, that had much to do with the prosperity and intelligence of Manchester. In 1855 there was a small library here called the Manchester Athenæum, which belonged to a few individuals whose names I don't remember now. Judge Bell came to me one day after I was elected governor and said, "I want you in your next inaugural to recommend a free public library." And I want to give Judge Bell the credit for that. I did it. He explained it to me, and during my next administration we were enabled to establish here a
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free public library; and, in order that the library should live forever—should live when we were dead—by the excellent forethought of Judge Bell, we had this clause put in the ordinance, "That this Athenaeum Company agree to give their library to the city, provided the city will furnish a building for it, and forever appropriate $1,000 a year, at least, to the increase of the library, and if, at any time, they fail to do that, it shall revert to the original owners." That, I think, was in 1855. The library was thoroughly established, and one of the proudest things in my life is that I had something to do with its establishment. It has gone on increasing and developing, and every man, woman, and child in Manchester can go to that library and find a work on almost any subject, and can have the benefit of it for nothing. A young man can come in here and work in a factory, and get as good an education as some men that come out of college.

I said we had no library before that, but we did. The second year of my being here a few gentlemen established what was called a "periodical club," and got some newspapers and books, and we had a reading-room where those papers were kept and were read. Very fortunately for me I was the secretary of it, and so had the privilege of reading all the books, which was a great advantage. But this present free library has done great things for the city of Manchester.

I forgot to state one thing, when you asked me what offices I had held. In 1855 I was chosen chairman of a committee to locate and build a reform school—and to that there was tremendous opposition. One of my objects in going to Europe at that time was to visit the reformatory institutions of the continent of Europe, and I did visit them during that year, with that object in view.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us an idea of the reform school.

The WITNESS. In 1855 the subject was broached. There was great opposition to it in the legislature. We did, however, get $10,000, and I was put on a committee with other gentlemen, and we bought the old Stark farm of 100 acres for $3,000.

Q. You mean that of John Stark, of the battle of Bennington!—A. Yes. That was in 1855. We have had in that, up to to day, 1,100 boys and girls, of which we think we have reformed 80 per cent.—saved them from a life of degradation. That is a State institution. After that time I was treasurer of it. In the State I am trustee of the Orphans' Home at Frankfort, and trustee of the agricultural college which was established, during my own administration as governor, at Hanover. They have had 1,100 inmates in that school. There are about 120 now.

Q. In the reform school!—A. Yes.

Q. What has been the financial history of the city, as to economy in its administration, and as to honesty and integrity, not only in the administration of the city finances, municipally speaking, but in the administration of the banks and other institutions?—A. I am glad you called my attention to that question, for I should not have thought of it—and right here something ought to be said. Speaking of the economy of the city as a corporation (which will serve perhaps as a fair example of everything else), I will mention that I served the city three or four years for $500 a year as city clerk. I was then elected mayor, and gave the city all my time for $400 a year, doing nothing but attending to my duties as mayor. The third year they gave me $600, and, in 1864 when I was elected for the fourth time they gave me $1,000. But salaries have always been very low. Now when it comes to the honesty of the city and its institutions: In all the history of this city government
for forty-four years—although it has not been a city as long as that—but during all its history—there never, to my knowledge, has been a defalcation, either from any city officer, or in any of our banks, or any of our counting rooms or corporations. In fact I don’t remember of a single instance of a defalcation in any department of industry, or in any organization or corporation in Manchester. If there has been any, it has escaped my recollection at the present time. I think that speaks well for all the men who have been in Manchester and have had money passing through their hands. I wish I knew how many millions and millions had passed through the hands of that man who sits in the corner.

Q. You mean Mr. Parker!—A. Yes. And other men have had millions and millions of dollars passing through their hands. Millions of dollars have passed through the hands of the paymasters and agents of these corporations. In all these millions, and in all the millions of the savings banks here, I have not known any defalcation. It is possible there may have been, sometimes, some small examples of dishonesty on the part of clerks, but none to my knowledge.

Q. None even on the part of the clerks?—A. Never to my knowledge. And I have been twenty-five years now in the management of the Merrimac Savings Bank, which has had millions of dollars on deposit, and they have never had a dollar of defalcation.

Q. You were speaking of the homogeneity—the uniform condition, as among the inhabitants, of the wealthy and of the poorer classes, so that there may have been no distinctions except those attaching to merit; how is it about the religious organizations, Catholic and Protestant? Are they found in large numbers here? And how is it as to there being anything like prejudice and collision among them in a religious way!—A. I am glad you asked that question—very glad. For I think that is deserving of record. I was here when the first religious society was formed.

Q. What one was it?—A. The Congregational. I have seen every religious society organized, I have known their clergymen, including every Catholic clergyman who has been here, and not only known them but been intimate with them. Although a Protestant myself, I have been quite intimate with the Catholic clergymen, and have known every one of them, from the first who came to the present day. I think the religious element here is perhaps as large and larger, certainly it is as good, as the average of the religious sentiment anywhere; churches are abundant; there has been no jar between any of the denominations. I have contributed, since I have been able to do so, to every religious denomination, although strictly orthodox myself. I think there is no religious society in the city that we have not contributed to; and we should do so to-morrow if they needed it. I mention that to show the good feeling that exists. I frequently invite to my house Catholic clergymen, and Catholics who are not clergymen, and we are on just as good terms here as though we were all of one denomination.

Q. Nobody has been burnt at the stake here since you have been in Manchester!—A. No, there has been very little discussion. I remember when President Bartlett was here, who was a combative fellow, he used to discuss a little with the Universalists, and he had provided for a discussion, but it was postponed, and we have not had it since. In business we do not, as far as I have ever known or heard, know anything about what a man’s religious belief is. We never ask, and never know anything about it. I suppose my neighbor Parker and myself have deposits in our savings banks from every denomination, and I
don't suppose that we could tell in one case in ten what the religious denomination of the man is that we do business with.

Q. You have, of course, observed the industrial character of the operatives all the way along. You spoke of their being Americans in the early days. Won't you give us some idea of the transition from the American help to the present? I should also like to get an idea of the way in which labor and capital have harmonized throughout the history of the city.—A. All the operatives, at first, were Yankees. Then the Irish came directly from Ireland with their families, and after they had dug the canals—of course we employed them for all that sort of work—we commenced gradually working them into the mills; machinery was improved, and as the young children grew to be old enough to do any kind of work, we gradually got them to tend some of the machines. So then we had first the Irish, and we had no other; then came the Germans. There were not yet any French. As the foreigners worked in, the Yankees worked out; they were crowded out; some of the old overseers after a while had left for other parts, while some remained, and what we call the "second hands" worked up to firsts, and then by and by the third hands worked up. As the Irish came in, they took the under work, and gradually rose up till they had places of importance. That has been going on gradually till the Germans commenced coming, and then the French. It is going on all the time, until this day, for, as you know, a very large part of the help now is foreign.

As to the American help you may ask me what is become of them. Many of them, after they had got a competency, went out, and went onto farms. Many of them went West, and foreigners naturally came in and took their places. The Yankee girls got married and made splendid wives, as a rule, and there was a demand then for the Yankee girls in other departments. As female labor has been advanced, and as the sentiment has been growing to employ foreign labor, the Yankee girls have worked out of the mills to a large extent. Mr. Bourne could tell you the proportion of American girls that still work in the mills, but I think they have been gradually working out, and the foreigners working in. But that is all right. There is no prejudice between the Irish that have worked up and the Americans, because while they may, here and there, have worked out the Yankees, the Yankees were ready to go. Just like the Chinese—when they went into San Francisco, the Yankees and the Irish were put out, and the Chinese took their places. And now the Canadians seem to be growing here faster than any other.

But you asked me how all this labor and capital have worked together: I must say that there has been no jar at all. I do not remember more than one strike here, and that was a very small one. I think there is general satisfaction with the prices of labor—of course not altogether. There are always some grumbling people, and there is always some cause. I think we have been very fortunate in getting agents who understand human nature, and understand how to get along with their help.

And right here, let me bring up something that may be forgotten, and that ought to be mentioned, showing that in the early days the kindly feeling of the agents—and when I say agents, I mean capital—towards the laborer. When I was in England in 1861, I had my attention called to it by an Englishman who had come here. He said that when he was up to Manchester, that is, this city, he saw a beautiful elm tree, and he was told that in building a mill the Amoskeag Company had determined to cut down that tree. It was a beautiful tree, growing on the bank of the river and opposite the window of the Amoskeag mill.
The girls in the mill signed a petition to the agent to spare that tree, and he did, and the company went and changed all its plans for that mill at considerable expense, and built the mill in another place, in order to spare the tree on the petition of the operatives. In England that was considered a great thing for a company to do. And such things were so common here, and so constantly exhibited the good feeling between capital and labor that we thought nothing of it. I had known all about this before; but I did not really think it worth mentioning until this gentleman reminded me of it. That tree was spared for many years, just on account of the petition of those girls; and that, perhaps, illustrates, better than anything I could say, the kindly feeling existing between the operatives in the mill and the capitalists. I am informed by Mr. Bourne that that tree has just been cut down. I presume the petitioners are all dead and gone now. But I will say even now that, from what I know of Colonel Livermore, if, to-day, the operatives in his mills had petitioned for that tree to stand, he would have let it stand. If they had said a second time "Spare the tree," I think he would have spared it. That is my opinion. There always has been on the part of the agents and on the part of the capitalists here a most excellent good sense and most kindly feeling, and it is seldom that you will see or hear anybody talking against capital. It is sometimes done. I remember a newspaper here that once said, "We hope the day will come when the bats and the owls will make their nests in the mills." The man that said that is dead now. He thought he was going to cater to the laboring people here and get votes, but from that day his paper went down, and it didn't live sixty days after it said that thing. You could not raise an antagonistic feeling, you could not excite a prejudice among the laboring people here against capitalists; for capitalists are their very best friends.

All these parks that you see around here were given by the Amoskeag Company to the people of Manchester; the city never paid a dollar for them except to build the fences around them. It was all given by capital, and it was not obliged to do it. I remember that when I set these trees here, there was a tremendous opposition to it. I went to the agent of the Amoskeag Company and said to him, "I want to do something; I want to set some trees." He said, "So do I, and I will tell you what I will do." (I had got 200 trees and had not got quite through with them.) He said, "I will furnish you with all the trees you want." Although the Amoskeag Company were paying one-third of the taxes, they encouraged this and every other good thing for the advancement of the city. And what was true then is true now to this very hour. We have no men in Manchester who take more interest in the religious and moral character of the city than our mill agents. They come out here with the boys, and parade the streets with the firemen and with the soldiers when asked, and they all go and sit down at their banquets. I am not overdoing this, gentlemen; it is the exact truth. It may be true of other places to some extent, but you will excuse me if I am a little enthusiastic about this city, for I love it. It seems to me as I walk under these trees that the branches of the trees recognize me. I love to think they do. And the people that I have lived among here for forty-four years, when I think how kind they have been to me and to everybody—having voted for me six times (four times as mayor, and twice as governor)—you must excuse me if I am enthusiastic.

The Chairman. So long as you state only facts I do not think it is any wonder that you feel a little enthusiastic, and that you excite that,
feeling in others. Now, I want to ask you whether you know any wealthy man in the city who has not made his money in the city?

The Witness. I do not think of any now. It is possible there may be, but they do not occur to me now.

Q. That being so, I would like to ask you to give us as good an idea as you can of the amount of capital that has come from outside the city to be combined with the labor performed by those who have lived here, and which, together, have brought about these results as a whole; it is the creation of labor; you began by saying that.—A. I do not think there has been much capital brought to Manchester, except the capital in the mills here. I think it has been wrought out by the brain and muscle of the men that you see here to-day; it has been wrought out in all departments of trade. We are having a large country trade, and all our farmers, who were of no consequence,—many of them having been fishermen—are to-day increasing in wealth from the land that this town has enriched for miles around. The city has enriched this country till farming is really profitable around Manchester, and considerable money has been made that way. Then individual enterprises have come in here in many departments. Down on Canal street, and what they call Mechanics' Row, there are many individual enterprises; but I do not think these men brought much capital here. I think these deposits in the savings banks have been earned by the muscle and brain of the men, women, and children that are here to-day.

Q. At the inception of manufacturing, of course, there was capital brought here from elsewhere to erect the buildings and to erect the machinery!—A. They have all been well paid for it, I think you will find.

Q. But the increased investment from year to year, up to the present time, do you think that that investment has been principally the result of the earnings here, upon the spot, of the capital and labor already here!—A. I do.

Q. So that really the capital which may have come from time to time, from abroad since, has been more than replaced by the capital around here on the spot?—A. Decidedly.

Q. Therefore, it would follow that the city itself comes practically to be the creation of the labor that has been here!—A. Combined with the capital of the corporations.

Q. The original capital that they started with—but the point I want to get at is rather that corporate capital has, by its investment here, been able to replace itself, and also to create the increase of capital that has been put into the factories here.—A. I think that the capital that has been put into the mills here by people out of the State has on the average paid an excellent dividend, and that we have returned to them a good return; and they with that capital have worked with our hands and our brains, and we, having their capital to start with, have made capital of our own. I am speaking now of the laboring people, for I am one of the laboring people; we have returned these corporations good returns for their capital. We have made for ourselves money by having first the capital here, and giving employment to our hands and brains.

Q. There was some water, running down hill, which was an important element to start with; that is to say, the water-power was here!—A. Yes.

Q. You have seen most of this country and of Europe, governor; do you know any reason why, with the same effort, the same industry, the same economy, the same integrity, and the same zeal, what has been
done here could not be done in many places in all parts of the country
and in other countries?

The WITNESS. With water-power?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; where they have the power.

PROSPECT FOR MANUFACTURES IN THE SOUTH.

A. I have traveled in every Southern State, and I can see no reason
why another Manchester could not be built up in those States where they
have good water power. I see only one disadvantage that our Southern
people labor under, and perhaps that may be balanced by their having
material on the ground, and that is that I don't think that the European
race can do as much labor in a warm climate as in a cold one. That has
been my experience the world over, that in a cold, climate the people
work faster and walk faster and generally accomplish more labor. But
there are many parts of the Southern States, where, as Senator Pugh
knows better than I know, there is water-power, and where the climate
is as good as in New England, and not any more uncomfortable to those
who have experienced it.

Q. All through the mountain region?—A. Yes; where you find wa-
ter-power you generally find a salubrious climate. I have been in factories
in Rome, Italy, and I am sure that the operatives in the hot climates do
not work as rapidly, and I don't think they accomplish as much labor.
That is to say, if you should move these Manchester mills into a warmer
climate, and let every circumstance be equal except the climate, taking
all the same operatives, the same overseers, and the same machinery
and buildings, I do not think that you could accomplish as much labor
within the same number of hours as you will in a cooler climate. I may
be mistaken about that, but our Southern friends have this to balance
that: they have the material right there, and have no freight to pay on
it, and I have no doubt manufacturing may be made a success South as
well as North, without any injury to New England. There is room
enough for all.

Q. How can you entertain the idea that other folks can gain and we
not be hurt by it?

FOREIGN MARKETS.

A. Because every place builds up a community for itself. We have
not begun to get the markets of the world that we can get to-day. When
in Mexico I was astonished to see how little of the markets of that
country the Americans have. With our machinery we ought to clothe
the world. We compete with England, not completely; England is
doing well enough, but markets are being created all the time. We
are going to have a good market in Mexico in time. In the city of
Mexico, when I was there, I could not get an article that was of Amer-
ican make. I paid thirty-seven cents there for a cake of soap, which
my wife told me was made in New York, and would cost in New York
two cents. We have done nothing to supply the Mexican market. I
mean that I do not think we have made the proper effort. I do not
think that our Government—excuse me, Senators, for saying this—has
made a proper effort for a market for our products abroad, and I think
to-day that you can duplicate all our mills in the South, and with an
energetic Government that will send active consuls abroad on good sal-
aries instead of starving them, we can make markets all over the
world, and establish factories all over the United States, and it would
not hurt New England a bit. I rejoice to see the mills going up in the
feeling in others. Now, I want to ask you whether you know any wealthy man in the city who has not made his money in the city?

The Witness. I do not think of any now. It is possible there may be, but they do not occur to me now.

Q. That being so, I would like to ask you to give us as good an idea as you can of the amount of capital that has come from outside the city to be combined with the labor performed by those who have lived here, and which, together, have brought about these results as a whole; it is the creation of labor; you began by saying that.—A. I do not think there has been much capital brought to Manchester, except the capital in the mills here. I think it has been wrought out by the brain and muscle of the men that you see here to-day; it has been wrought out in all departments of trade. We are having a large country trade, and all our farmers, who were of no consequence—many of them having been fishermen—are to-day increasing in wealth from the land that this town has enriched for miles around. The city has enriched this country till farming is really profitable around Manchester, and considerable money has been made that way. Then individual enterprises have come in here in many departments. Down on Canal street, and what they call Mechanics’ Row, there are many individual enterprises; but I do not think these men brought much capital here. I think these deposits in the savings banks have been earned by the muscle and brain of the men, women, and children that are here to-day.

Q. At the inception of manufacturing, of course, there was capital brought here from elsewhere to erect the buildings and to erect the machinery?—A. They have all been well paid for it, I think you will find.

Q. But the increased investment from year to year, up to the present time, do you think that that investment has been principally the result of the earnings here, upon the spot, of the capital and labor already here?—A. I do.

Q. So that really the capital which may have come from time to time, from abroad since, has been more than replaced by the capital around here on the spot?—A. Decidedly.

Q. Therefore, it would follow that the city itself comes practically to be the creation of the labor that has been here?—A. Combined with the capital of the corporations.

Q. The original capital that they started with—but the point I want to get at is whether that corporate capital has, by its investment here, been able to replace itself, and also to create the increase of capital that has been put into the factories here.—A. I think that the capital that has been put into the mills here by people out of the State has on the average paid an excellent dividend, and that we have returned to them a good return; and they with that capital have worked with our hands and our brains, and we, having their capital to start with, have made capital of our own. I am speaking now of the laboring people, for I am one of the laboring people; we have returned these corporations good returns for their capital. We have made for ourselves money by having first the capital here, and giving employment to our hands and brains.

Q. There was some water, running down hill, which was an important element to start with; that is to say, the water-power was here?—A. Yes.

Q. You have seen most of this country and of Europe, governor; do you know any reason why, with the same effort, the same industry, the same economy, the same integrity, and the same zeal, what has been
done here could not be done in many places in all parts of the country and in other countries!
The Witness. With water-power?
The Chairman. Yes; where they have the power.

PROSPECT FOR MANUFACTURES IN THE SOUTH.

A. I have traveled in every Southern State, and I can see no reason why another Manchester could not be built up in those States where they have good water power. I see only one disadvantage that our Southern people labor under, and perhaps that may be balanced by their having material on the ground, and that is that I don't think that the European race can do as much labor in a warm climate as in a cold one. That has been my experience the world over, that in a cold climate the people work faster and walk faster and generally accomplish more labor. But there are many parts of the Southern States, where, as Senator Pugh knows better than I know, there is water-power, and where the climate is as good as in New England, and not any more uncomfortable to those who have experienced it.

Q. All through the mountain region!—A. Yes; where you find water-power you generally find a salubrious climate. I have been in factories in Rome, Italy, and I am sure that the operatives in the hot climates do not work as rapidly, and I don't think they accomplish as much labor. That is to say, if you should move these Manchester mills into a warmer climate, and let every circumstance be equal except the climate, taking all the same operatives, the same overseers, and the same machinery and buildings, I do not think that you could accomplish as much labor within the same number of hours as you will in a cooler climate. I may be mistaken about that, but our Southern friends have this to balance that: they have the material right there, and have no freight to pay on it, and I have no doubt manufacturing may be made a success South as well as North, without any injury to New England. There is room enough for all.

Q. How can you entertain the idea that other folks can gain and we not be hurt by it?

FOREIGN MARKETS.

A. Because every place builds up a community for itself. We have not begun to get the markets of the world that we can get to-day. When in Mexico I was astonished to see how little of the markets of that country the Americans have. With our machinery we ought to clothe the world. We compete with England, not completely; England is doing well enough, but markets are being created all the time. We are going to have a good market in Mexico in time. In the city of Mexico, when I was there, I could not get an article that was of American make. I paid thirty-seven cents there for a cake of soap, which my wife told me was made in New York, and would cost in New York two cents. We have done nothing to supply the Mexican market. I mean that I do not think we have made the proper effort. I do not think that our Government—excuse me, Senators, for saying this—has made a proper effort for a market for our products abroad, and I think to-day that you can duplicate all our mills in the South, and with an energetic Government that will send active consuls abroad on good salaries instead of starving them, we can make markets all over the world, and establish factories all over the United States, and it would not hurt New England a bit. I rejoice to see the mills going up in the
South, and I am certain it will not hurt us. I want the Government to send consuls abroad, not for political reasons, but men of ability who will open up markets for our industries. But I am getting off the subject, I am afraid.

The CHAIRMAN. Not at all.

Mr. PUGH. You are on a vital subject, I think.

Q. Have you any other suggestions for opening up markets?—A. I do not think there is a market on this globe that America cannot get into. She can go up the Nile, yet in Egypt you cannot get anything from America. Our English friends go in with everything there. They took Cyprus. I could have bought, in Cyprus, all the property in the place with my letter of credit, when I went there; but the English Government went and bought it out at 300 per cent. Why can we not send energetic men of intelligence and spirit to different important stations throughout the world, and let them make it their business to establish trade relations. We do not want to fight people, but we can expend our intelligence in developing our trade relations and our commerce with the whole world, if the Government will help. I am ashamed of our Government abroad. We have no Navy, and we have nobody to introduce us to any of the foreign nations. I don’t see that the Government is doing anything in that direction at all. American goods can compete with goods in any part of the world, but I do not find them anywhere but in America.

LABOR AND CONDITIONS OF LABORING LIFE IN EGYPT AND THE EAST.

Q. You have observed the laboring people abroad and here. What should you say as to their relative conditions?—A. Oh, there is no comparison. There is no people in the world that can compare in virtue and intelligence with our laboring people. The people of the Nile labor hard, and are good agriculturists, but it is labor of no compensation. To illustrate: we hired a donkey and man all day and traveled several miles, to Thebes—the man taking his donkey and furnishing himself and his donkey with food, and coming back at night (having left at 5 o’clock in the morning), and if you give him 5 cents for such time and labor he is perfectly satisfied.

Q. What can he buy with it?—A. There is nothing to buy. It does not cost him anything to live. They live on the sugar cane there. What you call a laboring man does not own any land, and they get a mere nothing for their labor. For one penny such a man will get sugar cane enough to feed him all day.

Q. The cane in a raw condition?—A. The raw cane. He will break it in pieces and will live all day on a cent’s worth of it. The grass and feed of a mule grows constantly, and is got for a mere trifle. Then these people expend nothing for clothes. Why should they want any money? I bought the complete costume of a lady for forty cents. She took it all off and gave it to me, all she wore (and she was well dressed for that country). Of course my wife was present or I should not have got it.

Q. What of the working people in other parts of the world?—A. In Spain I found them working for 25 cents a day. That is good pay for a laborer in Spain in the vineyards and orange orchards, and mechanics are getting less than half what we pay.

Q. How do they live?—A. I will give you an illustration. At Syria
there is an American college, and we called on the president of the college, Dr. Bliss. We saw four men working in his garden. I said, "Doctor, what do you pay these men?" "Why," he said, "they come to beg of me the privilege of working for a sixpence," that is about 12½ cents of our money. "They come and beg for the privilege of working," he said, "and I cannot pay them less than 6d., but they would work for less." I said, "How do they work?" He said, "Look and see." I sat down for awhile and observed these men, and they worked as well and intelligently as our men do. Syria, by the way, is a beautiful country. There are fine silk factories there, but the laborers get only 12 cents a day, and they live on it.

Q. What sort of a living is it; what do they have for clothing and food and shelter? — A. Their food and clothing and manner of life are exceedingly simple. Take the common people of Syria and Egypt, and in fact all parts of Africa that I have visited, they never eat any meat. To be sure there is poultry, and there are eggs there for the better class of people, but the common people never eat those things. They never sit down to a regular meal in most of those countries.

In Syria they live better than they do in Egypt. The Syrians are improving. But we all know what labor is in Europe. But in those countries outside of Europe, on the other continent, I should say that labor was not compensated more than one-fourth what it is here for the same class of work. Consequently they cannot have the luxuries of the country. Of course every country has its luxuries. There are as good hotels, for example, in Syria and even in Egypt as there are here, but the most of the people have nothing to do with them. Here our people can all come to the best hotels without its costing them much, even our operatives.

Q. Even if we sold our goods to those countries, we would not get much for them? — A. The business would grow. At Tangier they wear altogether common white cotton cloth, except the higher orders of the people. In Morocco we could get a market also for our cotton cloth. They want the cheap calicoes that we make here and all our cheap goods. There would be quite a market in those poor countries for them.

Q. They would contrive to pay something for them? — A. I think so. We want exactly what they are making. We want their Morocco rugs (I have got six of them), and we want cloth sent there to pay for them. I had to pay for mine in gold.

IN THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

Q. You spoke of passing through some portions of the Turkish Empire, coming this way, and through Austria, I think you said; and you have spoken of Spain. Give us some idea of the condition of the working people of those countries respectively. — A. Starting from Cairo, or rather from the Upper Nile, at Nubia, and coming then towards home, there is all the way through a gradual improvement. In Nubia very few of the natives wear any dress, and in consequence their wants are very few. As intelligence increases, the wants of the people, of course, increase, till you get to Port Said. Of course in Alexandria, and the cities, you find educated people, as you do here; and even the lower class of people there are an improvement on the Nile people, as you come through Barea and Syria; at Ismailia, on the Suez Canal, I find a better kind of Egyptians — people of more enterprise. Going along to
Port Said on the canal, and the Mediterranean, there are quite intelligent people. When you get into the Holy Land and Joppa, the common people are a little improvement on those of Egypt; they are a little higher class, but not much. When, however, you get up into Syria there is a great improvement. I think that has come from the industries of the people. That is a mountainous country and they make considerable silk there. They are better clad, more intelligent, and more industrious, and have more of the luxuries of life than in most of these other countries.

Then you come up the coast till you get to Asia Minor, and you find about the same line of people till you get to Asia Minor and Antioch and Mesopotamia, and up along the coast till you get to Smyrna you find on the whole quite an intelligent people, a little improvement still on the others. When you get up to Smyrna, where our New Hampshire consul, Mr. Stephens, is, you find a decided improvement. And as you go along that way till you get to Constantinople, you find it keeping on improving. As you go up the Dardanelles, up the Black Sea and to Bulgaria, you will find the people a little more advanced still. By the way, we ought to have a market there. The people are lazy, and work only about three days in a week. Their country, however, is something like ours. They are better than the Turks, though there are some very fine specimens of Turks. I am speaking now of the laboring people. They are ground to death. The Turk has no voice in anything. He is taxed to death for these harems and palaces of the Sultan and all his family, and he has no voice of his own in the affairs of his country. Up in Bulgaria there is a little more independence, and as they get more independence they get more intelligent. Going into Roumania you find something a little better still than in Bulgaria.

Q. Is there any chance for an American market there?—A. I think so.

Q. What could we sell in Roumania?—A. We could make wooden toys and sell them there. Some of our dry goods would sell there, and our machinery would sell there easily. They have nice cities. We ought to be there, and could be there if an effort were made. Of course, in Hungary, between Bulgaria and Vienna, people seem to be quite well off, though not as well off as our people. Laborers there get about fifty cents a day—about one-half what our laborers get. The farming people there seem to be very well off; they come nearer to us than any people east of us. France you know all about, and also Germany. It is not worth while talking about these.

IN SPAIN.

Q. How about Spain?—A. Spain is just about one hundred years behind France and the other nations. As soon as you land at Barcelona it is like going out of the United States into the northern parts of Canada, like stepping right back one hundred years. Their cars are run with no system. They start out at all hours of the night, and stop without regard to plan. They have no system in their hotels. But still we could find quite a market there.

Q. What could we sell?—A. Well, we ought to sell almost everything there. You may say that we do not want their wines, &c., but there are things that we do want. Mr. Reed, the consul at Madrid, told
me that we had no rights there. They are afraid of England, but of nobody else. We are importing grapes and wines from there. They are carried up into France and mixed there with other poorer wines, and we get them that way. If we are to buy them at all, we ought to get them directly from the place where they are produced—though I suppose we are going to get our wines from California. I am aware that I am speaking to a very strong temperance man, but I will say that there is nothing we make in Manchester that I could not sell in Spain if you give me power.

Q. Do you think you could make it so cheap that you could go into the Spanish market and exchange there for goods that we want?—A. Certainly; because they are so lazy there that they won't make anything but what they are obliged to. They are too lazy to earn anything. If they have anything to buy with, however, such as grapes, oranges, lemons, and wines, they will buy. I went out into the city of Madrid, and found that all sorts of goods are about 50 per cent. higher than in this city. Most of them come from France; France has a pretty good trade there.

Q. Then we have only to add the transportation charge to the price of the goods in order to get the trade?—A. The transportation charge is very slight. A case of goods that I had brought from Gibraltar to Boston did not cost as much as it did to bring the same goods from Boston to Manchester, only sixty miles. My freight bill in Boston was not as large, I assure you, as the bill from Boston up here. You can go right straight to Spain with almost anything, and you will find that the transportation is a mere nothing.

Q. I want to be sure that we have got your idea as you mean it. I understood you to say that nearly all, or absolutely all kinds of dry goods are one-half higher in Madrid than in Manchester. A. That is my experience, except silks. It may be different with silks, veils, and fans, and two or three other things that they make specialties of. But ordinary dry goods for dresses are dearer and boots and shoes are dearer there than here. A pair of shoes that cost there $3 could be got here for $2.

Q. That pair of shoes, if transported, would not probably cost more than 1 cent for transportation?—A. Well, we could take the hides and make them here and send them there. I am not a writer or speaker and I am only talking now from my own observation. I have no doubt some people might contradict me, but that is my opinion, based upon what I have seen. Why, our Southern people ought to be making goods and shipping them and opening markets everywhere. You, Senator Pugh, ought to be making manufactures down South to-day and sending your cotton goods all over the world. You have got fine ports and can start right out.

Mr. Pugh. We are just beginning to learn what you seem to know. We have been misled and deceived, and have been too lazy—the very reasons that you state. I fully agree with all that you have said, and I have been very much instructed and gratified by your statements.

The WITNESS. What I have said is very much broken and disconnected, no doubt, but it is just what I have thought as I have run along over the ground.

Q. Does any other point occur to you to state to the committee?—A. I have no doubt there are many other things that I could mention, if they came to my mind. But that is all that I think of mentioning at present.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

STEPHEN N. BOURNE sworn and examined.

By Mr. PUGH:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In Manchester.
Q. With what mills are you connected here?—A. I am agent of the Stark corporation.
Q. How long have you been in that service?—A. I have been agent of the Stark mills two years last June. I was formerly in Rhode Island. I have worked in a mill ever since I was a child, off and on.
Q. What do you manufacture at the Stark mills?—A. We manufacture sheetings, drillings, ducking and bagging.
Q. Cotton goods entirely!—A. Cotton goods entirely.

THE STARK COTTON MILLS; THEIR CAPACITY, ETC.

Q. You have heard the examination as made of the other witnesses here; will you please proceed now to give us such information as you have on the subject upon which they were examined, stating the number of laborers that you have at your mill, the rates of their wages, the character of houses they live in, the rents they pay, and the general condition of these laborers!—A. The Stark mills employ about 1,200 hands, and the annual pay-roll amounts to about $450,000. We manufacture about 9,000,000 pounds of goods. We consume about 25,000 bales of cotton per annum. We have good tenements. The Stark corporation is one of the oldest here, and their houses were built of brick in 1848. They have always been kept in good repair.
Q. They are owned by the company?—A. Yes. We have about 150 tenements. These tenements we keep in repair and rent at $5 to $7 a month, according to the size.
Q. What number of rooms?—A. From four to seven.
Q. The houses are all two stories?—A. Two stories; yes, sir.
Q. The buildings are in good healthy places, I suppose, and with good ventilation and drainage?—A. Yes; we always take great pains to have the drainage kept good. They are supplied with city water and are well ventilated. They are houses that anybody could live in and be comfortable.
Q. Do these operatives seem to be satisfied or dissatisfied—what is the state of their feelings toward their employers, in your judgment?—A. The operatives in Manchester seem to be very well satisfied. Many of them have worked in the Stark mills for twenty, thirty, and thirty-five years.

STRIKES.

Q. Have they had any strikes?—A. There have been no strikes of any account.
Q. Has there been any general complaint?—A. No general complaint. Occasionally of course this man or that man will have little grievances, and they change if they want to.
Q. They are generally contented, I suppose; their general condition, you think, is one of contentment and satisfaction?—A. Their general condition is one of satisfaction, as far as I know.

NATIONALITY OF MILL OPERATIVES.

As to the nationalities, I presume your operatives are of different nationalities, as they are in the other mills that have been testified
about.—A. About the same, yes. Perhaps we have more French in proportion than some of the other mills have.

Q. Canadian French?—A. Canadian French. And then we have some Swedes, not a large number, however. I used to have a good many Swedes in Rhode Island, and some of them have followed me here, and many of them have come from Sweden here.

WAGES.

Q. Please state the amount of pay these men get in the different employments?—A. I took off our pay-roll list a little memorandum. It is what we report to our treasurer. Do you want females and males separated?

Mr. PUGH. Yes.

The WITNESS. In the carding-room the average pay of the females is 94 cents per day.

Q. It is not by the piece then—that is so, much per day?—A. Some of them work by the piece, and some by the job, and that is what their average earnings are per day. The men in the carding department average $1.15. I will here state that the difference between the females and males will be accounted for by this fact. The average of the men is made up so as to include the overseers and second hands and high class labor, which consequently brings up the average. But a female and male that do the same work get the same pay.

Q. Those are the classes of males and females that you get the average from?—A. Yes; in the spinner's room, females average 69 cents per day, males $1.50 per day; for spooling, the average wages are, females 84 cents, males $1.10; twisting, females 74 cents, males 91 cents.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Did you mean to be understood that the spinning was 69 cents?—A. The average pay of the females, yes.

Q. That is the way you mean to be understood?—A. Yes; but I want to explain that the spinning takes a large share of small girls—children. Of course they do not earn as much as grown girls, and that brings the average down.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Just at that point it might be well for you to state the lowest and highest wages. Can you do that?—A. I have not got the figures with me. I could not give it positively.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How low may the lowest be?—A. The lowest would probably go in all those cases to about 50 cents a day.

CHILD-LABOR.

Q. That includes children?—A. Yes.

Q. Over twelve, I suppose?—A. Over twelve. The children work by the job. They have so much a side for tending the frames. Some tend more and some less.

Q. The children's work is light, I suppose?—A. Yes; it does not require muscular work; it is light work. It is nothing but what children have as good a time at, as they do at school. In fact when I was a child, I thought I had the best time when I worked in the mill.
Q. What is your idea of the highest wages that you pay to females; how high wages do they get? — A. I have got female workers that earn $10 a week.

Q. Is that amount of wages included in this average you make of 69 cents? — A. Yes.

Q. Then it will run from 50 cents a day up to $10 a week? — A. Yes. Then for dressing we pay females 89 cents, males $1.43; weaving, females 90 cents, males $1.63. There is another class of weaving (duck weaving) where the female make $1.19, males $1.45. We employ about 350 males and 925 females.

Q. Are these the daughters of the operatives themselves? — A. Many of them are.

Q. The majority, do you think? — A. Yes, sir; I should say so. The children are the children of operatives.

Q. You have now stated the wages, the house, the rents, and the condition as to health. Is there anything else that you think of that relates to this subject that you wish to state.

WORKING HOURS.

A. The matter of working hours has been talked about a good deal.

Q. Is the number the same in your mills as in the others—10½ hours? — A. Yes, about the same as it is in Rhode Island.

Q. You do not hear any complaint among the workers about the time? — A. No. In Rhode Island the company that I used to work for—one of the largest manufactories in Rhode Island—owned mills in Rhode Island and in Massachusetts, and one of the firm has repeatedly told me that he considered his property in Rhode Island worth 10 per cent. more than in Massachusetts, because the laws did not interfere with their labor. The mills in Rhode Island would be full of help and the mills in Massachusetts short of help, because they could earn more pay in Rhode Island.

Q. He thought the Massachusetts laborers had made a mistake in having that law passed? — A. It worked against them. I have had a good many families come to me from Massachusetts to Rhode Island because they wanted to get away from the laws that many people thought "protected" the laborers.

Q. And for the reason that when they worked by the piece they ought to be left to decide for themselves the length of time they will work? — A. Yes.

Q. Does it not seem to you that that is pretty reasonable? — A. It does. I do not think any farmer would want to have his hours regulated by law.

THE TEN-HOUR LABOR LAW.

Q. You do not think that any law-maker should interfere with the hours of work? — A. Well, I don't think it improves a laborer any. I won't say anything about its being their business.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you know of any reason why help should be abundant in Rhode Island and scarce in Massachusetts, just across the line, except this fact that you mention, that they could get work for longer time and consequently more money? — A. They can earn more money in Rhode Island;
that is the only reason. The mills I speak of belong to the same party and they are paid the same price in the same place. The yard of cloth costs them about the same in each place, as near as the labor would get it.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. There is no scarcity of labor here?—A. No.
Q. And there is a scarcity of labor at Lowell, Fall River, and Lawrence?—A. There is a general scarcity of labor in Massachusetts among the mills—among the men that I am acquainted with.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you know of anything to attribute that to but the fact that they have a ten-hour law—is there any other reason that you know of?—A. I do not know of any other reason than they have a ten hour law, and so cannot earn as much money. People will go where they will earn the most money.
Q. Even if they have to work a little longer?—A. Yes. They would work longer here if you would open your doors.
Q. How long would they work, do you think?—A. It would not be practicable to do it. But it is just the same as among farmers. Some farmers would lie in bed until sunrise, and other farmers would be up by sunrise and at work. The same rule applies to everybody else.
Q. I suppose they would keep the machinery running 12 or 15 hours, some of them?—A. Yes; that is what I used to do when I was a boy; but I think it is too much.
Q. Do you think that the health of the operatives would really permit them as a class, no matter what their own disposition might be, to work more than 12 hours a day? Do you think that as a class they can endure more than 12 hours' labor each day, consistent with their health?—A. Yes; I think they could.
Q. You think 11 hours is not too much?—A. I do not think it is.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. The operatives here are healthy, you say, and will compare in health with those in any other manufacturing place?—A. Yes, sir; I think they will.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

MALACHI F. DODGE examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Will you please state your age?—Answer. I am sixty-eight years old. I was born on the 8th of January, sixty-eight years ago—the day that General Jackson fought the battle of New Orleans.
Q. You do not remember the battle, I suppose?—A. I do not remember the battle; but I read about it as soon as I was old enough.
Q. Well, I take it that you could read pretty young?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Where were you born?—A. In Eden, Vt., on the north line, near Canada.
Q. How long have you lived here?—A. I have lived in New Hampshire fifty years. I have been here in Manchester seventeen years.
Q. You know the history and growth of Manchester pretty well from observation and actually living here?—A. I came from Vermont when I was eighteen years old and passed down through this city, or on the
west side of the river, on foot. There were no buildings here except a couple of wooden factories over on the Amoskeag side. This was all a pine grove where this city now is. I went to Nashua and went to work there in a mill.

Q. That was when?—A. In 1833, and I commenced to work in the mills there. Now, if you will tell me what you want me to state, I will state it.

The CHAIRMAN. Just tell us the story of the growth and development of this city and its manufacturing interests as you have observed them. Tell it in your own way and as fully as you choose.

ACCOUNT OF MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The WITNESS. I went to Nashua and commenced work there at a time they were having the trouble about the nullification in South Carolina on the tariff question. Manufacturing business was very dull in Nashua at that time. There was nothing in Manchester then, only a couple of mills on the other side, and it was about that time that Henry Clay, who was called the great champion of the "American system," introduced his compromise measure to bridge over that difficulty down South. The mills ran on low wages. These compromise measures on the tariff were a gradual scaling, you know, so as not to change it abruptly, but to run it down to what they call a tariff for revenue only. But it ran down so that in 1840 our mills could not run, and most of them were stopped. Manufacturing was then in its infancy, and wages were low, and I think that at that period the condition of the laboring people in New England, especially in New Hampshire, was worse than it ever was before or has been since, taking it I mean as a whole. Our help was American help, but the wages were very low. Where they are now getting an average of 95 cents a day, the average was but 40 cents for the best help in Nashua in 1835 and 1836. Then in 1837 there came a financial crash. Perhaps you will be old enough to remember that. Banks suspended specie payments, and we went on to a paper currency. Did not even have any change; we had to use bills of $1.75, bills of $1.50 and of $1.25. If the paymaster could not give us these, he had to let it go over until the next month. At that time there was a difficulty in the commercial world, and I remember that in the winter of 1837 we had to pay $15 a barrel for flour. I remember men who worked in the mill for 50 cents a day working a whole month for a barrel of flour. Our help then got but small pay; 58 cents a day was the best pay for dressing help and weavers, but they did not average that. I was an overseer there of one, two, and three rooms, and had charge of work there for 16 years, so that I had a pretty good chance to know the condition of the laboring help. I then went on to a farm, my health having failed me a little, and I worked there for thirteen years. Then I came to Manchester and ran a bag mill for Governor Straw here for eleven years, so that I know something of the condition of the laboring people here. During my laboring life I had charge of over 2,000 different individuals. In 1840 it looked as though New England was going to ruin. The factories could not run; they had suspended operations, and only now and then a mill would run. The mills were stopped in Nashua. I was an overseer at that time. I went south as far as Washington and saw some of these men there in the Senate, and heard them talk, and I made up my mind from my experience that the trouble was that we had got to have some system to encourage our manufacturing here at home. And when I heard such men as Mr. Clay talk in favor
of the American system, I made up my mind that it was the turning point then, especially for New England, if the doctrine of free-trade prevailed, and that if we did not get a new tariff, manufacture would be doomed in this country. It was so talked by men there. I was nothing but a poor laboring man, and had no education, never having had but a few months' schooling in my life; but I heard people talking on this subject a great deal, and I reflected upon it a good deal myself, and I came home and talked protective tariff. We met those who said that every duty that was put on goods was taxing the consumer, and I found the subject of a protective tariff very poorly understood—the poorest understood of any political question, and it was the hardest work to explain it.

THE TARIFF OF 1842.

But Mr. Clay, perservered and got the tariff act of 1842 enacted, and, although we did not have it a great many years, yet it gave an impetus to manufacture and business all over the country. And although it might have been too high a tariff to continue, still we were in such condition that it started up business, and mills began to start. They began to build here in Manchester a little, but they had to hold up in 1840. They started up anew in Lowell, and everywhere, and I believe that that measure that Mr. Clay got through President Tyler's administration did more for the American working people than anything he ever did in his life. I look back to that time as a starting point. The condition of the laboring people has been improving ever since.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. That tariff ran for four years, up to 1846?—A. Yes. I have always taken a great interest in politics, but never had hard feelings towards anybody that did not feel as I did. In Pennsylvania, during the canvass of 1844, when we ran Henry Clay, the people had inscribed on their banners "Polk and Dallas, and the tariff of ’42," which showed that Pennsylvania was in favor of tariff; and I believe that the South generally would be so if they went to manufacturing. You see how it was with the South: when the mills ran down we could not sell their cotton, and they had to send it to Europe and sell it cheap. As soon as the market here stopped buying cotton, England refused to pay high prices. Then they sent it here to us again. On that tariff the duties were mostly specific, and that was one of the beauties of the tariff, too, in my opinion. There was 6 cents duty on a square yard of cotton cloth. Those opposed to a protective tariff said we were taxing our poor people here 100 per cent, for cotton goods had run clear down then, and we were selling some of them for 63 cents a yard. Some people said the tax was too much, and that it was taken right from the laboring class. At one time at a Democratic meeting one of the speakers said that the duty doubled the price of the goods, and I asked him whether he supposed if there was no tariff at all he could give everybody a yard of cloth for a half cent. The goods were 63 cents, and the duty 6 cents; and, according to his account, if the duty were taken off they would have to let the cloth go for 3 cent a yard. That shows the absurdity of some of the statements made in those times. And during the working of that new tariff they got short for cotton in the South—they lay off raising it, in a measure. The Nashua company sent an agent to England and bought some of the cotton that had been sold there from the South, and which was crowded out there. He brought it back and manufactured it in Nausha and sent it to China and undersold the British on coarse goods.
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That tariff, as you say, ran four years, and then they modified it somewhat and made the duty more what you Senators call "ad valorem." But that has its bad points, you know. When the price of a thing is high the tariff is high, and when it is low the tariff is low.

That 1842 tariff imposed a duty of $1.50 on a pair of boots. People told the laboring men that the Government was taxing them $1.50 on every pair of cowhide boots that they wore, and many of them believed it, when the fact was that that $1.50 was on a pair of French boots; and, of course, if these laboring men bought French boots they would have to pay $1.50 more than they would have to pay under free trade. But the boots worn by the farmers could be bought, out and out, for $1.50, so that the tariff did not affect them in the least. That is a question I have studied a great deal, and I have made up my mind that although I would not go for a high tariff, the most that Congress can do with this labor question is to protect us by incidental protection, by putting the tariff on such things as we are manufacturing, and as we grow skilled in those goods and manufacture them cheaper, we will not want it so high. But we want some protection, if we do not want to be like those foreign laborers that Governor Smyth told you of this morning.

Q. How did the manufacturing industries get along under the tariff of 1846?—A. Well, they did not affect much of anything here until some years afterwards. They had dull spells. They did not drive the business along so hard as they had done for a few years under what they called the tariff of '42; but there was this difficulty that I speak about—it was based on a different system altogether, on ad valorem duties, and there was a chance to cheat the Government and undervalue the goods; and while the laboring people worked along very well, I do not think that that tariff worked so smoothly as it did when they had specific duties. You can't, perhaps, get specific duties on everything, but I think it would work better on all articles where it is practicable.

A TARIFF FOR REVENUE.

Q. You think that the duties on these imports that would raise enough revenue to support the Government would afford sufficient incidental protection for the manufacturing industries?—A. I do; yes, sir. And this talk about the Government taxing the laboring people where it incidentally protects the very thing that they are manufacturing, and keeps the wages from coming in competition with the wages of Europe, is absurd. It is not injuring them, as some people say it is—some outsiders who undertake to get up a prejudice against a tariff for protection, and who say sometimes that it is a law that makes the rich richer and the poor poorer.

Q. You mean by protection incidental protection resulting from the duties put on these things for revenue?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that revenue duty, properly adjusted, would enable the manufacturer to pay the difference in wages between this country and Europe for labor?—A. Yes; and that is what the laboring people want of them. I have been a close observer for fifty years, and I think that under a tariff for incidental protection we would work well; but I would not raise a revenue so as to accumulate a surplus. You Senators and Representatives in Congress ought to look after that. I do not think that there can be a great deal of legislation in favor of the laboring class, other than to give us incidental protection and a good sound currency.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

INTERNAL REVENUE TAX ON WHISKY AND TOBACCO.

Q. What do you think about these internal revenue duties on whisky and tobacco—raising a revenue say from those articles?—A. I am no lover of whisky or tobacco, and never used those articles to any amount—never used any tobacco at all—but I think we could get along without them very well, unless they use whisky as a medicine, and I do not know but what something else would be as good for that purpose as whisky, but I do not know but what those who use whisky and tobacco should pay a portion of the expense of the Government, because it is a luxury.

Q. You voted for Henry Clay in 1844?—A. Yes. The first vote I cast I cast for General Harrison in 1836 or 1840.

Mr. Pugh. I was a young man then, but I made speeches for Harrison and I voted for Henry Clay—I cast for him my first vote for President.

The Witness. They were both good men. Henry Clay was my ideal of a statesman, and when the news came that he was defeated I could not help shedding tears.

Mr. Pugh. I remember that we all thought the country was ruined.

The Witness. I never felt so bad in my life about anything as about that. I thought New York must have gone for Henry Clay; but when we found he had lost it by 2,000 majority I felt very bad I assure you.

Mr. Pugh. His Texas letter was the trouble.

The Witness. That was what the matter. I need not give you gentlemen any caution about how careful public men should be about the letters they write.

I suppose now you would like to have me state something about the condition of the laboring class, not in Manchester in particular, but throughout New England—whether they are improving or otherwise.

Mr. Pugh. Yes; we should be very glad to hear you on that subject.

CONDITIONS OF LABOR FIFTY YEARS AGO AND NOW.

The Witness. I think that, taking it as a whole, the condition of the laboring people is very much better than it was fifty years ago—not only manufacturing people, for there were but few of them then, but better than the farmers were fifty years ago. The last time I worked on a farm in Vermont I worked for a man that kept 100 head of cattle, 300 sheep, and 30 horses, and I worked for $110 a year. Then he had one or two boys by the year, and he hired his help through the summer at from $7 to $10 a month for six months. We used to have to get up at 4 o'clock in the morning and work all day—had to milk forty or fifty cows and work until into the evenings sometimes. When I was eighteen years old I was often out pitching hay in the field at 9 o'clock at night, and my wages were very low—everybody's wages were. You can see how things were when I tell you that handsome cows sold for $10 and $15. I have sold some since living in New Hampshire for $75 that were not as good cows as I have seen sold for $15. Farmers raised cattle then. My grandfather raised a large yoke of matched cattle that measured 74 feet. When I was a mere boy I was at church one Sunday, and standing around the wood-shed I heard one man say to another that "Uncle Dodge" had sold his yoke of cattle, and that he had actually got $50 for it. That was considered a great price in those times.
Let me mention another point with regard to the condition of the laboring people. When I worked in Nashua we had to work fourteen and one-half hours for the small pay that we got, and had only a half hour to dinner—just a chance to run out and bolt a little food, and run back, and then work along until half past seven or quarter to eight at night, and in the long evenings in winter time burning these great tin oil lamps, and in an atmosphere full of the foul scent from these lamps. The sanitary conditions of the mills was nothing compared with what they are now.

Now the work in mills here is only ten and three-quarter hours a day. The mills are well lighted and well ventilated, and the wages are three or four times as much as they were then. Of course the condition of the laboring people is much improved, that is, if they choose to make it so. It depends on themselves, after all, in a great measure. If they will be prudent, and save what they earn and not spend it foolishly, their condition must be much better, and it is. The gentlemen who have testified here about Manchester have told you about the present condition of things, so that I do not know that I need repeat anything.

The CHAIRMAN. You may as well tell us what you know without any reference to anybody else, because you have had a different experience from others. You may go right on, if you please.

The WITNESS. Well, after working twenty years in a factory at Nashua, I bought a farm in an adjoining town here—Londonderry—and I staid on that farm thirteen years. I have five sons, and two of them went to the Army in the civil war. I worked until I broke myself down there. Both my boys came home, but my youngest brother, who went with them, was killed. When the boys came home they did not want to work on a farm, and I sold my farm out. I have been acquainted with Mr. Straw many years, and he said if I would sell out and come up here he would find me a place. I came up here and brought my family with me and had a better chance to educate the younger boys, and so I raised my five sons here, and they are all engaged in business—every one of them—and four of them are married. The youngest of my sons is bookkeeper in the Amoskeag Bank. Governor Straw set me to work at some repairs until he could sell the old machinery in the old gun-shop, and he set it up then and he put me in charge there, and I ran the bag mill for about nine years, and had 90 hands working there. That was before the crash of 1873. My hands there would earn more wages in a day than some of them did at Nashua thirty or forty years ago in a week. I had girls there that would take their wearing bags—girls that were working on a job—and would make very large wages; but paper money ruled then and caused great extravagance among laboring people, and among those that did not labor so much. That has hurt the laboring people ever since. They are not as well contented as they once were. The truth is that the worst period they had was the period when they were making such high wages. Here I have known girls working for me that would go out and buy a silk dress and pay $75 for it. When I was young and working down in Nashua, if they could get a good calico print to wear to meeting, they looked neat and nice, and were contented. But since the Government came back to specie payments, and a dollar is worth a dollar, it has checked that matter, and wages are reduced somewhat, and in some places reduced considerably. But I think it is better for the people, on the whole, for, as the wages are now, the people are a little more economical and prudent, and busi-
ness is permanent right along. I do not know where it would stop if the banks all suspended specie payment and the dollar in gold or silver was worth as much again as the paper dollar. Why, if they get the value of the gold and silver in paper they think they are getting a good deal more pay, when in reality they are not, and I think if you folks had got back on to that specie standard some time before you did, it would have been better for the whole country. It would have stopped a good deal of this everlasting speculation to get rich.

**ADULTERATION OF FOOD.**

I think one of the worst things that the laboring people have to contend with now, though they do not perhaps realize it, is adulteration of the food they eat. I think if you were to look to that it would be a grand thing.

**By the Chairman:**

Q. Won't you explain just about what the evil is in that respect? Do you find any of it here?—A. Well, on a small scale you will find it here. Even the milkmen undertake to doctor the milk, and sell it to laboring people and pass it off for pure milk. There is not much of it here, but there is in a great many places all over the country. Our legislators last year passed a law trying to improve matters in that respect.

"**CORNERS** IN FOOD.

There is another thing I wish to mention that is an evil; that is the fact that your banks lend money to men, when business is dull and when business does not need it, to form "corners" and buy up breadstuffs and provisions, and hold them at a high price and make the poor people pay that price out of their own pockets. I call the banks "your banks" because they are creatures of Congress, and that is something that Congress, should devise some plan to check. It is next to robbery. A year or so before the war in Europe it was telegraphed all over this country that war was inevitable. That came to be the universal feeling, so far as the telegraph could make it. The flour dealers here in Manchester, and everywhere, put flour right up $2 a barrel. Everybody that was short of flour went for a barrel, because they did not know how high it would go. I got a barrel of flour myself. In less than a week the telegraph announced again that the thing had all blown over, and down went flour. Somebody had made a pretty handsome thing in the mean time during that scare when everybody expected there was going to be war; but it was the result of this telegraphing, and it seems to me that it is hardly a legitimate business for telegraph companies to do that are chartered by the Governments. If 100 laboring people went and bought a barrel of flour apiece at that time, when there was a rise of $2 on each barrel, that made a considerable amount of money taken out of those poor people.

Q. Do you think that that was done by design?—A. I have no doubt of it. In a great many of these corners the designing men try to make things look as plausible as they can, but most of them are intended to increase the price of the articles. And, if these articles are provisions, the laboring people are mostly affected by them, because the larger amount of the people of the country are laboring people and have to buy just these things, and have to pay the extra price called for by the formation of the corner. They could not form these corners very well if the banks did not let them have the money to hold the material.
Q. Are there any other things that you have thought over in your mind that you would like the committee to know? You seem to have been philosophizing on public matters a good deal.—A. Yes; I have thought a good deal upon matters of Government. I was always a lover of my own country, and I want to have it prosper. I never had any hard feelings towards the South. The Southern people differed with us on the tariff question, and because we carried Congress and had a protective tariff in 1832—and probably that tariff was rather high—then South Carolina was going to nullify. If it had not been for General Jackson I do not know but what we would have had civil war then.

Mr. PUGH. But that State was only one—South Carolina.

The WITNESS. Yes; that was only one State. After they got over that there was a chance then to mingle with the South. When I went to Virginia I got introduced to Representatives Wythe and Stanley and Stephens, and all those old Whigs that Senator Pugh knows, and I found that the only difficulty between the North and the South was got up a good deal by politicians. They misrepresented from one to another. I found many men, not those we call “fire-eaters” here, but such men as I have mentioned, who were willing to let us have some protection. I got my first ideas on that from a speech of Henry Clay’s made in Baltimore; and, as Governor Smyth says, you can manufacture in the South, and if you were to manufacture there you would be in favor of incidental protection; that is, enough to raise the revenue of the Government on, or nearly so, and just have the protection incidental to those articles that help the masses.

Mr. PUGH. I have no doubt that 90 out of every 100 persons in the South are in favor of the incidental protection that a revenue tariff, properly adjusted, would afford.

The WITNESS. There are always some men that will try to stir up bad blood. Lecturers come here and undertake to create bad feelings against capitalists. There has not been much of that lately, but a few years ago they came here talking against capital, when in reality labor and capital should work in harmony. They have preached here that there was to be a war between labor and capital, that was going to rend this country from one end to the other. But I never took much stock in that sort of thing. I thought that if the Government was wise and prudent in its legislation, we were not in much danger of being “rended.”

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. You think that there are duties and responsibilities resting on the capitalist as well as on the laborers!—A. Yes. Governor Straw told me one day that if that thing did come, his great fear was for the laboring men of the country; for if they came to that, he said, capital could take care of itself. But, as we are situated, labor would be in a bad condition without employment.

Q. You think these capitalists ought to pay a fair and just amount of wages according to the value of the work they get, do you not!—A. Yes.

Q. And then that they ought to treat their employés as human beings!—A. Certainly. My experience in the mills has been that wherever there was a corporation that took an interest in their help it always succeeded, and things ran along smoothly, hardly ever having any strikes. We have got along well in Nashua and Manchester. I remember that in the old times, nearly fifty years ago, Mr. James S. Amory of Bos
ton (now an old man, and one of the finest men I ever met) was treasurer of the Nashua Company, and had been treasurer for a great many years. Every Thanksgiving and Christmas he would come up to the mills and leave some money with the agent to buy a turkey for any poor family that he knew of. In that way he always had the good-will of the operatives. I never knew a place where they were more liberal with their help in these matters than they are here in the Amoskeag Mills.

Mr. PUGH. Wherever we find that sort of treatment by the employers toward their working people we find no serious strikes or trouble.

The WITNESS. My advice to young men, those who were working under me, was to be honest and faithful to their duties, and to preserve their manhood. My doctrine was that I would never tread on a man, and I would not cringe to a man, however big he was. I would treat every man as well as I could. I would not oppress a poor man, no matter how far down he was. Like Governor Smyth, I dislike very much this idea of an aristocracy such as he was talking about this morning. I am not of that blood, although I am of English origin. My grandfather was a soldier in the Revolutionary war, and my father was in the war of 1812.

EFFECT OF MANUFACTURES ON AGRICULTURE.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. If you have observed it, you may state what effect the creation of this city here has had upon the agricultural community?—A. That has been very marked indeed. When I first went to Nashua, 18 miles south of here, there were two small woolen factories on the other side of the river; that was the first little plant of the Amoskeag Company. Then in 1837 or 1838 they enlarged and came to this side. It was the same corporation and the same president, but it was a small corporation then, and they did very little business compared with what they are doing now; it was hardly a drop in the bucket. In going through the farming towns, as I used to go sometimes, I noticed that the farms looked pretty well generally, but there were no painted houses. Fifty years ago the houses were just wood color and were out of repair. As soon as they began to create a market over here for their apples and milk and produce generally, the agricultural interests all around here for 30 miles improved quickly, and the prices of real estate increased very much in value, if anywhere within decent reach of a railroad station after the railroads got built.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. The farmers had to sell what they made on free trade?—A. Yes.
Q. And they prospered?—A. Why, yes. When I was a boy we used to make good butter and carry it with a horse-team to Boston, and we could not get more than 11 cents a pound for it there then. Another thing that made it hard for us at that time was that we had to give 30 or 40 cents a yard for India cotton. I can remember when there was no manufacturing here, and my mother used to send to the storekeeper at Boston and get cotton yarn and spin that, bring it up into the country, and wind it, spool it, and warp it, and have the wool carded and spun and woven, and in that way make cloth for the family.

Another thing that strikes my mind with regard to the condition of the farming people is the condition of the female portion of the family—our wives and mothers. When I was a boy and worked out it was the practice all over the country, in New Hampshire and Vermont, for the women to do the milking. They had to go out into the barn—a
dirty barn it was generally, too—or into the barnyard, and milk, early and late. As soon as I was big enough to learn I learned to milk; but I have known many of the farmers who would sit in their comfortable rooms in the morning and let the women go out in the cold and milk the cows. You hardly hear of such a thing as a woman milking a cow in the country now.

When I first came to New Hampshire there was only one savings bank in the State, and that was way up in what we might call North Concord now. The treasurer of the Nashua Company used to get out bank-books, and if any of the operatives had any money that they did not want to use, and wanted to put it away somewhere, he used to take it and allow them 5 per cent. interest on it. That is the way it went along for some time, but they did not get a great amount in. But when manufacturing under the new tariff began increasing business, there was more money paid out, and they began to charter savings banks, and now I believe there is between thirty and forty millions in the savings banks, a large portion of it being the deposits of the laboring people.

In those early days when I worked out my father made a bargain with a wealthy man for my labor. The bargain was that I was to take one-half my pay in stock in October, and one-half in grain in January. I received no money. The only way we had then to get money to pay our taxes was to chop down the forest up there, burn the trees, make ashes and bleach it and make salts and pearlash, and send it to Boston. In that way we made money enough to pay the taxes.

Q. How did you get it to Boston?—A. Teamed it.
Q. What distance is that?—A. Two hundred miles and over to Boston.
Q. What sort of a team—a horse-team?—A. Yes.
Q. How long would it take to make the trip there and back, 400 miles?—A. Well, I do not remember how long it used to take. My uncle used to team, and he would be away a fortnight or over. It would spoil the best part of a month to take a team there and back and do the business. We used to raise some herb and grass seed and carry it to Boston. Up there where I used to work the laboring men can now all get money for their work. When I was a boy I worked for $110 a year, and since I have been here in Manchester, while running this mill down here, I have had to pay $20 a month for six months to a man to work on my little farm, and then he did not want to work more than ten or eleven hours—no longer than the factories did.

Q. I would like to have you state something about the houses of those days—the shelter that people had, and something about the clothing then worn compared with what we have now. What did they have?—A. Well, in those early times all that the companies allowed for board was $1.25 a week—this was in Nashua. Now they allow $2.25. Boarding house keepers had to board the girls for that, and they used to get pretty poor living sometimes. The houses were cold, wooden buildings, and the mills were cold in the winter, and the conditions were nothing to what they are now. Out in the country where I worked, for the man I was speaking of—that man had nice American girls working for him doing housework, spinning, and so on; and the girls that spun only got 50 cents a week, and the one that worked about the house, cooking and so on, got 58 cents, and the one that made cheese and butter got 75 cents a week. Girls nowadays would not work for that sum per week. It shows that they are in a better condition and more independent. I never had a foreigner work for me all the years that I was in Nashua. It was all American help. Since I have been here I have
had Americans for weaving and drawing in, and Welsh and Irish for carding, spinning, and weaving.

Q. How about the clothing that the farming people wore then compared with what they wear now?—A. It was very simple then. We used to have home-made cloth—colored, part of it, blue, making what they called striped cotton—Canada gray—and making up a suit of clothes from it. They used to wear it everywhere almost, then. A suit of Canada gray was good enough to wear to meeting.

Q. You think the condition of the farming people has improved during these years as well as the condition of other people?—A. Yes; very much. I think that this question that I spoke of in the first part of my remarks, the question of the incidental protection of manufacturing, helps the farmer in the end as much as it does the laborer and manufacturer. He gets a ready market without spending a fortune to get his produce there.

My idea is to legislate in the interest of laboring people, that we should have a good, sound currency, and preserve our currency sound, and do not let anybody kick it over. Then, a good tariff with incidental protection, something that should be permanent, and the laboring classes will then see to it for themselves that they go on improving.

I might add that when I went to Nashua at first, many years ago, the first thing we did was to form a debating club, and we tried to learn something and get up some lyceums; but the trouble was that we worked so many hours—until a quarter to 7 at night—that, having to meet in a hall, the people who were not mill-hands would get into the hall and take the seats, so that when the mill-hands got there we would find no seats, and that was a great discouragement for tired people to have to stand up, after having been worked so hard all day. Nowadays they can get through in time to fix up and go to a hall and take seats like other people.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

Miss Sarah B. Bachelder examined.

By the Chairman:

Question. Are you at work in the mills here?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. In what mill?—A. In the Stark Mill.

Q. State how long a time you have been employed there or in any other mills in Manchester?—A. I went there in 1851.

Q. That is thirty-two years ago, is it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you worked there all the time since?—A. Most of the time.

I was out attending school some and resting some.

Q. Where were you born?—A. In Exeter, N. H.

Q. Has your work in the mill been interrupted or continuous?—A. Continuous, right along, most of the time.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYÉS.

The Chairman. We have been sent out by the Senate to ascertain what we can of the condition of the people who work in the mills of the country, the operatives, their hours of labor, the severity of the labor, the pay that they get, and also to ascertain the state of feeling, as far as we can learn it, that exists between them and the employers for whom they work. If you choose, we would like you to state in your own way
what occurs to you in regard to the life of an operative as you have known it here in Manchester during these thirty years. You might begin, perhaps, with the beginning and give us a short sketch of how you found it at first and how it is now. The committee will be obliged to you for such a statement.

The Witness. I went into the spinning-room of the mill when quite young, and found it very pleasant there. We had a very good class of operatives then. Of course there were no foreigners in the spinning-room at that time. There are more now than there were then. Still in the room that I am in, I worked one year I think with the same corporation in the spinning-room. Aside from that I worked in this room, except when sick, and found it very pleasant indeed. We have always had very pleasant overseers. They have always done just as they agreed to do, and I have always tried to do just what I agreed with them to do.

Q. How long do you work in the day—how many hours of labor have you?—A. I work in the dress-room. We do not work as many hours there as in some of the other rooms because we get our work out. We work from 6.30 in the morning to 6 at night.

Q. And how long an intermission do you have at noon?—A. An hour.

Q. Do you find that work very wearisome?—A. Well, not more so than they do in other places—any more so than household work or anything of that kind, I think. Of course the air is different, and work of all nature is somewhat tiring. People get tired of all sorts of work, I suppose.

MILL-WORK PREFERABLE TO HOUSEWORK FOR WOMEN.

Q. Do you think that your work is more taxing to health than ordinary housework? Which would you rather do? You know about both, of course.—A. Well, if I was going to be out at work as I am now I should prefer the mill.

Q. For what reasons?—A. Well, one reason is that you have more time to yourself; that is, when your work is done you are independent. Housework is never done. When one goes out to work at a mill they know that at night their work is done, while it is not so in a house. In the evenings, as it is with us, we lay all thought of work aside, and do not take it up again until the morning. Perhaps many of them in the mill cannot do that—many people think of their work even at night; others can throw it aside after leaving the building and take it up in the morning.

Q. How do you occupy your time when not in the mill?—A. Either sewing or reading or going to meeting. I have never been to dance or anything of that kind. I never allow myself to do it.

Q. You find opportunity for intellectual recreation, church going, &c.?—A. I do, sir.

Q. You, think, then that there is more opportunity for mental improvement in the life of an operative than of one who works in a family?—A.-Of course. They have more time, I think. But I think the work is laborious in both. In a family you cannot go out to meeting of an evening, or to lectures or concerts, or anything of that kind. But dances, and such things as that, I never was interested in.

WOMEN’S WAGES.

Q. How about the pay that you receive—I do not want to know it as a mere matter of curiosity, but with reference to operatives generally,
as you have known it. What rates do they receive who work at such work as you do?—A. Dressers get somewhere about $1.10 or $1.15 a day; but then there are different grades of work and different grades of pay.

Q. Are you able to save any money?—A. I do try to. I should not want to work all the time if I did not think I could save something.

Q. Do you think operatives generally do save anything?—A. I think some could save when they do not.

Q. Well, if any can save, all could—except from peculiar circumstances!—A. Yes. Some people have sickness, and some have families, and some are widows with children, and of course with those it would be impossible. But these are exceptions. When people have their health, and have no families, they can afford to be more saving.

GOOD FEELING.

Q. I would like to have you state as to the feeling that exists between the employers here and the operatives throughout the mill generally.—A. I do not think I could say anything of it generally, because I do not go anywhere but in my own room.

Q. As far as you know it, then?—A. I know my room, and I have heard it spoken of in some of the other rooms. The best of feeling exists. I know the overseer in my room, Mr. Mansfield, tries to do the best he can for his help, and the best of feeling exists.

Q. Do you become well acquainted with the overseers and superintendents, or are they haughty and forbidding men?—A. Well, I have always become acquainted with the overseers.

Q. How many are there under the charge of your overseer?—A. He has two rooms, and I think he had some 90 persons in the month of August in one room; I do not know how many in the other.

Q. I suppose there is the same difference between overseers as between other men—some are good natured, and some are cross.—A. Of course there are differences. Some are good natured and some otherwise. There are all classes of people among them, just as among others. Some have patience and some have not.

Q. If an overseer gets in the way of maltreating the help—if he is sour and cross and becomes abusive, have the help any chance to make complaint or get redress from the agent or any other power?—A. I do think they ever have complained. I have heard of no operatives making complaint—not out of our rooms, at any rate.

Q. You never heard of any complaint at all?—A. No.

Q. Have you heard of any in any of the other mills?—A. No.

Q. If an overseer did become abusive there would be some way found to reach him, I suppose?—A. Of course there would be.

Q. What would be the result?—A. They would go to the agent in the first place, and I do not think the agent would allow anything of the kind.

Q. You do not think they would be disposed to take sides with the overseer against the help?—A. I do not think they would.

Q. You think they would inquire into it and apply a remedy?—A. I think they would. I think they would talk to the overseer. Mr. Adams was our agent until Mr. Bourne came, and he was a very nice Christian man.

Q. How long was he agent?—A. Mr. Adams was agent before I went there to work, and Mr. Bourne has been there some two years, I think.
Q. How have you heard the other agents spoken of?—A. I have heard them highly spoken of.
Q. Have you known of any strikes since you have been in the city?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. What have they been and about what—how extensive have they been?—A. They were strikes in regard to the long hours—trying to get the eleven hours.
Q. About how long ago was that?—A. I could not tell you just what year it was. It was about 1850 somewhere.
Q. Back about thirty years ago somewhere?—A. Yes; I think it was.
Q. Has there been any since then of any consequence?—A. Not of any consequence that I know of or that I remember.
Q. Do you know of any grievance that the operatives have—anything that they talk about that they think ought to be remedied?—A. No, sir; I do not know of anything.
Q. In regard to the savings of the operatives, do they make more or less deposits in the savings banks?—A. That I do not know.
Q. You only know about yourself?—A. I only know about myself. I cannot say in regard to others.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

MRS. MARY B. HOVEY examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You have heard what Miss Bachelerd has stated here this morning?—Answer. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you give us any opinion or information on the subjects of which she spoke?—A. I think she has told the truth.
Q. Have you had some experience and knowledge of the mills?—A. I worked at the Stark Mills for ten or eleven years.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYÉ.

Q. What should you say as to the state of feeling between the employers and employés who work for them generally?—A. I could only speak for myself. I have always been treated well.
Q. Have you known or seen any instances of any unusual or harsh treatment of others?—A. No, sir; I do not know as I have.
Q. You do not know that you have observed any?—A. No.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

GEORGE B. LAWRENCE examined.

By Mr. PUGH:

Question. Are you at work in any of the mills in Manchester?—Answer. Yes, sir; I am in the Stark Mills.
Q. How long have you been at work in that mill?—A. Fourteen years.
Q. What kind of work do you do?—A. I was a spinner when I first went in. I am running an elevator there now.
Q. How long had you been a spinner?—A. I spun eight and a half years—a little over.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL

SPINNERS' WAGES.

Q. What wages did you receive as spinner?—A. When I first went in I got $1.50 a day.
Q. How long did you get that pay?—A. I think it was three or four years that I got that pay before it was reduced.
Q. What year did you go to work?—A. I do not remember the year that I went to work for them.
Q. For three or four years you got $1.50 a day?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. The balance of the time how much?—A. I got $1.30.
Q. You got $1.30 then as long as you worked as a spinner, did you?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. What are spinners like yourself getting now?—A. Well, they are getting about the same.
Q. About $1.30?—A. Yes, a little more, I think, some of them are getting.
Q. Did you work by the piece?—A. No, sir.
Q. You worked by the day?—A. Yes.
Q. Those who work by the piece now get more than you did?—A. There are not any spinners that I know of that work on the piece.
Q. All spinners work by the day?—A. By the day.
Q. They are not paid according to the quantity they spin?—A. No, sir; not in that mill—not that I know of in the Stark Mills.

OPERATIVES' RENTS.

Q. In the matter of rents, how do rents run now as compared with when you first worked there?—A. I believe I paid $12 when I first commenced, and the last rent I paid in the city was $10. I do not live in the city now.
Q. How many rooms are there in the house you rent now?—A. I do not rent any now.

RELATIONS BETWEEN EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYÉ.

Q. What is the state of feeling between the workers and the employers?—A. I do not think I have heard any complaints at all myself.
Q. Not since you have been there?—A. No, sir.
Q. Do they have confidence in the agents and overseers and in the employers?—A. I think they do.
Q. They seem to be satisfied with their condition and treatment?—A. They appear to be. I do not hear any complaints.
Q. Are they healthy?—A. They are healthy and well as far as I know.
Q. Do they get good food and pure air?—A. They get all the pure air that can be got in a mill.
Q. And in the houses where they live is there good ventilation?—A. I think so.
Q. As to the time you work in the day, have you heard any complaints of the length of the hours?—A. No, I do not think I have. I know I have never heard any general complaint. We may hear something of that kind mentioned by some individual sometimes, but no general complaint. I have got none myself to offer.

By the CHAIRMAN:
Q. Where were you born, sir?—A. In England.
Q. How long have you been in this country?—A. I came here in 1836.
Q. You have been here in Manchester how long?—A. Eighteen years in Manchester.
Q. Have you worked with any other corporation but the Stark?—A. Yes.
Q. Would your statement as to the condition of things in the Stark Mills be true of the other mills, you think?—A. I think so.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

FRANK MEAD sworn and examined.

By Mr. Pugh:

Question. You live in Manchester?—Answer. Yes, sir.
Q. What sort of work do you do?—A. I am a card-grinder, employed in the carding department.
Q. In what mill?—A. Mill No. 9 of the Amoskeag Company.
Q. How long have you been there?—A. I have been there about two years in that mill.
Q. How long have you lived in Manchester?—A. Fifteen years.
Q. Have you worked in any other mill?—A. Yes.
Q. What other mill, and how long?—A. I worked in the spinning-room of the Stark Mill, under Mr. Fogg, at the same time that Mr. Lawrence did. I worked in the Amoskeag spinning-mill, room No. 4, and in the Stark Mill. That comprises all the mills I worked in in Manchester.

CARD-GRINDERS' WAGES.

Q. What pay have you been getting?—A. One dollar and sixty-five cents a day.
Q. By the day, or do you work by the piece?—A. By the day.
Q. How long have you been receiving that pay?—A. Two years.
Q. Ever since you have been with the Amoskeag Company?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Are you a man of family?—A. I am, sir.
Q. What is the number of your family?—A. I have a wife and two children.
Q. Are any of your family employed in the mill?—A. No, sir; none of my folks work in the mill but myself.
Q. Are you able to live as you wish to do upon your wages?—A. Yes, sir; outside of sickness or accident, or something of that kind. Of course we get behind hand a little when we are sick; but as a general thing we make a good, fair living.
Q. Could you save a little?—A. I could under reasonable circumstances; but I have not saved much because I have had a good deal of sickness in my family.

OPERATIVES' SAVINGS.

Q. How about deposits in the saving banks by yourself or others within your knowledge?—A. Well, I know of quite a number that have got deposits in savings banks; I could not say what banks, but I know that they have.
Q. How as to that being a general fact, as to many of them having
deposits? What proportion do you think of the operatives here save anything? Is it a majority, or one-half, or one-third, or one-fourth only?—A. I could not say for a fact. No, I hardly think they do. But there are, I think, a few that do save, but the majority do not save anything, I think.

Q. What is the reason; do they not get enough, or have they too large families, or are they wasteful and extravagant?—A. Well, there are a few that could not save anything under the wages they get; but there are a good many that could save and do not try to save.

Q. How is it as to the houses you live in, for health and comfort?—A. Well, I have a good house. I live at No. 125 Elm street.

HOUSES OF MILL EMPLOYÉS.

Q. What rent do you pay?—A. Eleven dollars a month.
Q. For a two-story house?—A. No, sir; eight rooms, well situated and well ventilated.
Q. Is it comfortable living there?—A. Yes, sir; it has good water and good drainage.
Q. About how much would it cost to build that house?—A. I could not say; it is a block that I live in—a wooden block on Elm street, belonging to Mr. Young. The Amoskeag Company has tenements for $4 and upwards. Some of them were built a year or so ago; very nice block, and well situated. Brick is handy.
Q. There is no cause, then, for complaint on account of the character of the buildings occupied by the operatives?—A. I do not see why there should be, as far as I know anything about it.
Q. The rental they pay seems to be satisfactory to them?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. They do not complain that it is too high?—A. No, indeed; I do not see how they could reasonably.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYÉS.

Q. Then, as to the general feeling, as far as you have discovered it, how do the operatives feel toward their employers?—A. I think as a general thing the best feeling prevails. I know it does in our room. We have a good overseer who is a kind and indulgent man as far as his duties will allow him to be.
Q. Do you know of any different treatment from that by any of the overseers here?—A. Not personally; no sir. There are a good many of the operatives that will find fault with the best of men; no mistake about that. They would find fault where there is none to be found.
Q. You know of no ground for complaint?—A. No, sir; I do not. I have none myself.
Q. What do you think as to the condition now and the condition in the past of the operatives here, so far as you know?—A. I think it is a very great improvement. I went to work in mills fifteen years ago, and I have worked more or less ever since. I know it is a great improvement over what it was four years ago. We are, getting better wages as a general thing.
Q. You could save more?—A. Yes; house rents are just as cheap, and provisions are just as cheap. I do not see any difference. I do not pay any more house rent, and do not pay any more for provisions, and yet I get more pay; so I do not see why it should not be an improvement.
Q. Do you hear the working people that you associate with disagree with you in that opinion?—A. Oh, yes; you will find people that disagree with you on almost any subject, wherever you go—even if it is the very best opinion in the world.

Q. To what extent is that disagreement?—A. To no extent whatever, only some particular ones would find fault if they were getting the best of pay and treatment.

Q. It is an exception to find a man disagreeing on that matter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The general rule is that they agree with you?—A. That is the general sentiment.

Q. Is there anything else that you wish to state?—A. No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where were you born?—A. In Cambridge, Vermont.

Q. That is near the north part of the State, is it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know anything of the Canadian help in the mills?—A. Yes, I do; at least I ought to know, for I work right with them all along.

FRENCH CANADIANS AS OPERATIVES.

Q. Do you know any reason why anybody should undertake to speak in a defamatory or disparaging way to their discredit as a class of laboring men or women?—A. No, sir; I do not. As far as the laboring class are concerned, I do not think as a general thing that they are as steady workers as the American class of people are; but I have worked among them a great deal and have no hard feelings against the Canadian class of people. I never saw anything out of the way with them, as a general thing, any more than any other class of people.

Q. Do you think it would be easy to get the necessary amount of help to carry on the mills if the Canadians were not here?—A. That is a pretty hard question to answer; but I have never seen the time yet since I have been in the mills but what we have had all the help we wanted.

Q. You have had a great deal of Canadian help, however, to furnish you with a part of the supply?—A. Yes; a large part of it.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

GEORGE MORVILLE sworn and examined.

By Mr. PUGH:

Question. Where are you employed?—Answer. At the Manchester Print Works, in this city.

Q. What kind of work do you do in the mill?—A. Engraving rollers for printing cloth.

Q. What length of time have you been there?—A. I have been there between nine and ten years.

Q. In the same business?—A. Yes; in the same place.

Q. How many men are employed in the same way that you are—to do the same thing?—A. There are different branches of engraving. In the particular branch that I work at there are only four in the shop that work at it.
Q. How many engravers of all kinds are there there?—A. I should think there would be somewhere from 12 to 14 of those that we call engravers.

Q. How long are you employed in that work every day?—A. In the summer time from 7 o'clock in the morning until 6 at night; in the winter from 7 until dark.

Q. Is that laborious work?—A. No; I am sitting all the time, working through a magnifying glass.

Q. Your work is skilled labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What pay do you get?—A. $26 a week.

Q. The four get the same pay do they?—A. There are two of us that get $26, the other two get $25.

Q. What pay do the others get—the engravers?—A. The lowest, I think, is about $22, excepting apprentices.

Q. Twenty-two dollars a week?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you all save from those wages?—A. I suppose so.

Q. All of them save money?—A. I suppose so—for anything that I know to the contrary.

Q. Are they men of families?—A. Most of them.

Q. How many persons are there in the largest families that you know?—A. There is one gentleman who has 8 or 9 children; I am not sure which.

Q. Does he get any help from his family in any form of work?—A. I think that he has one boy at home that is working. Two or three of his sons are married, and one daughter is married, and another son is away from home.

Q. Is that about the pay that your class of skilled workmen get generally?—A. Well, in some places they get a little more; in a great many places they get a little more than that.


Q. Do you know any reason for that difference of pay or compensation?

The WITNESS. Between the different shops?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Q. You do not know, I am sure.

Q. You do not know of any reason for the difference?—A. No, sir.

Q. What is the difference, according to your judgment?—A. Where we get $26, there are some in the same branch of business that get $28 a week.

Q. Do you suppose that the condition of those who are working elsewhere is as good as yours in point of place of residence, house you live in, and the treatment you receive?—A. I do not suppose there is a great deal of difference.

CONTENTMENT OF EMPLOYEES.

Q. Do you know of any discontent among other operatives where you are—any ground of complaint that you have heard stated?—A. No reasonable ground, I think. Of course there will always be some discontent in a shop.

Q. But you do not know of any reasonable ground of complaint?—A. No; I do not know of any reasonable ground.
Q. You see no reason yourself why they should be discontented with their treatment or mode of living, or compensation?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you get enough pay according to the value of your work or the commodities that you aid in producing; what is your opinion as to the pay you get, is it reasonable?—A. Well, if I was to go to another place I should ask more money, and get it if I could.

**ENGRAVERS' WAGES.**

Q. Do you think that the employer, considering the profits he makes on your work, ought to pay you more?—A. Well, I suppose they are governed by current prices in other places.

Q. I mean according to the prices that they get for the fabrics that you work on; what is your opinion as to the amount of pay that you get out of the product of your work with their capital?—A. Well, I think it is fair pay.

Q. You think it is a fair division?—A. Yes, sir.

By the **CHAIRMAN**:

Q. Is there any other matter that occurs to your mind that you would like to state to the committee?—A. No; I do not think of anything just now.

Q. Are you acquainted with the manufacturing business in other places somewhat?—A. I have worked in several other places.

Q. Where?—A. I served my apprenticeship in Lowell, on the Merrimac, and I have worked in Fall River; I worked a number of years in England.

Q. Are you of American birth?—A. I was born in England and came here when I was about four years of age.

**COMPARISON OF WAGES AND CONDITIONS OF LIFE IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.**

Q. You know something of the comparative condition, then, of the working people there and here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is it?—A. They are better paid here than they are in the old country.

Q. Where do they live the best, there or here?—A. That is a good deal a matter of opinion, I think.

Q. You know, perhaps, what I mean; which on the whole is the most prosperous and happy and contented class of people, those there or those here?—A. I think they are decidedly better off here than they are there.

Q. Do you think they have, as a rule, better food, shelter, and clothing?—A. Well, they are paid better.

Q. If better paid they must be better off in those particulars, must they not?—A. They may to a certain extent, yes.

Q. How as to opportunities for reading, and for mental improvement here and there?—A. Well, I see very little difference. The print works that I was connected with on the other side had a very fine library connected with the works, something that I have never seen in this country.

Q. That was connected with the print works?—A. That belonged to the print works.

Q. I mean my question in a broad sense, and so as to cover the laboring classes generally. Take the operatives generally there and the
opersatives here, which do you think has the better opportunity, if they choose to improve it, of reading and of study, and of lectures, newspapers, and all that?—A. I see very little difference in that respect, because in all the large places in England they have public libraries and anybody can take books from them.

Q. How is it as to the opportunities of educating their children in the common schools if they have families?—A. The common schools are good there.

Q. For how long a period of each year do they last?—A. I do not understand your question.

Q. How long are the schools open annually?—A. That I do not know.

Q. The operatives, as a rule, in England are able to read and write, I suppose?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And take the newspapers more or less?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do the hours of labor there and here compare?—A. Well, I think they are about the same.

Q. What part of England are you most familiar with?—A. I worked for some time in Manchester. Then I had charge of a large concern in Glossop, in Derbyshire.

Q. How far is that from Manchester?—A. Twelve miles from Man-

Q. Manchester is a very large center of manufacture, is it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you some idea of the number of operatives there of all classes?—A. No; I could hardly give you an idea.

Q. Is the woollen, as well as the cotton manufacture carried on there?—A. No, it is chiefly cotton. The woollen manufacture is chiefly in Yorkshire.

Q. Have you been in Yorkshire?—A. I passed through it.

Q. I suppose you have not much personal knowledge of the woollen manufacture there?—A. No, nothing at all.

Q. This department that you are engaged in—the print works—is that considered as one of the most difficult and delicate processes connected with the manufacture?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Perhaps the most so, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. I suppose the pay then corresponds to the quality and character of the work somewhat?—A. Well, the printers are better paid than the engravers.

Q. The engravers make the design, or do they place the design upon the stone?—A. They do not use stone at all. It is copper rollers that are used. The design is made in Boston in the warehouse. They select the design and give the style that they want, and the designs are made there and then sent here. Then there is an outline made—that is what they call sketch making. You will have one of the sketch makers here, Mr. McIntosh. The sketch makers take and make a tracing of the outline of the pattern and that is given to the engraver.

Q. And the engraver works it out on the surface of the roller?—A. Yes.

What is the rest of the process after the engraving upon the surface of the roller?—A. It goes into the printing machine. Each color has to have a separate roller. If there are fourteen colors in the print there are fourteen rollers engraved. They are all made exactly of a size, and the work is put on so that one color will fit into another. It has to be very accurately done to secure a good fit.

Q. Both in the engraving itself and in the adjusting of the rollers?—A. Yes.
Q. Your particular business is the engraving?—A. Yes.
Q. I was somewhat preoccupied when you were testifying as to your pay. How much do you get?—A. Twenty-six dollars a week.
Q. Four dollars and twenty-five cents a day?—A. A little more; $4.33 about.
Q. How many of you are there in these works here?—A. I should think about twelve or fourteen; I could not tell you the exact number.
Q. Do you have employment continuously?—A. Yes.
Q. And you engrave this year, I suppose, the styles for next?—A. The works generally shut down in the spring and fall while they are changing styles, and we get patterns engraved for the printing machines to start with. For instance, we are now about starting on light styles, and the print works will probably shut down for a few weeks until we get some work ready for them.
Q. In the factories of England, are there operatives of Irish or other nationalities employed to much of an extent?—A. I think they are to a considerable extent.
Q. You think there are a good many Irish operatives in England?—A. I think so.
Q. And, of course, a good many Scotch people?—A. Yes.
Q. Do people come from the Continent to work in England—French, Germans, or Scandinavians?—A. I think not.
Q. So far as there is an emigration from the Continent of factory workers, is it to this country then, is it?—A. I think so; yes.
Q. I suppose some go to Australia, or do they have no manufactures out in Australia?—A. I do not know. They did not used to have. I spent three years in Australia, and there was nothing much in the way of manufacturing there then.
Q. How long ago was that?—A. Nearly twenty years ago.
Q. There is a considerable English immigration here, is there not?—A. Yes.
Q. I mean of operatives.—A. Yes; there are a great many coming from England.
Q. I suppose that the reason must be that they understand, and they find by experience that they better their condition by coming here?—A. Yes; I should suppose that would be the reason.
Q. That is the practical judgment, then, of the man most interested, that, all things considered, he is better off here than there?—A. Yes; I think so.
The CHAIRMAN. If any matter occurs to you further, you may state it. The WITNESS. Nothing particular occurs to me.

HOURS OF LABOR FOR ENGRAVERS.

Q. In regard to the hours of labor, they sometimes work more than eleven hours, do they?—A. Well, we do not work eleven hours at all. We work from seven in the morning to six, in the summer time, and in the winter time from seven o'clock until dark. If we work longer than that we are paid extra.
Q. By the hour?—A. Yes.
Q. And in the same proportion as your day’s work is paid?—A. Yes; calling ten hours a day.
Q. You have one hour intermission at dinner?—A. Yes.
Q. To what extent is the opportunity of doing extra work, and being paid for it embraced; do many work extra hours?—A. Whenever they are busy there is a good deal of extra work sometimes.
Q. How long have you known men to work?—A. Until twelve o'clock at night sometimes, but that is not common. They generally work until about nine when they are working "over time," as they call it.

Q. This is a matter of choice with them?—A. Well, they are expected to do it, if they are asked.

Q. I suppose they would rather do that than to have other men brought into the city to compete with them at times when there was only the ordinary work to do?—A. Yes; that is the feeling.

Q. During the time that the mills are shut down for you to prepare the work, the operatives are idle, are they?—A. Yes.

Q. Do they get pay during that time?—A. I think there are about four of the printers that get full pay, and the rest of them get half pay—just the printers. Those are the only ones that are paid that way.

Q. How about the operatives?—A. They do not get anything when the mill is shut down.

Q. On the other hand the proprietors are getting nothing when the mill is shut down?—A. Of course not; they are something out of pocket. There are the salaries that have to be paid, and the foremen are paid; but the operatives are not.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

JAMES M. McINTOSH sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. How long have you lived here?—Answer. About ten years.

Q. Before that where did you reside?—A. Mostly in Rhode Island.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am a sketch maker or designer for calico prints.

Q. You have been in that business for how long?—A. For a great many years; I suppose forty years.

Q. Where did you learn it?—A. In Scotland.

Q. Are you of American birth?—A. No, sir.

Q. Scotch, perhaps?—A. Yes, sir.

ENGRAVING IN CALICO PRINT WORKS.

The CHAIRMAN. Won't you please describe to us the business that you are in, the process, and the part it plays in the manufacture of cloth at this time? And as you go on you may give us some account of the compensation and the hours of labor, and whatever occurs to you as affecting this labor question that we hear so much of. Particularly, I should like first that you would give us an account of the process you speak of, and how the printing of cloth is effected.

The WITNESS. This branch in which I am engaged may be considered the initial step. There are two branches in the trade, I should say; first, that of the designer, who produces the design originally. That design is carried forward, or sent to the works, and there rendered perfect in the matter of the distribution of the colors, &c. It is rendered mathematically correct, so that when put into the machine it will come out on the cloth without any blemish or anything that will specially attract the eye. It secures uniformity. That is the nature of the branch called "sketch making" in the print works, now. Of course that branch did not always exist, because there have been changes in printing, but, taking printing as it is at the present day, that is the nature of the occupation.
Q. It is one requiring considerable artistic taste and skill in execution?—A. Yes; it requires all that, and there seems to be no end to learning in it. I have been many years at it, and yet I find that new things come up, and I find that although I have got to apply old principles to them, yet there are intricacies and difficulties in them year by year. The patterns we receive one year after another are more difficult to render than they have been in years gone by.

Q. Where are the patterns obtained?—A. Mostly in Boston and New York.

Q. From American designers?—A. Yes; mostly. I should think there are a number of American-born designers now. Of course there are a number of English and also French; the English and Scotch predominate.

Q. Is the etching your part of the work?—A. The etching is in the engraving room. I can carry you through there.

Q. Just begin and carry us through the whole process to the final and complete printing.—A. After the sketch is made, according to the mode now adopted, the pattern has been taken and carefully traced—every special line of it—every special boundary of color, and we put this tracing on thin paper and put it in a camera, which is adjusted to magnify nine times. Taking the process we have down here, the sketch can be adjusted there 9, 5, or 3 diameters. We prefer 9 diameters at the print works here. That increase of size is done upon a table after being traced in the dark room. In the dark room the shadow throws the lines down upon the white paper. After that is traced the traced sheet is taken into the light and put upon a table, and there rendered as perfect as can possibly be. All the figures are increased 9 diameters; and when that is done the drawing is made with a transfer-block—a block that will transfer. That is turned then on to a sheet of zinc, and the impression taken off, and the zinc plate is then carried downstairs to the engraving room, and the sketch-maker's lines are carefully cut there, and provision is made for all the colors where they come, and the mark painted on the zinc in large shape. This is then put into the engraving machine—the pentagraph machine—and by means of combination of levers this enlargement of 9 diameters is again reduced back to its original size as given upon the first tracing that was made. This small size is then scratched by a diamond point on the copper roller through a thin skin of varnish. The person tracing follows the cut in the zinc plate, carefully following the line; and at the farther end of this combination of levers the same line is reduced back 9 diameters—making a scratch on the roller—and so it goes on through every color, every color has its own boundary traced. These rollers after having been so traced are prepared for etching. They are taken into the etching room, and wherever the copper is bare the acid eats the line up, and it requires a large amount of skill and experience to know when the line is deep enough. That is the work of the engraver, or the person having care of the etching.

There are other processes, as the engraving by mill (by the dye in the mill). That is the old style of engraving. There is no enlargement in that case. The original tracing is transferred to a roller of steel that when run around the roller will join, that is, it is calculated that a circumference of 10, 15, or whatever number it may be when it is revolving 15 or 18 times, or whatever it may be, comes together and makes a correct joining. That is the old style of engraving by the mill, and the most perfect style that we know of. All very fine goods are done in that way, and the roller is then taken downstairs into the
printing room and put into the printing machine. We have down in
the print works as many as fourteen colors, and we put in ten or twelve,
eight or nine, according to the number of colors in the pattern. Those
colors are all impressed upon the cloth. Then when it is passing through
the printing machine, all the colors being put in one after the other, the
cloth is taken into the dye-house or steaming place, where the colors
are raised, and it is brought out clear and bright, as seen in the shop
windows. It is almost impossible, however, to give you an idea of it
in words, because, as you observe, the whole matter is a succession of
skillful operations, each depending upon very high skill and adjustments.
Those are the three departments, however, of sketch-making, engraving,
and printing.

Q. It is quite evident, I think, from your statement, that this must
be a very high order of skilled labor.—A. Yes, we think so. This is
shown when we encounter a man that is not properly trained. A mis-
take in the initial process deranges the whole matter.

Q. I suppose it must require something of the same order of ability
as is required in sculpture and the fine arts, very nearly approaching
those?—A. Well, I do not know. We do not have any room, except in
the case of the designers, for the employment of the imagination.

Q. But all the accuracy and delicacy of handwork is needed?—A.
Yes; that is just the whole idea.

Q. Do you think all these qualities can be possessed in a high degree
without an imagination?—A. Well, no. I think in our department of
sketch-making we sometimes come to a place where we do not see any
road to get out of the difficulty, and I suppose imagination will then
supply the road. We have to travel along an imaginary road until we
find a real one.

Q. You have worked here about nine years, I think you said?—A.
Yes.

Q. You have pursued this business all your life?—A. Yes. I went
to it when I was quite a lad.

WAGES OF ENGRAVERS.

Q. I suppose the compensation varies according to the skill of the
various workmen?—A. Yes.

Q. Or is there a certain rule of prices?—A. No, sir; it is according
to the standard of the men, I think. There is no uniform rate that I
know of.

Q. How many are there employed here in your special department?—
A. I think eight or nine.

Q. And then how many engravers?—A. The engraving machines are
mostly operated by ladies.

Q. It is mostly done by machine?—A. Yes; by the pantograph ma-
chine, by which the reduction takes place. Those machines are oper-
ated by ladies.

Q. What compensation do the ladies get?—A. Somewhere about $1
a day, or a little over.

Q. What is paid to male help in your own department?—A. In my
own department it is $20, or a few dollars over that—$20 to $25.

Q. How does compensation for your work compare with compensation
for like work abroad?—I mean to say in England?—A. There is not very
much difference. There may be a little difference in the figure, but
there are other things in the case of English workmen that compensate
for a little less wages, arising out of the old methods and old customs. Clothing is cheaper; for one thing, and shoes are cheaper, fuel is cheaper, and rent is cheaper.

ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES, THEIR RELATIVE ADVANTAGE FOR THE WORKING PEOPLE.

Q. Comparing working people there and working people here in the like pursuit, or the like department of labor in the factories, what should you say of their relative condition, all things considered?—A. Well, I asked an intelligent lady not long ago, who had been some years in this country—she was a weaver in the old country—if she would like to go back. She had been back once or twice. She said, “Yes, I would like to go back, and I would like to stay;” and she explained the reason. She said that the working people have a better time there than they have here. The hours of labor are shorter, and they have a half holiday on Saturday. That is universal all over England. The hours of labor are shorter and the people do not work as hard; they are not driven as hard as they are here. I asked if she could make as much money there. She said, “Yes; I should make as much money there if I were allowed to run the same number of looms, but they won’t allow the weaver to run as many looms there as they will here;” so that she could not make as much. I do not know that I could give anything like a general answer as to my own business. I think my department is about as well there as here, but some prefer America, because of the climate, and other reasons.

Q. Do you know of any American help emigrating from here to England to remain permanently?—A. No; I do not.

Q. Do you know that English help of all descriptions does come here?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Do you know of English help, to any considerable extent, having come here, returning to remain permanently in England?—A. Oh, yes; in my own business this year several have returned; but I do not know with regard to mill help, how that may be.

Q. You are speaking now of skilled labor—your own labor?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you known the ordinary operatives, after having come here and remained a while, to return, preferring their chance here to their chance there?—A. No. As a general thing they remain here. If they remain a considerable time here, and children begin to grow up, they remain. For the first seven years that I was here I felt every day, almost, that I should want to go back. I had great difficulty in persuading my wife to remain; but as the children grew up and went to school and began calling this place their home, our minds changed and we finally concluded to remain.

Q. I suppose every foreigner who comes here, especially so patriotic a nationality as the English, has a natural longing for home?—A. Yes.

Q. And that is a feeling that must have a tenacity to keep them prejudiced—if that is a proper word—in favor of home rather than in favor of a new country, is it not?—A. I do not know that I would use the word “prejudice.” If they are intelligent men they are better informed regarding English affairs than any American can possibly be. I hardly know an intelligent English or Scotch man who does not receive regularly, old country papers; and, consequently, they are posted on the politics of the day in England as well as about politics here.

The CHAIRMAN. The word “predisposed” would be better than “prejudice.”
The WITNESS. Yes; they are disposed to give the best motive for doubtful actions, as they would in any other case; I do not think they make any worse citizens for that, however.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no; I was not speaking of it in that view in the slightest degree; but here is this fact: We are expected to make up our minds, if we can, whether the working people are better or worse off here than the corresponding classes of people in England, or on the continent of Europe; the resolution of the Senate requires us to ascertain the relative condition of the working people in most countries, if we can. Now it is a fact that many English working people come here; no American working people go there; a few of the skilled English working people who come here return, but even the majority of them remain. That fact, or all those facts combined would to a third party indicate pretty strongly that the general verdict of the working people, both English and American, is that this is the best country to be in. You have cited the opinion of an English woman. I do not know whether you mean to make her answer your own, or not; but, if so, I was trying to find in my mind what reason there might be operating upon her, so as to bring her to so different a conclusion from that reached by the great mass of working people.

The WITNESS. Well, I ought to have finished what she did say. I asked that question whether, taking it all together, she preferred to go home or stay here, and her conclusion was that she would rather stay here, and such is my conclusion. This is a broader country. The chances are wider every way. If a man wants to step out of his particular business, there is room to do so here, and there is not much room in England, because of the crowded condition of the country. I think there is no doubt at all that this is the better country for the laboring man.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is a very intelligent explanation of it. I suppose—I think you said in substance—that on the whole the laborer earns more money here.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Q. Do you think with that lady that the American help is, as a general thing, driven to more active work during the hours of labor, and given to longer hours of labor than the English working people are subjected to?—A. Yes; I think so. I have not very much means of knowing that, however, because I left when I was only a few years a journeyman, not long out of my time. I have been over 30 years in this country and from what I might quote of my own knowledge of the way the work is done on the other side, it certainly was not as much driven as it is here.

Q. A man would not do as much real work there as here in the same time?—A. No; his tasks were lighter—were shorter—he had a shorter day. Then there is another thing.

OVERSEERS; THEIR RELATIVE NUMBERS IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

There is one peculiarity about English factory or mill life: the number of overseers is fewer; there are fewer men "on the staff," as I should say. They do not bound it as they do here.

Q. In what way does that affect the happiness and comfort of the workingmen?—A. Just this way, that a man can work a half a day and not be annoyed by an overseer.

Q. He can work as he pleases?—A. No; but he works more easily,
without the sense of being overseen, if you can perceive the idea that I mean to advance.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I can see how to some men that might be offensive, and to others it might be quite necessary.

The WITNESS. Well, to those to whom it is necessary, they would in a well-regulated shop be the smaller number. Of course there are always those who take advantage. But, take men as they come, they know what they can do.

Q. Do you think that the same English help will do more with the fewer overseers than with the many?—A. I should think so.

Q. They will do more work, you think?—A. I should think they would do it more comfortably.

Q. Do you think they would accomplish more work in the day than if taken, as in this country, and put under a larger number of overseers?—A. Well, I can only answer that by a general remark, that where men act from a sense of necessity or duty, or whatever it may be, the work will be done, overseer or no overseer, and the great thing is to train men to that habit. As far as my experience with the best men has gone, they say when they begin in the morning, “I shall accomplish so much—I shall get over so much ground by such and such a time;” and they work by a “stint” that they lay down themselves. I think that is a better state of mind for a workman to be in than to have the constant impetus given by the presence of foremen.

Q. You think that the man likes to be trusted?—A. Yes; that is just it.

Q. It is a compliment to his better nature?—A. Yes.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYÉS.

Q. What should you say from your observation in this city of the relations, as to harmony and good-will, between the agents and employés—those having supervision, and the employed or working element in these mills?—A. I think that it is very good. I have a very good opinion of the relations so far as can be seen by a person looking from the outside, as I must do—or as far as my experience goes I think the relations are good.

Q. You have of course that sort of knowledge which an intelligent man gets of what is going on in his own community in regard to all these mills?—A. Yes.

Q. And all classes of labor?—A. Yes.

Q. Of course, if there was anything serious there would be mutterings and complaints that would reach your ears—that must necessarily be so, must it not?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you hear anything of a serious character of that kind?—A. There is no controversy that I know of, unless it be the hours of labor, and that is hardly a question that has stirred the public as far as I know. It has been up occasionally.

Q. Do you think that it would be possible, where work is done as we learn it is, largely, here by the piece, or a system substantially like that, to enforce a law, if passed, reducing the hours of labor to ten, or less, without making it compulsory on the employed as well as the employers?—A. Well, I do not know about that. The only thing that I can say about that is the general desirability of shortening the hours of labor. It has always operated well, and would operate well here if it could be done. But whether it is desirable for this place or not, I do not know. I understand there is a great deal of the work done by the piece. In
that case, without the consent of both parties, it would be difficult to make any kind of general law.

Q. Do you know of any grievance that laboring people have here, for which any remedy can be provided by legislation?—A. I do not know of any, sir, unless it be the matter of the hours of labor, and that I do not think can be settled by legislation in the mean time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is any other matter on your mind which might be interesting or pertinent, we would be glad to have you mention it.

WORKING HOURS.

The WITNESS. Well, I would like to say this: that in regard to the abuse that people would make of additional hours of leisure, I think that the number of the people—of the help—who would be found upon the streets after supper time would be a very small item in the aggregate of the whole. I think the number who would be at home reading or sewing or doing other necessary things would be by far the largest number. The majority would be at home, and I think that any one visiting our libraries here and observing the parties who take out books would be convinced that our better help are all readers to a large extent.

SAVINGS OF OPERATIVES.

Q. That suggests another matter. I would like to have you state something, if you have knowledge as to it, as to the savings effected by the operatives—the accumulations of money beyond their mere support—A. Well, sir, as far as I know, the habit of saving is very general. I have seen on pay night in the Amoskeag and other banks quite a crowd of people that were likely to be mill help. I think the habit of saving is quite general. The woman that I referred to was a weaver, a poor Scotch girl, and I know that for a number of years she had a bank account—until she left the city. Taking that as a sample, I think that savings banks are well supported by the laboring people.

SAVINGS BANKS IN ENGLAND.

Q. Are there any savings banks in England, or is there any place provided by law for the deposit of savings?—A. Oh, yes; and I think they are even more generally patronized than here. The post-office savings banks is a notable instance. Every little village now can have its saving bank; very small deposits are allowed. Then, the most recent in that way is the habit of collecting a certain number of stamps, and having them exchanged in the post office, and the amount credited to the depositor; so that a boy by saving penny stamps can by and by deposit a shilling. I think it is one of the most cheering signs of that condition of the laboring people with regard to saving.

Q. Do you know anything of the amount of deposits by the laborers in England, or the operatives in English manufactories?—A. No, sir; I do not know the exact amounts; I only know the general fact that they are notable savers, and that even in Ireland, notwithstanding the disturbed condition of things there, I was surprised some time ago to find the amount of money in the savings banks.

Q. They do save and make deposits?—A. Yes. The main thing that the English operative hungers after when he comes here is the loss of the half holiday.
GENERAL IMPROVEMENT IN CONDITIONS OF LABOR.

By the Chairman:

Q. Do you not think that the condition of working people in all civilized countries is, on the whole, improved?—A. Oh, decidedly so; yes.

Q. And the differences between their condition here and abroad constantly lessened?—A. Yes. There is a great deal of improvement, and I know it. Within my own memory the mill help worked fourteen hours a day, when I was a boy.

WORKING HOURS IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

They never worked any more than ten hours in Scotland, but in England it was a common thing to work thirteen and fourteen hours a day.

Q. And you say you never knew them to work over ten hours a day in Scotland?—A. No; ten hours a day has been common in Scotland from time immemorial—unless it might be in the mining districts. There may have been some difference there; but in the manufactories, ten hours have always been a day's labor.

Q. You say from time immemorial?—A. Yes; I do not know the time when it was otherwise.

Q. Going right back to the days of trades unions?—A. Yes. The trades unions have never had anything to do in Scotland. There have been strikes there, but never any in the matter of hours. In England there have been strikes regarding the hours of labor; but never in Scotland. The great strikes that I knew of there were for prices.

Q. In what do you understand that this custom of ten hours labor instead of longer hours, as in England, originated—what led to it?—A I do not know, indeed.

Q. Does it go back far in the history of the people?—A. I think it does. The Scotch law is founded upon the Roman law. There are more Roman maxims in it than in the English, and many customs in Scotland can be traced back to the days of the Roman domination in Scotland. That may be a theory, however.

Q. Do you understand that the ten-hour system was in vogue under the old Roman domination?—A. Well, I do not know any other way of tracing it.

Q. Have you knowledge, or do you, understand that this ten-hour rule has existed there for centuries?—A. Oh, yes, sir.

Q. It must have been the Eden of workingmen four or five or six hundred years ago, compared with other parts of the world?—A. Well, it has not been much of an Eden. The dietary in Scotland has never been as high as in England or America. It is now, I suppose, better. I do not know that they grow up any the worse for being confined almost entirely to the simple viands of the table; in some cases almost entirely to oatmeal and mutton broth.

Q. Have the hours of labor been ten among agricultural workers?—A. Yes, sir; that is, common labor.

Q. And just across the line it is twelve or fourteen?—A. Yes; in Lancashire and Yorkshire the hours of labor were longer.

Q. Can you tell how the wages compared before the union?—A. Oh, yes; the wages have been lower than in England.

Q. In proportion to the work done?—A. Yes; the wages in Scotland have always been low—making a general statement.

Q. How do you think the condition of the working people in Scotland was as compared with the same working class in England fifty or sev-
enty-five years ago!—A. In regard to time and education, I should say that the Scotch workman was better than the English, because of this: we have always had the parish school in Scotland, so that a boy need be, and hardly ever was, without the rudiments of education. That has been since the reformation.

Q. And the girl also, I suppose!—A. And the girl also. At the same time, as I have said, the dietary has always been under that of England. So that, taking education and the hours of labor, the Scotchman was better off than the Englishman, at the same time that he never got as much money.

Q. And he never got so good fare!—A. And he never got so good fare.

Q. Was he physically as vigorous as the Englishman?—A. Ch, yes; more vigorous.

Q. Then he may have had more nutritious fare, notwithstanding the plainness.

OATMEAL AS AN ARTICLE OF DIET.

A. The staple of his fare was oatmeal and its various preparations, bread and pudding.

Q. Do you understand why oats have been the cereal relied upon for food to such an extent in Scotland when wheat and other grains grow there?—A. Yes; in some parts of Scotland, in the south of Scotland, and in some particular valleys of Scotland, wheat can be raised, but the staple grain is oats. They raise the best oats in the world.

Q. Better than the Irish!—A. Yes; it has a fuller grain than the Irish. The cultivation of it, I suppose, arose out of the heavy nature of the soil. The soil is not light; it is a heavy, clayey soil, and better adapted for the raising of oats, potatoes, and barley.

THE LAND QUESTION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

Q. How about land holdings in Scotland, their size, &c.?—A. In England and Scotland the land matter is in a very backward state. Of course a man who wants to buy a farm either in England or Scotland can get it, but nobody wants to own a farm there. A farmer would rather hire a farm, just as a store-keeper would rather hire a store. There is always land for sale, but there are not as many buyers as if there were more of it, and men do not have the land hunger there that they have here.

Q. How do the agricultural laborers live? They live as tenants, I suppose?—A. Yes; they usually live as cottagers connected with the farm.

Q. You know something of the productiveness of land in this vicinity. How does it compare with the productiveness of land as you knew it in Scotland, say by the acre? Does it grow as much grass or give as much in value?—A. I do not think much grass is grown in Scotland, because of the humid nature of the atmosphere. It is more adapted to grain crops. Oats are not so liable to mildew as wheat. They will stand more wet weather, and they are a hardier grain altogether, and that may be one reason why oats are so much better adapted to Scotland.

Q. What is the feeling among the common people in these two countries toward each other now? Of course formerly there was a feeling of rivalry, and perhaps something of hate; but how do they feel now?—A. Oh, nobody knows anything about that now.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Q. It has all disappeared? — A. Yes, all disappeared.
Q. They feel like the inhabitants of two adjoining States here? — A. Oh, yes; England and Scotland are very much united, and Scotchmen go to England just as the Irish come to America. William Cobbett gave it as one of the grievances that he had against Scotland that whenever you went into the garden you found an Englishman trimming, and an Irishman digging, and a Scotchman overseeing both. As I have said, the parish school, or institution, has enabled Scotchmen to take positions that others could not take. But all that has become equalized now with regard to education; things have improved greatly since I left; thirty years makes a great change.

THE APPRENTICE SYSTEM.

Q. The apprentice system was well known in Scotland, I suppose, in your time? — A. Yes.
Q. What has become of that? — A. Well, it is still held in England and Scotland. No man is considered to have acquired a trade without having served an apprenticeship.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

Q. Do you find industrial schools developing there? — A. Yes, they do not amount to anything though as independent institutions.
Q. Do you not? — A. No, they use them differently from the ideas they have here on the subject. Take a boy who is learning his trade as a carpenter, serving his time, and coming under the discipline of a shop, a discipline that a school can never give in the world, he comes under the discipline of a shop and learns to do what he is told, under authority. That is one of the things that he learns in his apprenticeship, and he never learns it except in the hurly-burly of a shop. There they take a boy of that kind and place him in their industrial school, and he learns the technicality of his trade; they teach him to make a draft, and every stroke is a gain. I think they have a common-sense way of treating the industrial schools there that we do not seem to have attained here.
Q. We have no apprenticeship system, at least I am not aware that it exists anywhere in this country to an appreciable degree at present; are you? — A. Oh, yes; all the boys down in the machine room and print shop and engraving shop are apprentices.

The Chairman. We have a law in this State—but I am speaking of the country generally—and the apprentice system even in this State, in many common trades, such as the building trades, &c., is hardly known. I suppose they serve an apprenticeship in the machine shop.

The Witness. I do not know; I think it has almost gone out of vogue; and the result is, that when they want skilled labor they have great difficulty in finding it.

Q. You do not think industrial schools could be introduced or would be really efficient? — A. No, sir.
Q. You think that the real place to train a boy is where he has got to earn his living afterward? — A. Yes; he has got to be in a place where a peculiar machine comes to be repaired, and there are no tools in the shop with which to do it. The trained workman should be able to make the tool there, and then adapt it to the peculiar work that is wanted. Now, these exigencies can never arise in a school, never in the world.
They come in the thousand and one incidents of a shop, and that is the training an apprentice should have.

Q. It is really, after all, the difference between theory and practice?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. How would it do to organize these schools in connection with a shop, so as to let them learn the theory and practice together?—A. That could not be done, sir; that is, the theory and practice cannot be learned together. The boy learns the technicalities in the shop, but he does not learn them scientifically. He learns them as they come up. When he goes into the industrial school then he is able to put those technicalities where they belong in a scientific way. He does not become an architect nor a master builder to any extent, but he knows his trade more thoroughly, because he is able to draft.

By the Chairman:

Q. That is, if he learns it in the shop?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Are not these art industries taught in this way in the Cooper Institute?—A. I believe so.

Mr. Pugh. It is pronounced a great success, and overcrowded all the time.

The Chairman. In the Institute of Technology, under General Walker (the former Superintendent of the Census), I have seen the students engaged in the various avocations, in the assaying of metals, for instance. They go through all the processes, and it seems to be a thoroughly practical work. Their hands and faces are smutted by the work, so that they look like men that are really doing business. But all these institutions cost a good deal of money to the students or their parents, and but comparatively few people have the means of maintaining their children in that way. Then these young men do not expect to be privates in the rank and file, but expect to be lieutenants or captains, or in some positions of authority in life. As I have seen them, they are most of them young men of more than average ability, and are being trained to take charge of things rather than to do the practical work.

Mr. Pugh. We had a witness before us in New York, who seemed to have reliable evidence that three hundred and sixty art industrial schools have been established in England by the Government, and about four hundred and seventy in France, and that that institution was the source of education in the art industries of those two countries.

The Witness. It is the apprentice boy who goes to the evening or afternoon sessions of those schools. You know by the factory law, the latest law on the subject, which I think was passed in 1874, no boy under eighteen is allowed to work over-time. So that after he gets out at half past 5 he has abundant time for an evening session at the industrial school.

By the Chairman:

Q. So that that school is really the union of the theoretical with the practical school, as Senator Pugh has suggested?—A. Yes.

Mr. Pugh. That is the idea I would express on that subject—to run the two together.

The Witness. Yes; the idea that the industrial school can ever take
the place of an apprenticeship is a great mistake. It can never be
The boy does not get the discipline that he needs.

Mr. Pugh. I appreciate the reasons you give for the education that
one can get in a shop and in an art industrial school. The training
must be necessarily thoroughly practical in the shop; but the other
would be a good preparation.

The Witness. Yes, to go along with it.

Mr. Pugh. And some system might be devised in this country, such
as exists in England and France, for increasing our art industrial edu-
cation. There is a great want of it in this country. Here you send a
boy to college, and fill him full of Latin and Greek, which disquali-
fies him for all the industrial pursuits.

THE APPRENTICESHIP SYSTEM IN ENGLAND.

The Witness. There is one habit in the apprenticeship of England
and Scotland that does not seem to be understood here. The first year
that a boy is put into a room he is not to be a productive laborer—it is
not expected that his work is to have any money value. His work, gen-
erally the first year, is to run around and do odd jobs for the men. He
will be picking up here and there, and all around, and he gets acquainted
with everything in the shop, knows where everything is laid, and will
carry tools and things back and forth; but he is not set down to any
kind of work. In the best shops too he has a chance of drafting, if he
has any taste at all for it. When he comes to his second year the fore-
man gives him some job to do. It is not until he has been there three
or four years that he gets a job to finish right through, and he begins
then to feel that he is a man, and the employer begins to feel the benefit
of this new manhood, because he has an apprenticeship of perhaps two
years yet to serve, and then he is probably as good as any man in the
shop. The idea here is that as soon as a boy comes into a shop he is
expected to become productive right away, and he has no chance of lay-
ing any kind of foundation.

LABOR-SAVING MACHINERY.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is this enormous and unparalleled development of labor-saving
machinery, as we call it, to continue in time to come as it has gone on
in the last thirty or fifty years, or are we getting somewhere near, or
are we likely at some time to reach, the ultimate of what machinery is
to come to, so that there may be a permanent labor status in the future,
such as labor was before the invention of all these machines?—A. I do
not think that it can go much farther, sir. We have the steam loom
and the engraving machine, and the printing machine, and I really do
not see anything beyond that. I have seen all that has gone before these
things from my boyhood. There may be improvements in the prin-
ciples of these machines, and in their details, but I do not see anything
beyond them.

Q. You do not apprehend that this transition period is to continue!—
A. No; I find in my observation that there has been rather a recession
than an advance—a going back to old ideas.

Q. To old employments?—A. To old methods; yes.

Q. And to old machines?—A. Well, not old machines, but old methods
of work. For example, in engraving: some twenty-five years ago when
the penograph machine came out I knew a printer who sold off all the
machinery he had of the older style of engraving, and introduced the new. He had not a single specimen of the old engraving machines left. Since then the old style has been coming up, because there are some sorts of goods that can only be produced by the older method; and we are even going farther back than that; and down at the calico works here we are engraving some by hand, and engraving what was done one hundred and fifty years ago. So I think we have got just about as far as we can go.

SUBDIVISION OF LABOR.

Q. This matter of the subdivision of labor that we hear so much of—do you think that it is likely to go on and on?—A. I do not think that that will go any farther, either. It is found that a man who is only acquainted with one item of a branch is not a productive workman.

Q. It is found so?—A. Yes, because he will by and by have to step over the border of his experience and do something that will be productive in another line. That has been carried as far as possible in England; and I suppose in some departments here it is found so. The man that grinds the knives of Sheffield cannot do anything else. He cannot temper steel. But then these two operations are different; the line is sufficiently broad.

Q. So that the time will probably come, unless new forces and new natural principles should be evolved to accomplish the ends required by the necessities of life—and unless electricity, or some other natural force, should come in to be applied, you think the laborer can expect that the perfection of labor-saving machinery has been obtained, or will soon be obtained, and that he will not be thrown constantly out of employment, as he has been in the past, by the introduction of new machines to do his work for him?—A. I don’t know, I am sure, what to say about that. The mere laborer has been the sufferer in the operation hitherto. The general public has been the gainer.

Q. And the laborer as a member of the public, but not otherwise?—A. Well, he indirectly gains it. He gets a piece of calico a little cheaper, certainly; but the trade that he formerly made a good wage from as a skilled workman has entirely disappeared.

The CHAIRMAN. It is just that question that I was thinking of—whether trades and pursuits are to be suddenly swallowed up as by an earthquake, when some improvement comes along.

The WITNESS. There are two branches in the printing that have entirely disappeared. I do not suppose possessors of the knowledge can now be found anywhere. They might possibly be found in some parts of Scotland or England, but certainly nowhere else. The block-cutter, the man who carved the figures in wood, or who made them in copper by driving a thin piece of copper into wood and smoothing it over, the man that made the block, and the man that printed it, are gone. Those two branches have entirely disappeared from calico printing.

Q. Something else comes in, I suppose, that answers the same purpose?—A. There is a printing machine that will print a piece a minute, instead of a man taking probably five hours to print a piece.

Q. Now, a man learns to manage that machine?—A. Yes.

Q. And that becomes his means of support?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you think that that process is to be repeated over and over again, and so displace him again?—A. No; I do not think that any machine will ever come up that will do the work of the fifty men that are running these machines. It would take fifty block printers to do the work of one machine, but then there is this one compensation (I sup-
pose all evils bring with them a certain compensation), the goods that were made in those olden times never wore out. After being washed twenty years, they were just as pretty and bright as ever. Now a woman in the West or South, after wearing a dress in wet weather, undertakes to wash it, and when she gets through, there won't be much to represent the labor.

Q. It disappears in the form of dirty water?—A. It becomes so sickly and pale that it is offensive to the eye.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

ARETAS BLOOD examined.

By Mr. PUGH:

Question. You understand what information the committee desires from you. We are investigating questions affecting labor and capital; the condition of the laborer, his wages, how he lives, and, generally, we should be glad to have such information regarding the industries of this place and relations of the capital and labor, as you consider pertinent and important to state to the committee. In the first place, however, we should be glad if you would state the opportunities you have enjoyed for acquiring information and forming opinions on those subjects; stating at the same time the business in which you are engaged, and for how long you have been engaged in it.

THE MANUFACTURE OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINES.

Answer. I have been in business here since 1854. I commenced in a small way and am still operating in a small way compared with some concerns, but we are probably the largest locomotive concern in this State. In fact, I believe there is no other locomotive shop in the State.

Q. How long have you been running the shop?—A. Since 1854. It was started by individuals in the first place. There were four of us—O. W. Bailey, William D. Means, Joseph M. Stone, and myself. We were the company, and the name of our establishment was the "Vulcan Works." We ran that way for a year and then became incorporated.

Q. What is the name of the corporation?—A. The Manchester Locomotive Works. We ran until 1857. In that year the works were shut up for one year.

Q. You resumed a year after you shut up?—A. Yes, I resumed business myself. I leased the works. During that time business all through this country was very dull, and the parties that started with me—that is, the other gentlemen concerned—sought business otherwise, and I took the old shop. I think I carried on the business personally for about a year or a little more, as nearly as I can recollect, and then the company resumed business again under the name of the Manchester Locomotive Works; I rather think we started in 1858. We sent out a dozen or fifteen locomotives in 1858, and increased from that time up to the time the war broke out, to perhaps sixty or seventy locomotives. Meantime we were enlarging the works, and brought them up to the capacity of about one hundred and fifty locomotives a year.

Q. What year was that?—A. That was soon after the war broke out—1861. Meantime we were enlarging our works—probably to three times the capacity of what they were when we started—and have a capacity
now of about one hundred and fifty locomotives a year, with about six hundred and fifty men.

Q. That is the number you employ now?—A. No, sir; we are not employing to-day more than about four hundred and fifty. Two years ago we had six hundred and fifty to six hundred and sixty men, and in 1882 we had about six hundred and fifty men. In 1883 business commenced to slack up, and has slacked up to the present time. As near as I can recollect, I think we have turned out ninety-eight locomotives in 1883.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Up to this time?—A. Yes.

STEAM FIRE-ENGINES.

About the year 1877 we took on a little additional business besides locomotives—steam fire-engines; what is known as the "Amoskeag steam fire-engines." Of course that would take away some of the business from the locomotive department. The probability is that we employ seventy-five to eighty men on steam fire-engines at present.

Q. Those are such as we saw on the street on Saturday?—A. Yes.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. You make steam fire-engines now as well as locomotives?—A. Yes.

Q. How do your locomotives stand as compared with others?—A. Well, I think we have a fair reputation. We generally get the preference where our engines have been used.

Q. Do you find a market here for all you make?—A. Oh, no; I don't suppose we sell more than one-tenth of our product in New England. We sell to the West, Oregon, and Mexico. This present summer we shipped twenty locomotives to Oregon. We have six on the road now, going to Portland, Oreg., over the Northern Pacific road. Previous to that, when sending engines away, we were compelled to first build them up, that is, to put them together, then take them all down and box the parts and ship them, which was a pretty tedious job, besides being expensive.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How do you get them there now?—A. They go by the Northern Pacific Railroad from here to Saint Paul.

Q. How do they run?—A. They run on their own wheels.

Q. You start them on their own wheels for Portland, Oreg.?—A. Yes; it is two weeks to-morrow since we sent out six.

Q. How do they go; do they take a train with them, or go on without a train?—A. They take no train. We send a messenger with them, one man to every two engines, to keep them oiled up and in good condition.

Q. They make a train by themselves, then—a train of engines?—A. Well, if they would put them all on one train, they would go that way, but the road wouldn't do that. They don't care to put any more than two engines on one train. Sometimes they put in four, but when they do that they put them separate, so as to have several cars between each two. The engine and tender, you see, will weigh 106,000 or 108,000 pounds, and if you put two of those engines together and run them across some of the bridges of this country, they might get into trouble. It would be a great weight on a bridge.
AMERICAN LOCOMOTIVES EXPOR TED TO CANADA.

I have built a great many engines for the Canadians. We build quite a number for that section, notwithstanding the high tariff that they have to pay on them. The skilled labor here will enable us, with our labor, to compete with the Canadians in building locomotives.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You say, "Notwithstanding the high tariff"?—A. Yes; they have to pay 33 per cent. duty on locomotives going into Canada.

Q. In order to get the engines in there?—A. Yes; that is, at the present time, unless they are for a government road. I rather think a government road does not pay any duties. I know that in 1873 we built sixty engines for the Grand Trunk road, and there were no duties paid on them. Sometimes we take a contract, and agree to pay the duties ourselves, knowing what the duties will be. Of course we add that to the cost of the engines, but usually we prefer to build them and deliver them here, and let the other people take care of them afterwards.

FOREIGN LOCOMOTIVES IMPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES.

Q. Are any foreign locomotives ever imported into this country?—A. Oh, yes; when we first began to build railroads locomotives were imported. The first engines that they had on the Boston and Lowell road were foreign engines. Engines that would weigh from 12 to 16 tons in those days were considered large engines. Now we scarcely build an engine of less than 33 tons, and the weight is increasing.

Q. There must be a limit reached soon, I suppose?—A. Yes, I should say so; indeed the limit, I think, is reached already. I think the locomotives being built to-day are too heavy for most of the railroad tracks. But still there is this immense business to be done, and it requires power to do it.

Q. And you cannot get the necessary friction without great weight in the engine?—A. No, sir; they are building locomotives at the present time with cylinders as much as 22 inches in diameter, and it was rarely that an engine was built ten years ago of more than 16 inches diameter of cylinder. We could not haul the trains on our road here at home with an engine of less than 17 or 18 inches cylinder. The cylinder of a locomotive fixes the dimensions of all the other parts. When a railroad specifies the size of the cylinder all the other proportions of the engine have to be left to the builder.

DEMAND FOR LOCOMOTIVES.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Do you make enough engines to supply the demand that you have for your own engines—could you sell more than you make?—A. Well, in 1881 and 1882 I could have sold quite a number more, but at present all the locomotive shops can more than supply the demand.

SOURCES OF MATERIAL FOR MANUFACTURE OF LOCOMOTIVES.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where do the materials entering into the manufacture of a locomotive come from?—A. From our own country. Most of the iron comes from Pennsylvania. All the steel that I put into locomotives comes from Nashua.
Q. It is made from American iron there?—A. It is American steel. Most of the boilers of locomotives, at present, are made of steel. The engines have steel tires and steel axles, which twelve years ago was something unknown in this country, or rather was perhaps known but not used.

Q. How is it as to the application of the steel tire to the steel rail, or the steel tire to the iron rail.

STEEL COMPARED WITH IRON, FOR LOCOMOTIVES.

A. I should suppose that in the case of a steel tire or a steel rail, the adhesion would be fully as great as with an iron tire; in fact, we cannot use an iron tire at the present time. Previous to the use of the steel tires they used what was called a Low-Moor tire; but a Low-Moor tire, with the business that they have to do with locomotives today, wouldn’t last more than a year before it would have to be replaced.

Q. It would be crushed by the weight?—A. It would be crushed and worn out, the material being so much softer. It was a great improvement when the steel tire was introduced.

Q. Is the steel tire more destructive to the iron rail than the iron tire to the iron rail?—A. I don’t think it is, but railroads are seldom built now with iron rails.

Q. Is the steel more inclined to slip on the steel surface than it would be on an iron surface?—A. Well, I don’t know as the adhesion would be quite as great; I don’t think it would.

Q. Does the tariff legislation affect the locomotive business any?—A. I don’t know that I can answer that question intelligently. There is some reduction in materials in the last year or year and a half, but I attribute that to the demand. There is not so great a demand. The demand is probably one-half what it was. In fact, there are quite a number of locomotive shops in the country that haven’t much of anything to do, and consequently material reduces, and prices for the machines are reduced.

Q. It seems that you are able to manufacture locomotives from American materials at present and previous prices, and to sell them to Canadians—they paying a high tariff or customs duty?—A. Yes; we do that. I presume there have been more than three hundred locomotives shipped into Canada this present year from different concerns, but that may be attributed partly to the demand there, and the fact that there are not shops enough there for the supply.

Q. There must have been an immense amount of railroad building in Canada.

LOCOMOTIVE WORKS IN CANADA.

A. Ten years ago there was not more than one locomotive works in Canada of any note; that was the Kingston Locomotive Works. Today I believe there are four establishments, one of them being in Montreal.

Q. I suppose the capacity has been also increasing?—A. Oh, yes; but to what extent I could not say.

NUMBER OF LOCOMOTIVES IN THE UNITED STATES.

Q. Have you any idea how many engines or locomotives there are in use on the railroads of this country at the present time?—A. No; I have not. I suppose there are some eighty or ninety railroads in operation.
The Chairman. I understand that in Poor's last manual there are said to be 113,000 miles of railroad in the United States.

The Witness. Very likely. The calculation is that on every good railroad, doing a good business; there is a locomotive for every four miles of rail. If that is so, there must be over twenty-five thousand locomotives.

The Chairman. The information conveyed to us was that since that estimate the mileage has been increased to about 120,000 miles, but all these miles are probably not in very active operation. If they were, however, figuring it up on your basis, there would be about thirty thousand locomotives, would there not?

The Witness. Yes.

**LIFETIME OF A LOCOMOTIVE.**

By the Chairman:

Q. I have not much idea how long a locomotive lasts. I suppose they have a life-time fixed for a locomotive as well as for other machines?—A. Oh, yes. I suppose a locomotive would run twelve years; that is to say, the boiler of the locomotive will give out first of anything. It will want renewing every ten or twelve years. Then there would be different parts of the machine that would want redressing or refinishing, and would then last perhaps a life-time, some parts of it. But they calculate that the expense on a locomotive will amount to the cost in about ten or twelve years; but that would depend a good deal upon how the engine was used. On some roads they take a locomotive and run it night and day, using two sets of men for it, and then run it just as long as it will possibly run. That is Vanderbilt's principle, to run the locomotive as long as it will run. But I don't suppose the way they run here the engines will average more than six or eight hours a day in constant use.

Q. But such, you say, as they are, they will last ten or twelve years, on an average, of actual life?—A. Yes.

Q. Then, if there are about thirty thousand in this country they will wear out at the rate of about three thousand a year?—A. Yes.

Q. And the simple consumption by use will extinguish so many locomotives every year, and, of course, give a pretty large quantity to supply?—A. Yes; but there are a great many railroads in the country that build their own locomotives.

Q. They enter into competition with you?—A. Yes; for instance, the Pennsylvania Railroad builds all their own locomotives, and have done so for years—all, or nearly all. Sometimes they get close and have to buy a few, but they calculate to build all of their locomotives. Some of the roads have just as good facilities for building as anybody in the country.

Q. Now, how can you build locomotives up here, where there is no iron, in competition with the locomotives which can be built in the iron regions?—A. We have to be satisfied with less profit. I think that is the only way we could do it. I think we have an advantage, though, in labor here in the Northern States. Labor is more vigorous here, and the men can perform a better day's work.

**DEMAND FOR STEAM FIRE-ENGINES.**

Q. How much is the demand for steam fire-engines? Is that increasing or otherwise?—A. That is increasing. I don't make any effort to
push that business very much. I guess we would average about twenty
steam fire-engines a year at the present time, but then that is no busi-
ness at all to be compared with the locomotive business.

Q. And it is not likely to expand very much, I suppose?—A. No; the
largest cities that we have do not have many fire-engines. New York
has about sixty steam fire-engines, I think, and fifty-five of them are of
the Amoskeag make.

Q. Fifty-five of them are your make?—A. They are of the Amoskeag
make; I did not make them all, but they were made by the Amoskeag
and Manchester Locomotive Works. Boston has twenty-five or twenty-
six.

Q. How many of those in Boston were made here in Manchester?—
A. Twenty-four, I think.

SUPERIORITY OF AMERICAN LOCOMOTIVES.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Are not the American locomotives superior to any that are made
in any other country?—A. Far superior to any that I have ever seen,
whether for speed or freight purposes.

Q. Or for durability?—A. Or for durability. In England they have
made some improvements, but they have not made the improvements that
have been made in this country. This country is far ahead of Europe
for railroad purposes, not only in the cars and the locomotives, but in
everything whatever pertaining to a railroad. There are but few Pull-
man cars used in the old country. Their cars are constructed on the
same plan as the cars of the first railroad ever built in America—the
road from Schenectady to Albany—Peter Cooper's train. That was in
1837 and 1838.

WAGES IN MANCHESTER LOCOMOTIVE WORKS.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What wages do you pay your operatives?—A. We pay all prices.
We have different classes of operatives. For machinists, I should say we
pay from $2 to $3 per day, depending upon how good they are. Our
pay roll will probably average about $1.62 to $1.65, including all the
labor; that is, including yard-men, apprentices, and everything. The
apprentices we pay 75 cents, 92 cents, and $1.08 per day; we take them
as boys at sixteen or seventeen years of age.

Q. Are your workmen men of families, to any great extent?—A. Yes;
quite a number of them. Several families that are here commenced
when we commenced operations.

Q. In 1854?—A. Yes; a few, not a great many.
Q. You say some of your workmen are men of family, and some
were with you when you began who still remain with you?—A. Yes.
Q. Have they, or have they not, as a rule, been able to accumulate
anything beyond a mere living?—A. Oh, yes; certainly; most of them
have got homesteads or small farms. Some of them live out four or five
miles away from the city now.

Q. How do they get into their work?—A. They drive in with horses.
Q. Their own horses?—A. Yes.

THE HOUR SYSTEM OF LABOR AND WAGES.

Q. How many hours, work a day do they do for you; or do they work
by the piece?—A. They work by the hour; I have no piece-work at all.
Q. I am glad to find somebody that has reduced that plan to practice; how does it work?—A. It works well with me.

Q. Why did you adopt that system; I suppose that you have worked the other way—by the day!—A. When we first started the works, eleven hours were a day's work; then the ten-hour question was agitated, and I started in working by the hour, ten, twelve, or fifteen years ago. I could tell you exactly when it was if I were at the office; but I cannot tell you exactly now. If a man wants to lose an hour, by this system he may do so; it makes more trouble and detail for the bookkeeper to keep the time, than if a man worked by the day, but if a man does not want to lose a day or half a day he can go out and lose his hour, or he can lose his day or half a day, just as he pleases.

Q. How long do they generally work, from choice?—A. I think the majority of them will average ten hours. I run some time twelve hours. I have not run this summer twelve hours; but the wages are fixed by the hour. If we pay a man 30 cents an hour, and he works two extra hours, he gets his pay for it.

Q. Why is not that rule the proper and best solution of the question as to hours and length of a day's work?—A. I think it is, so far as I am concerned, and the men, too; they like it generally.

Q. I suppose that in some kinds of business they could not adopt it?—A. Not so well.

Q. Could they adopt that, do you think, in factories; could they make it work if they saw fit to apply it?—A. Well, I don't know why they could not; the factories, however, are different. They work by the piece; and those that work by the piece, I should think, would like it quite as well.

Q. If the employers allow work by the piece, why could they not as well permit it to be done by the hour? When they work by the piece, operators can quit whenever they please, can they not?—A. I suppose they do that now; but if they quit now, they lose a quarter or a half, or three-quarters of a day, or a whole day. If they work by the hour they need not go out for more than one hour, if they don't want to. The greatest fear I had from it was that perhaps a great number would not want to come in the first hour; but then that is easily enough managed.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. When do you make your payments of wages?—A. Once a month, the third Wednesday in every month.

STRIKES.

Q. Do you have any trouble with these strike difficulties that affect some parts of the country?—A. No; I never have had; I never had a strike; I don't believe in strikes.

Q. How could they be prevented?—A. Well, sometimes I don't think they can be prevented; for instance, this strike they had on the Boston and Maine Railroad, at the time that MacArthur, if you remember, and all the engineers struck. They could not prevent that strike. It cost the Boston and Maine road thousands of dollars. But they got over it, and not one of those engineers has gone back on that railroad since, and never will, as long as the present management is in existence. I happen to know all about that. This MacArthur got a hold of those men and got them fixed up and told them stories, I suppose, and they really thought that if they would strike they would get their wages
advanced to whatever sum they might name. But he was disappointed. By that time there were a great many shops that struck. Baldwin's works struck, and that is the largest in this country; and the Rogers works struck, and there was some talk of a strike here; but it originated with a few old ring-leaders. I found out who they were, and I went to them and told them that I thought I had always treated them well; that we were paying them the best wages we could, and all there was to it was that if they could not work for the Manchester Locomotive Works, the best way for them was to go somewhere else, and that if they did strike we should shut the concern down and would not start it again with the present men. We didn't have any strike.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Have you ever reduced wages?—A. Oh, yes; I have reduced wages two or three times, but to-day I think the wages are fully as high, or nearly as high, as they were during war times. During the war wages were very high; material was very high, and locomotives advanced from $8,000 to $33,000 within six months' time; the materials in proportion.

Q. Over 400 per cent. —A. Yes; I paid for common iron during the war 7 cents a pound—such iron as I can buy to-day for 2 cents, and everything else was in proportion. Copper and tin were enormously high, and a great deal of copper and tin go into a locomotive. Tin was then 45 or 50 cents a pound; to-day it is about 19 cents a pound.

MATERIALS AND PRICES OF LOCOMOTIVES.

Q. What are the materials that enter into the building of a locomotive?—A. Iron, steel, copper, tin, antimony, and almost everything in the line of metals, except gold and silver. At the present time, I think that half of the material in a locomotive is steel. For instance, the boilers, most of them, are steel, and the boiler of a large sized locomotive will weigh about 12,000 to 15,000 pounds. In fact, some of the roads feel able to pay for steel tenders, steel track, steel wheels, and steel tires, and the difference in price between the steel-tire wheel and the common cast-iron chilled wheel is 10 for the one and about 65 for the other. But some roads think it is economy to buy a steel wheel, because it lasts much longer and is safer.

Q. What are your best locomotives sold for? I ought to say right here that I don't want you to answer that question, or any question of any kind, if for any reason you prefer not to do so.—A. The best locomotives were selling three years ago for $14,000.

Q. Of that $14,000, about how would the cost be divided between materials of the various kinds, and labor, how much would be labor, how much iron, how much steel, how much copper, how much tin, and how much antimony?—A. I couldn't answer that question here, but all the materials would be, perhaps, five times as much as the labor.

Q. But these materials themselves would represent a great deal of labor that was done before you took hold of them?—A. Oh, yes; of course.

Q. You mean that they would represent five times the amount of your labor?—A. Yes; my labor would not be more than one-fifth after these materials were produced—copper, tin, iron, &c.

Q. Between two and three thousand dollars then of labor enters into the make-up of a first-class engine?—A. Yes.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYÉS.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. We are taking some pains to learn, if we can, what is the general feeling between the wage-working people and those who employ them, in different parts of the country. We would like to know what the relations between the employers and the employés are, not alone in your business, but in business generally in Manchester, and what they have hitherto been?—A. Well, I should say that they had been generally very harmonious between employers and employés. They certainly have been with me.

Q. You say you have never had any strikes yourself; have there been strikes of any serious importance here in the city since you have been in business here?—A. No; I don’t think there have been.

Q. In any kind of business?—A. None.

Q. Is there any legislation that Congress might enact that occurs to you as desirable, bearing on the labor question in your business or in any other business in the country?—A. Well, I don’t know that there is.

EXPORT OF LOCOMOTIVES.

Q. Speaking of selling locomotives abroad, you mentioned Canada and Mexico. Have Americans exported locomotives to any other part of the world?—A. Oh, certainly, yes.

Q. What extent or to what countries?—A. I have never exported to any other foreign country, but there have been quite a number of locomotives exported to Russia and other foreign countries. I remember that they once built locomotives in Lowell. I believe that about the first that were built in New England—perhaps the very first—were built at Lowell and sent to Russia, in years past. Baldwin’s works and Rogers’ works have exported them.

Q. Are there any other locomotive works in New England besides yours?—A. Yes; there are two in Taunton, one in Boston, and one in Portland; I guess that is all of any importance.

Q. You are connected with one of the banking institutions of the city?—A. Yes.

Q. What bank are you president of?—A. The Second National Bank.

Q. Do you have a savings bank in connection with it?—A. Yes.

SAVINGS OF MACHINISTS.

Q. How is it as to your having among your depositors any of the working people of the city?—A. There are quite a number of people that work in the city that deposit there—a great many of my own men deposit there.

Q. Without giving the names have you any objection to stating the amounts of the deposits in some instances—the larger ones, for example—laboring people that you know of, either at your bank or at other banks?—A. I don’t know that I can give you the amounts of any particular ones, but there are some mechanics that have large deposits in the savings banks.

Q. Take the mechanics that have worked steadily along and have acquired something in addition to maintaining their families and have acquired that money by their work—what have they saved from it; how much money do you know to have been so acquired by men of, say, forty-five to fifty or sixty years of age?—A. I don’t know that I can say
exactly, but there are some men that are working for me to-day that have in houses that cost from three to four thousand dollars, and some of their farms cost that amount. There may be some of them that have got $10,000 or $12,000, for all I know.

Q. They ought to have that to correspond with the dwellings they occupy, I suppose?—A. Yes.

Q. Those would be savings—accumulations from their earnings?—A. Yes.

Q. And they are men of families, and have supported their families besides?—A. Yes.

PROPORTION OF “JOINT PRODUCT” GOING TO WAGE-WORKERS.

Q. We are instructed to inquire substantially this, whether the wage-working people got their fair share of the result of the joint effort of capital and labor in production—whether they get their proportion or whether capital gets more than belongs to it. Now, as you have done business for the last thirty years, taking it from one end of the term to the other, do you or do you not think that the wage-working people have got a fair proportion of the production?—A. Well, I should say that they had, in this section, at least.

Q. And how as to their condition to-day as compared with what it was then, and generally has been, all the way down to the present time; is it improving or growing worse?—A. I should say it was improving.

Q. Are any of your employés foreigners?—A. Yes; I have some Frenchmen now.

Q. Please tell us your experience with the French population.—A. They are rather an itinerant class of people, fluctuating, going and coming all the time. They come for a few months, and then off they go.

Q. While they do work, how do they work?—A. They are very industrious while they are at work. There are no very good mechanics among them; we don't get any machinists among them. They are what are called “strikers” in the forge shop; they use the sledge, and help in the yard as common laborers. I don't think I have a machinist at all who is a Frenchman. I have employed them, but they want to go and come so frequently that you cannot do business with them; they are going and coming to and from Canada four and five times a year generally.

Q. They are generally employed in the factories, are they not?—A. Yes; I guess the women work steadier than the men do in the factories. They are a class of people that need watching a good deal in a shop; but at any rate I don't know of any good mechanics among them.

Q. Do you think it is because they have not been well instructed in that respect, or because their powers are not of a mechanical order?—A. I don't think their inclination is to that sort of work.

Q. You think their inclination is to other forms of work—agricultural work and the like?—A. Yes; they do for assistants—helpers.

Q. Speaking of their coming and going, it is said that they are particularly careful to save their money for investment in their former homes. How do you find that?—A. I suppose that many of them have come here for work, having homes elsewhere.

Q. And come here to raise money to pay off the mortgages?—A. Yes; they come here and generally bring their families with them, and make money to pay off mortgages on their farms; taking it pretty easy otherwise.

Q. Which we should, as a rule, think it a pretty bright thing to do, should we not?—A. Well, yes; I suppose so.
PERSON C. CHENEY examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You reside in Manchester?—Answer. Yes; and have been here for about seventeen years.

Q. And before that where did you reside?—A. I have resided in this county about forty-five years.

Q. You have lived in the State during your whole life-time?—A. Yes; I was born in what is now Ashland.

Q. During what years were you governor of the State?—A. Eighteen hundred and seventy-five and 1876.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am a manufacturer of paper.

Q. How long have you been a paper-maker?—A. I have always been such from my boyhood; my father was a paper manufacturer before me. That has always been my principal business.

PAPER-MAKING; ITS HISTORY AND PROGRESS.

Q. I would like you to give us a little history of this paper-making industry, the condition it was in when you were a boy, and the progress that has been made in it since—leading into the direction of the manufacture of paper from wood, which is your own process, I believe.—A. In part, yes. Paper as long ago as I can remember was manufactured by hand, as I have a faint recollection; the sheets were dipped on wires.

Q. On the principle that a candle is made by dipping?—A. No; but put into a copper wire sieve like, and dipped out in sheets. I have just a faint recollection of seeing that done in my father's mill.

Q. Where was that mill?—A. That was in Ashland.

Q. That is about 70 miles north of here?—A. Yes. I left Ashland when I was seven years old. This was prior to that time. Paper was then hung up in lofts to dry. That was before the days even of the 'fire-dryers,' as they are termed. The first process of drying paper was by a large cylinder, perhaps 5 to 6 feet in diameter, with a stove in the inside, heating the cylinder up to the required heat, the paper passing over it—using a cloth on the paper. That process was adopted very soon after my father went to Peterborough in 1835. One of the first things he did was to put in what was termed a 'fire-dryer' for drying the paper continuously—coming right from the wet paper and going right through and cutting off the sheets dry. It was done in a very small way at that time. I suppose the product of that mill at that time could not have been, perhaps, more than 600 or 700 pounds a day.

Q. What was the material used?—A. They made all kinds of paper, used all kinds of material. They made book paper, straw paper, and rag paper—a great variety of paper. My father made a great variety of book paper and news paper. Book paper was made from white rags in those days largely, news paper was made from the better grade of colored rags. The market was very limited, and the supply was also limited. The mills in the State at that time were all doing business in a very small way, and this industry has increased gradually from time to time until it has met the wants of the market, and has to-day become quite a large industry. I think there are perhaps to-day some twenty-five different machines that are manufacturing over 60 tons of paper a day in this State, and, I should think, giving employment to about seven hundred hands. I am not quite clear in my recollection as to what the value of the product is, but I think nearly $2,000,000 per annum.
Q. What proportion of the product is your own manufacture?—A. We manufacture here about 7 tons a day. We have manufactured as high as 8½ tons in a day, but the average production would be nearly 6 tons a day, taking the year through. You understand that paper mills run twenty-four hours a day.

Q. With two sets of hands?—A. Yes, for all that is done by machinery, but a great majority of the help is used in preparation, so that there would be a comparatively small number that would work nights, as few as we can get along with.

HOURS OF LABOR IN A PAPER MILL.

Q. How about your labor and the hours of labor and the compensation of the help in your employ?—A. Our help that work half the night and half the day are supposed to be in on time and work twelve hours, although they do not generally get in more than eleven and a half hours, nor indeed more than eleven hours, because they go out to tea at 5 o’clock. They would not usually work more than eleven hours, but they change about so as to make up their full time. The rest of our help would not exceed ten hours. Through the winter months they would not reach even that. This is a necessity of the business that leads to the continuous running of the machinery, but in the summer season the most of our help, mechanics and common laborers and bleachmen, and all of the outside help, commence at 7 o’clock in the morning and leave off at 12; commence again at 1 and leave off at 6. That comprises the great majority of our help. I should think three-quarters of them work that way.

Q. Do you ever employ any but full-grown men?—A. Yes, we have quite a number of females; we have but a very few boys.

WAGES IN A PAPER MILL.

Q. What wages do these men, women, and boys make?—A. Well we have, for instance, women who sort the waste, or rags, or whatever the stock may be; they work by the hour, and the pay is based on 7 cents an hour; they usually sort ten hours a day; that is as long as we should allow them to sort—from 7 to 12 and from 1 to 6.

Q. Would you not consider it consistent with their health to work longer?—A. Well, it is our custom and we rather adhere to that rule.

Q. Would there be any inclination to work longer for an increase of pay?—A. That is a matter that has never come up; they know that they cannot work longer. It would not work well in the winter, because we could not light up very well in that work. Our other laborers, the mechanics for instance, that we keep about our mills, five iron workmen, I think, and five carpenters; their pay would average all the way from $1.75 to $3.50, a day. I think we have 1 man now as low as $1.50, so that we run from $1 to $3.50 according to their experience and worth, and their adaptability to the business.

Q. Did you mention the boys’ pay?—A. I think we have two or three boys.

Q. They are not an essential element in the business?—A. They are not an essential element.

Q. How do these prices that you pay enable them to live, as to shelter
and food and clothing—the essentials of life!—A. I don't know of any reason why they should not live very respectably and very comfortably. In fact I think they do. I think the average price paid in our paper mills is about $1.43. That includes women, and those who get no more than 75 cents a day.

Q. Is that work of yours continuous, or is it interrupted from time to time?—A. It is continuous, steady work; there is very little lost time.

Q. How many do you employ of all descriptions of labor?—A. I think we have in our mills here slightly over one hundred—from one hundred to one hundred and twenty.

Q. Have you ever had any trouble with your workmen in the way of strikes?—A. No, we have never had anything of that sort; never had any feeling of dissatisfaction expressed whatever.

Q. Of what nativity are your work people as a rule?—A. We have some of our own (Yankee) help; we have Irish and English, and I think we have a few French.

FRENCH CANADIANS AS LABORERS.

Q. There are a great many of the French people in the city, are they not?—A. Yes.

Q. What would you say of this French population here as you know it, as an element in our manufacturing industry here and elsewhere?—A. I can only speak of my own experience; it has been quite satisfactory. They, perhaps, change a little more than the others, but I have had one man that has been with me six or eight years, and I have never seen any disposition or inclination in him to make any change at all.

Q. They are honest, thrifty, and industrious, are they, while they do work?—A. So far as my experience has gone with them, I don't know but what they are. I have not had so much experience with that class as others have had.

Q. I suppose if you should take the French population out of Manchester it would affect your industries, would it not?—A. Yes; they would have to be replaced by others, and I don't know how that could be done very well. We suffer a little, perhaps, on account of being so accessible to Canada. They come and go a great deal.

The CHAIRMAN. We have made inquiry of some witnesses as to whether there is any growing tendency among the French Canadians to remain in this country permanently, and many think that there is such an inclination; that they are buying some real estate and disposing themselves to settle permanently.

The WITNESS. Yes; I should be inclined to think so too. I have a Frenchman who is a carpenter, and he has been in my employ for six years, and has done very well.

Q. That is a different line of mechanism, I suppose?—A. Yes; probably the French people have had no good chance to learn the machinists' trade under good instruction.

Mr. BLOOD. I don't think the Canadian French have had.

The WITNESS. I have not had so much experience with the French nationality as others have had, with the exception of common laborers, two or three years ago, when I was building mills.

Q. These several nationalities seem to get on harmoniously together—the French, the Irish, the English, the German, &c.!—A. Oh, yes, they work all together; I never saw any antagonistic feeling among my help, and I have had all kinds of help.
METHODS OF MANUFACTURE OF PAPER.

Q. Please state something of the material that enters into the composition of paper; what changes have taken place in the process of manufacturing since the early days; what changes in the price of the commodity from the time when you were a young man to the present time; what the reduction in the cost has been to the consumer as the result of the improved processes, and describe those processes; not at great length, but in such a way as you think fit.—A. Paper, as all understand, was formerly made of rags and material of that kind. It has only been within a dozen or fifteen years that wood has been introduced largely as an element in the manufacture of paper in this country.

Q. How did that come about?—A. It came about in the first instance from the experience of foreign manufacturers, as in Germany, for example. We patterned after the experience of other countries in that respect.

Q. What kinds of woods are now used in the manufacture of paper, and to what extent do they enter into its composition?

WOOD PULP—THE MECHANICAL AND CHEMICAL PROCESSES.

A. Wood is used in various forms. In this State the interest has heretofore been very largely mechanical; that is to say, the manufacture of paper here was by the "mechanical process." The mechanical process is one process of treating wood, while another process is called the "chemical process." In the mechanical process the wood is ground from the log by mechanical means. By the chemical process it is treated with chemicals.

Q. And disintegrated?—A. Yes, disintegrated. Both of these processes are very largely on the increase, not only in this State, but all throughout the country. I think the two interests are now about even in this State, although the mechanical process has been the principal one up to a very recent period. Latterly they are treating wood chemically to quite a large extent.

Q. That separates the wood into long, stringy fiber?—A. Yes; without destroying the fiber.

Q. What do you do with the fiber in that condition?—A. You can make very fine sheets of paper out of chemically treated wood; you can have it strong; the system preserves the fiber. By the mechanical process, the grinding of the wood off, of course, injures the fiber more or less; still our ordinary newspapers are made of mechanical wood pulp, and the materials of each will vary. Take papers like the Manchester (N. H.) Mirror; probably 75 per cent. of that is mechanical wood pulp. The Boston Journal, the Boston Herald, and the New York Times, and most of the leading daily papers use paper made from mechanical wood pulp. I suppose the percentage might vary from 65 to 85 per cent.

Q. What kinds of wood?—A. It may be poplar, spruce, or pine. In white papers it would be usually confined to poplar and spruce—on papers such as I have referred to here—newspapers. But, in other kinds of paper, pine may be used very successfully, but that would have to be submitted to treatment, to a cooking process—a boiling process—not to the extent of calling it a chemical process, but simply a steaming or boiling process.

Q. Does wood enter into the manufacture of writing paper in these times?—A. Yes.
Q. To what extent?—A. I am not prepared to say to what extent, but the effect of the introduction of wood pulp into the paper trade has been to so reduce the price on other kinds of stock as not to make it of any special object for anybody to use wood; that is, it is really on a level with other grades of stock. There has been so much of it that it is all classed side by side.

Q. You could use wood unless the other stock came down in price!—A. Yes. What I mean to say by that is, that the man who uses wood has no advantage over the man who uses stock, because the introduction of wood has reduced the price of stock to the extent of equalizing the price of both.

Q. Yet to the consumer it has been of great consequence!

REDUCTION OF PRICE OF PAPER Owing TO INTRODUCTION OF WOOD.

A. It has lessened the price of paper one-half.

Q. Within these last twelve years?—A. Yes, within that time.

Q. There is good reason, then, why newspapers that have sold all along for 4 cents should be sold now for 2?—A. Yes; there was an order taken in New York by a manufacturer to supply white printing paper for 54 cents per pound—50,000 reams, I think it was—though I think that our newspapers here pay now over 6½ cents, but most of them I think are buying for less.

Q. Take the New York Times, for instance; that is sold now, in a sort of newspaper millenium, for 2 cents a copy. What fraction of a cent do you suppose the raw paper costs?—A. Well, I don't know that I could answer that at once, but it would cost per pound about 5½ cents; not over that. Very likely less, with such a contract as they give in the quantity of paper.

Q. Can you form an approximate estimate of the percentage of cost of the paper itself in a newspaper costing 2 cents and of the size of the New York Times?—A. The circulation would settle what the cost of the paper would be.

Q. Just the raw paper, I mean, before any printing was put upon it.—A. I should think the Times might be in size 30 x 44 inches, and if so it would cost. I should say, in some one place, somewhere from one-half to three-fourths of a cent a sheet; if three-fourths, it would be 3.60 a ream; I should say somewhere about that.

Q. Our stenographer went through your works and you explained to him the processes carried on there. Would you be willing that the description as he took it should be incorporated with your testimony?—A. Certainly.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. The processes that you spoke of, the mechanical and chemical processes, are patented, are they?—A. Yes; although the patents are of no special importance, and never have been anything except the lead to further developments in the trade. There is no patent that is regarded as good for anything in the chemical process; that is open; everybody uses it. It is almost equally true with the mechanical process, although there are one hundred and fifty different patents, I guess; but the patents, or nearly all, have expired, anyway.

Q. Are they English or American?—A. American.

THE VÖLTER PATENT.

The patent that has really developed the paper trade of the country, and made paper manufacturing what it is, is known as the Völter, a
German patent that has been used with better success, and better results have been reached by the use of it, than any other; but the use of that patent has led to a variety of other inventions, and people have never been held up very close anyway in these matters, although they have attempted to use it; they have not been strictly prohibited, and people have used it. They have sought, of course, to get around it, and have got around it, and that has led to these other methods of treating the fiber.

Q. Do you know who owns these existing patents now?—A. There are different owners. I think one hundred owners of different pulp patents, but the Völter patent is owned very largely by Mr. Russell and Senator Miller; that patent really has been the means of this large use of wood, because greater and better results have been reached by the use of it than by any other process, and it is a most simple patent. Do you understand what it is?

Mr. Pugh. No.

The Witness. It is simply the grinding of wood on a grindstone. The block of wood is laid right on the grindstone, the grindstone is turned, and the fiber of the wood is ground off. It is a perfectly simple process, as simple as can be. Take a paper like the New York Times or the Boston Herald, perhaps 75 or 80 per cent. of it is made from pulp ground off in that way.

By the Chairman:

Q. It is laid on the stone; is the side or the end placed next the stone?—A. The side; the wood is laid down flat. Of course the undertaking to defend or protect that patent has led to these other devices, so that there are probably, as I say, one hundred other methods, each claiming that they get as good pulp as by that method, but my own impression is that that is the only true way; that it is the best method.

Q. The best mechanical way?—A. Yes; that has undoubtedly lessened the price of paper nearly 50 per cent.

DIFFICULTY OF INTRODUCTION OF WOOD PAPER.

When that patent was first introduced here—when Mr. Russell built his mill up at Franklin, those of us who were engaged in the manufacture of paper and had no knowledge of what could be done with wood supposed that his enterprise would ruin him. We supposed that his material would be more like saw-dust or clay. Mr. Russell built his mills at Franklin, and after getting the mills erected and getting to manufacture the pulp, he could not find a paper manufacturer who would buy a pound of his wood pulp, because they did not believe in it—they had no faith in it, and he was compelled to go to work and buy out a paper mill in order to make a good test of it, which he did in Franklin, right beside his pulp mill, and made the test, and a successful test, and showed a very good paper. After he had got the paper made he found great difficulty in selling it. The printers felt that they could not use it; they were afraid to use paper made from raw wood; they were afraid it would injure their type or ruin it, and they declined to use it. His selling agents were the firm of Rice & Kendall, of Boston. They resorted to all sorts of devices to get this paper used, but they were finally obliged to resort to something that did not appear on the surface, but seemed to be necessary in order to secure the introduction of the paper into use. They had an order from, I think, the Boston Herald for about 500 reams of paper. They were supplying that jour.
nal regularly from month to month, and without saying anything at all about what the paper was that they sent in they sent paper made from this wood; the paper passed and was used, and when the next order came and they sent the regular paper which they had been in the habit of sending before, the Herald people came to Mr. Rice in some displeasure and asked him why he could not send in such paper as he had sent the month before. He told them that he could do so if they preferred it, and they said they did. They said that it worked very well—very much better than the other. So he told them that the next order they gave him he would send some of that paper. The next month he sent in 500 reams of the wood paper again, and that was used and gave very great satisfaction. But I think they were using it for six months before they knew that it was wood paper. That established the use of that class of paper, and there was no trouble after that in selling it. The fact is that it absorbs the ink better and works much better for printing than other paper does, and works particularly well in rapid presses.

Q. Do you use the wood green or seasoned?—A. Well, it is better green; it is not always possible to have it so; it will work either way, however.

COST OF PLANT FOR PAPER MAKING.

Q. What is your estimate of the cost of a plant for manufacturing paper?—A. I should estimate it as about $20,000 for a ton of paper; to manufacture a ton of paper requires $20,000.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. A ton of paper a day, you mean?—A. A day, yes; that is a general estimate, and I think that is very near the mark too.

Q. Does the labor employed in paper making have to be skilled labor?—A. It is necessary to have some of it skilled labor; for instance the engineers and machine men—it is absolutely necessary that they should be skilled laborers. In the preparation of the stock it is not so essential to have skilled labor.

Q. Three-fourths of the labor need not be skilled or it need only be such as takes but little time to qualify a man for?—A. Three-fourths of the labor you can teach quite quickly, but the other fourth, it is quite essential, should be experienced hands.

WAGES.

You were speaking about the wages; I don't think I answered that question fully. The average pay of our help is about $1.43 a day, and we pay as high as $3.50 for some of our operatives; I don't mean foremen, but mechanics.

Q. Do you find that labor here?—A. Yes; most of our mechanics are American help, but our other help is divided. Our carpenters and millwrights are most of them Americans. In our other help we have English, Irish, and French.

SAVINGS OF EMPLOYÉS IN PAPER MILLS.

With reference to the savings of wage-earners in our employ, I have one man who has accumulated from his wages some fifteen to twenty thousand dollars, a man of about sixty years of age, who has supported his family nicely, and educated his children well, and also made these savings; and these savings were made on wages of $3 per day.
Payment in our mills are made in cash weekly to all operatives; that plan works well with us. I think the operatives spend their money to better advantage that way.

**RELATIVE WAGES IN PAPER MILLS IN EUROPE AND AMERICA.**

With regard to the difference in wages as paid in this country and abroad, so far as it pertains to the manufacture of paper, my information is that we are paying fully one-third more for wages in America than are paid in England, and in England they pay more than in Germany.

Q. Is this information from your own personal observation of the European trade?—A. Yes.

Q. Made this last year, I believe?—A. Yes; this last year. I went through a large establishment in Liverpool, where they manufacture cotton belting, and the mills were full of female operatives. I had a letter of introduction to the owner, and of course what he said to me would be reliable. I asked him what wages he paid his operatives, and he said, “Well, you see what they are; just look at them; they are all a good class of work people; a better class than we are in the habit of seeing. I can get such help as that for 2 shillings per day” (60 cents of our money). This was in Liverpool.

Q. What would that class of help cost in this country?—A. In these mills here that class of help would earn more than double that money.

Q. You saw that yourself?—A. Yes.

Q. Comparing them with the corresponding individuals such as you see here, you have no doubt that is so?—A. No doubt whatever, and the same would be true of those of our help that I am hiring myself. I am paying them as much again as the corresponding class of help in England receives. My judgment would be that we are paying fully one-third more for labor than the paper manufacturers of England are paying, and I say this to you: That if New England manufacturers could procure their labor at the same prices that are paid in Europe we could sell paper at a profit in any part of the world.

Q. So that the difference is the difference in labor?—A. Yes.

**LAND IN MANCHESTER, N. H.**

Q. Will you state what facts you know with respect to land ownership in this place; the control and disposition of the lands of the city of Manchester from its foundation to the present time, as those lands have been brought into the market for occupation by the inhabitants of the city?—A. When the Amoskeag Company first commenced operations here they bought very largely of these lands. I don't know how many hundreds of acres they bought, but it was a great many. They bought the entire present site of the city.

Q. And much more?—A. Yes; I think so; and our present prosperous condition is, in my judgment, largely due to the manner in which these lands have been disposed of. They have been sold in such a way that nobody but absolute purchasers of land for actual settlement could secure them, and those, at a very moderate price. Their process has been to sell for one quarter paid down and take a mortgage for the balance, charging 6 per cent. interest, and giving the operative such length of time as he desired to pay the balance.

Q. The operative and also, I suppose, other productive citizens?—A. Yes; and, as I understand it, they have universally declined to sell it to
anybody who bought merely for purposes of speculation. The city was laid out regularly by them, and in some portions of it, at the north end of the city particularly, large lots, containing, say, an acre were restricted to one building for twenty years. And if you go through that portion of the city you will see how wise a provision that was and is; and to that provision we are indebted for the most beautiful part of our city.

Q. Do you know anything about the price at which the lands have been actually sold?—A. I think they are selling all the way from 8 cents a foot to 50 cents a foot, according to location, but a considerable part of it has been, I think, sold at about 25 cents a foot.

Q. If these lands could have been bought by individuals for private speculation in anticipation of the growth of the city, as has been the case with other cities, what do you think would have been the effect upon the development of the city?—A. I don’t think our growth would have been so rapid nor so healthy.

Q. At what price do you think the lands generally would have been sold for, or would have been held at, by speculators—higher than those that have been the rule with the company?—A. I don’t know whether I could answer that question definitely, but the fact that the company has fixed the price for these lands on these terms has enabled almost everybody to provide the purchase-money for the land.

Q. These prices are fixed by the company in advance?—A. Yes. An operative who desires to purchase a homestead could have one favorably and healthfully located at 8 cents a foot, so that a lot 50 by 100 would cost him only $400, of which only $100 was to be paid down and the remainder would be held on bond and mortgage at 6 per cent., so that you can see there is no reason why every operative should not own his own home, if he desires it.

Q. The lands are let at a price put upon them some time ago?—A. Yes.

Q. And were these prices adhered to year after year until the lands were taken?—A. Yes. Such lands as they put into the market had the prices fixed when they were put in. They are constantly putting new lands into the market. For instance, these new lands on the other side of the river were all put into the market since this new bridge has been constructed, within the last four years. They put them in at 8 cents a foot at that time, and that price is still adhered to, and people are taking them up constantly, and we have had that little village built up there within four years. I think they call it Raymondville.

Q. And undoubtedly they could easily have sold that land at a much higher figure if they had chosen to do so?—A. Oh, yes; portions of it. They do not change their prices; that is the difference between the policy of the company and the policy of the speculators.

Q. That will remain so, I suppose, until the land is all taken up?—A. Yes; they offer land now on Elm street for 50 cents a foot up to this side of Brook street. It is pretty much all taken, but there are a few lots not taken, and people can take it if they want to. They know the price of it.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS OF PAPER-MAKING.

The following is a description, made by the committee's stenographer, of the process of paper-making, as seen in actual operation at the Cheney Paper Mills, Manchester, N. H., October 11, 1883:

Cotton waste is brought in and picked, then run through a threshing and duster, then thrown into a rotary boiler, and there mixed with lime
and soda-ash, and "cooked" for about twenty-four hours. It is then
thrown or emptied out on to the floor below, put into a washing engine
and washed out clean. Chlorine and sulphuric acid are then applied
to it.

Cotton bagging goes through a cutter and duster, as the cotton waste
does; then through a washing process, a revolving wheel carrying it
around. When washed out thoroughly chloride of lime is applied to it
and it is then let into a drainer below.

The cotton waste (or bagging, as the case may be) is then thoroughly
drained and rinsed, and is then ready, as pulp, to be made into paper,
either by itself or in combination with wood pulp.

Wood-pulp paper is used for newspapers and for lining trunks, boxes,
&c. The woods generally used for the purpose are spruce, poplar, and
pine.

Blocks of wood about 9 inches long are cut from the tree or log.
These are put into a chopping machine, which chops the blocks into
several pieces. The pieces are then taken and each is put into a box
or "clamp," which holds the wood against a revolving grindstone. The
wood is by this means ground off, in the form of fine particles, into a
trough containing water, where the wood particles absorb the water and
mix thoroughly with it. In that condition it is pumped up into other
troughs which in turn allow it to flow into sieves, which arrest all slivers
and small unmanageable pieces. It then runs into another trough, in
which it runs against a cylinder covered with wire cloth. This wire
cloth takes it up, and from this it runs over an endless wooden belt
(about 5 feet wide) in the form of a film. In this form it is cut off into
lengths of about 5 feet.

The wood pulp or "stock" is then ready to be mixed with the cotton
stock in any desired proportion, the customary proportions being 50 to
80 per cent. of wood stock, the rest cotton. The mixture and its pro-
portions of stock, whether of cotton waste, of cotton bagging, or of
wood, depend on the special nature of the order given for the pa-
per, some orders requiring a larger proportion of waste or bagging
stock to be mixed with the wood, others a less proportion, according to
the kind or quality of paper desired. The kind of wood used also de-
pends on the order.

The different ingredients are then mixed up together and reduced to
a new pulp.

This mixing is effected by having the separate pipes which contain
the several kinds of stock converge, so as to discharge their contents
together into a larger pipe. In this larger pipe the pulp, now composed
of the combined cotton and wood, passes through what is termed a
"knife-box," which "even" the proportions of the pulp into a uniform
and consistent result.

The pulp is then pumped up into other troughs and again let fall into
still other troughs containing sieves or screens, which retain all im-
perfections and permit the now fully-prepared matter to pass through.
This by a natural rise then comes up into a Fourdriner machine or "bath," and,
passing over suction-boxes, the water is sucked from the pulp, allow-
ing the pulp to pass on in the form of a damp, continuous roll or
sheet, which becomes harder and more consistent as it proceeds. It
then passes through a series of rollers which press out all the surface
water; and when it has been rid of all the water which can be got out
by pressure, this continuous pulp-sheet passes over a series of steam-
heated cylinders, which dry it quickly, then between a series of rollers,
which render it hard and smooth.
The process being now complete, the paper, constituting a long, continuous sheet, is rolled up into rolls, weighing anywhere from 75 to 175 pounds.

The machinery of the mill is driven by a 30-horse power engine, the waste-steam being utilized in drying the paper.

When running in full force the time required to make paper, from the cutting of the wood from the log to getting it rolled up as dry and completed paper, is only six hours.

In the manufacture of white paper the ingredients used are poplar and spruce wood and cotton waste, without bagging or pine. The result is 140 feet of paper per minute.

The full capacity of the mill per day of twelve hours on one machine is 4,400 pounds of paper; the ordinary result on the two machines in the mill is 7 tons per twenty-four hours, though 8 tons have been made on those machines in that time.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

JAMES NUTTING examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. How do you come to testify here? Did you come here to the committee room with the expectation of giving testimony?—Answer. I did not.

Q. Have you been rather compelled to do so by me personally?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Nobody knew that you were to testify until I learned that you were an operative and notified you that you would be summoned if you did not testify voluntarily, and requested you to treat that as a summons?—A. That is so.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. What mills do you work in?—A. The Manchester Mills.

Q. How long have you worked there?—A. I have worked for the Manchester corporation for about twelve years, with the exception of something over a year that I was out West for my health.

Q. What kind of work do you do?—A. I generally work at carpenter work.

Q. How many carpenters are employed in that mill?—A. There are fifteen in the shop that I work in.

Q. What sort of work do you do; building houses or working on repairs in the factory, or what?—A. Working on repairs; very often setting up machinery and doing such work—putting up shafting, and so forth.

Q. What wages do you get?—A. Two dollars and twenty-five cents a day.

Q. Do you work by the day?—A. I work by the day.

Q. How many hours a day?—A. Eleven and one-half; that is what we are supposed to work, but out of the eleven and one-half we are allowed five minutes at noon to wash up in, and if we are outside the shop we are allowed ten minutes, and the same time in the evening; that is to say, if we are working out of the mills—outside of the repair shop—we would leave off work ten minutes before the bell rings, so as to give us ten minutes to get to the shop and wash up in.

Q. How long have you for dinner at noon?—A. One hour.
Q. And that is taken out of the eleven and one-half hours?—A. No, sir.
Q. You are at actual work for eleven and one-half hours?—A. Yes. Now, I say eleven and one-half—let me see; we go in at half-past 6 in the morning and quit at a quarter to 7 at night, with an hour out—that makes eleven hours in all, and we calculate at least fifteen minutes for washing up, and on Saturdays we quit at 4 o'clock, so I would like to correct that statement about the eleven and one-half hours.

By the CHAIRMAN:
Q. So you work, then, the same number of hours as the other help—eleven hours?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PUGH:
Q. Have you a family?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Of how many?—A. A wife and two children.
Q. Do you rent a house or own one?—A. I rent one.
Q. From the company?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. What rent do you pay?—A. Seven dollars a month.
Q. You have plenty of room in the house for your family, have you?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. How is it as to the comfort in the house?—A. Well, the tenement that I have is more than an average of the tenements throughout the city.
Q. You are healthy there?—A. Yes; that is through the hot weather; my health is not as good at any time in cold as in warm weather.
Q. You are healthier in the summer time than in the winter?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Are you able to save anything from your wages?—A. Well, I don't save very much. One reason of that is that within a year or so I have had a great deal of sickness in my family.
Q. Does your family assist you any—your wife?—A. Nothing more than in housework; she never has done her own work for the last twenty years.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES.

Q. What is the state of feeling among the employés in that mill, as to their condition and treatment, and their wages, if you know it?—A. Well, sir, there are various opinions and feelings; it is a hard matter to find even that small number of mechanics that are satisfied; some think they ought to get more; some think that others get too much; some think that they work too many hours.
Q. That is as to the whole number of operatives?—A. Yes.
Q. They complain that they do not get a "fair divide" of the product of their labor?—A. There is a portion of them that do; I don't mean to make the statement that they all do, merely a portion.
Q. Now, what proportion of the whole number would you say complained?—A. Well, I should say in our shop that we have perhaps three or four.
Q. That is in your mill among your own class of carpenters?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. But I am speaking now of the whole number of workers in that mill, if you know?—A. I could not make any estimate as to that.
Q. Your estimate, then, only refers to your own class of workers?—A. To my associates.
By the Chairman:

Q. You said three or four; how many are there of your own associates?—A. Fifteen.

Q. Three or four of the fifteen, then?—A. Yes; that is as far as my experience and knowledge goes about it.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Do you know anything of the state of feeling among the other operatives?—A. I think that taking it on a general average it is rather satisfactory.

Q. As to their wages, the way they live, and their condition generally?—A. Yes. I have some acquaintance among the weavers, and some think that they do not make pay enough, while some think that they make good fair pay, for the very reason that you may take two weavers on the same kind of work, side by side, and one will make a dollar a day, and the other make no more than 50 cents.

Q. For doing the same kind of work?—A. On the same kind of work and the same speed of loom.

Q. How is that, do you work by the piece?—A. By the cut.

Q. One does more work than another, I suppose?—A. Yes.

Q. And that is the reason for the difference?—A. That is the way I look at it.

Q. They do the same kind of work?—A. Yes.

Q. But not the same amount of product?—A. They do not accomplish the same amount.

Q. They do not turn out as much?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are they males or females where that difference exists?—A. Females.

Mr. Pugh. We would be pleased if you would inform any of the actual operatives or laborers there that the committee are ready to hear them at any time that they will come, on Monday, and that we are as willing to hear them as anybody else; we are here for that purpose, and we do not discriminate at all. We gave notice when we first arrived that we would be glad to hear from the operatives and would like that information to reach them.

The Witness. I think if you will find a skilled operative, you will find a person that has no complaint to make. If you find a poor mechanic or a poor operative, you will find an element for complaint.

Q. What is your own judgment, as a man, and stating it as between men, as to whether the operatives here in this city are treated fairly and honorably, and whether they are fairly paid by their employers, or otherwise?—A. I cannot speak for any but the corporation I work for. Candidly, I think that as an average the mechanics get dollar for dollar—all they earn.

Q. Do you know whether the operatives here in the mills understand that the committee desire to hear them or that they do not desire to hear them, if they have anything to say?—A. It is generally understood that they are free to come if they wish, and that you would be glad to see or hear anybody that has any complaint or remarks to make.

The Chairman. We are here hunting for abuses or grievances, if they exist, and we so stated in the beginning, and I was a little annoyed to hear to-night that it was said on the street among operatives that we hear nobody but the "bosses," "agents," and so forth. We have heard four laboring people to one of any other kind since we set out upon our work, and we propose to continue doing so. And if anybody wants to be heard, and has anything to say; they are themselves at fault if they
do not say it. No man is likely to be turned off because he has told his story here.

The WITNESS. Well, if I had a grievance to speak, it would make no difference to me, because if I did not choose to work on the Manchester corporation somebody else would have to give me more.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is distinctly understood by the working people that we are ready and will be glad to hear them, that is all right, and any assertion to the contrary is a calumny upon the committee.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

MARCELLUS GOULD examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Are you in business in this city?—Answer. I am an overseer on the Amoskeag corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything that occurs to you as pertinent to say to the committee? If so, please say it.

THE HOUR SYSTEM OF WORK AND WAGES.

The WITNESS. You asked the question of Mr. Blood this evening what he thought about working by the hour in cotton factories, and you said you were interested to know about that. I wanted to say that I worked in Connecticut ten years, and in factory work there they worked by the hour all through the mill, and as the result of my observation I was led to conclude that it was a better way of working than by the day. The help observed their work closer, and were out less; they were less away from their work when they worked by the hour than they would have been if working by the day, and as a result the production of the mill was greater than it would have been if worked by the day.

Q. Then you would approve of the system of working by the hour, from your experience?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any difficulty in applying it where work is conducted on so large a scale?—A. I don’t see any difficulty at all.

Q. Where two or more work jointly, as is sometimes necessary to manage some of these machines, if one wanted to leave could he not practically compel the other to do so?—A. No, not at all.

Q. There is no difficulty of that kind?—A. No difficulty in that respect.

Q. You see no reason, then, why the Amoskeag corporation with its immense business could not be managed upon the hour system?—A. No.

Q. And you think if operatives average ten hours, working by the hour system, the production is even larger than where they work by the day system?—A. I think so, and my reasons for it are that, when I first went to Connecticut to work in 1871, the running time of the mill was sixty-nine hours a week, and there was a little difficulty among the mule-spinners about their pay; they wanted less hours or more pay. The company, after consultation, concluded it was best to give them less hours, thinking that by doing so it would reduce their wages, or that they would want to keep the same number of hours that they had. They accepted the proposition of the company, however, and readily went to
work on sixty-six hours a week instead of sixty-nine, and in less than a month the production of the mill was greater than it had been in any month previous to that without any increase in speed of the machinery.

Q. How did the mule-spinners come out, with more or with less wages?—A. With more wages.

Q. Because they were paid at a higher rate by the hour than they were by the day?—A. No, they work by the piece, mule-spinners—they spin by the pound—but they made it by closer application to work.

Q. Then they do not work by the hour?—A. They keep the time by the hour, and every hour they are out they are docked. The better application to work was what increased the result.

Q. Then that system was both by the hour and by the piece?—A. Well, there is a certain class of mule-spinners and portion of the carders that work by the piece, regardless of the hours of the day. It is the best way to work, by the piece, wherever they can.

Q. Is there any difficulty then, in such an establishment as the Amoskeag, combining the two systems, the piece system and the hour system?—A. None at all.

Q. Then you get in that way all the motors that stimulate the laborer?—A. Yes.

Q. He works by the piece, and he can work as fast as he chooses?—A. Yes.

Q. And if he works by the hour he can work longer, if he pleases?—A. Yes.

Q. He gets the advantage of all the haste that he may make when he works?—A. Yes; all the piece-work is practically day-work and hour-work, as well as piece-work, in this way: That if a man is out an hour or two hours, the overseer sees that he is out an hour or two, or whatever it may be. In making up the account for the month he deducts, for instance, if it be one hour, one-tenth of a day. If he is out a quarter of a day, it is deducted as a quarter of a day. It is hardly fair to put a spare hand on to a person’s work and let the regular hand go out, and still pay that hand while he is out.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. If he is absent an hour when he works by the day, the overseer takes off a quarter of a day, whereas if he is out one hour, when working by the hour plan, he takes off only one hour?—A. Well, if the hand is out one hour with us, they usually take that hour and charge for the hour only, but that is only by courtesy. They do not come down to so small a thing as to take off a quarter of a day for one hour.

By the Chairman:

Q. I got the idea that when a man is out for an hour he is docked for a longer time, as a sort of penalty for his absence; that is, that if a man is out for an hour they might dock him for a quarter of a day?—A. I hardly think any corporation in Manchester would be mean enough to do that.

Q. You know of nothing of that kind?—A. No.

Q. There is no such practice then?—A. No.

Q. How long have you been with the Amoskeag Company?—A. Three years now.

Q. You say you are an overseer?—A. Yes.

Q. How many hands have you under you?—A. One hundred and twenty-five.

Q. Men or women—or both?—A. Both.

Q. Any children?—A. I have got only four boys.
Q. What do they work at? — A. At carding.
Q. Does your help work by the piece? — A. The girls work by the piece; the men by the day.
Q. As a rule, what system of work is preferred by the operatives—that by the day or by the piece? — A. By the piece.
Q. And those who work by the piece, about how many hours do they average? — A. They work about the same as the others.
Q. Which way will the hands make the most—by the day or by the piece? — A. By the piece.
Q. How much difference will that make generally with average men of about equal capacity—one man working by the piece and the other by the day—and both working the same length of time? — A. The man working by the piece would get most.
Q. How much more would he get? — A. I should say from 5 to 10 per cent. more.
Q. How much would the man working by the day make? — A. One dollar and fifteen cents.
Q. Then the man working by the piece would make, say, $1.25 or more? — A. Yes.
Q. Is there any other matter that occurs to you? — A. No; I don’t think of any other matter.
Q. Is there much grumbling or growling among the operatives? — A. I don’t hear any.
Q. What class of men are the supervisors of the manufacturing industries here? — A. They are gentlemen in every particular.
Q. As you have worked in Connecticut and elsewhere I would like to know your opinion as to Manchester as a manufacturing city—as to its desirability to employes, compared with other manufacturing cities in New England? — A. So far as my observation goes, Manchester is the best manufacturing place in New England that I know anything about for an operative to work in, so far as the item of wages and general condition are concerned.
Q. Has it such a reputation as that among operatives generally? — A. Well, I think it has, from the fact that in Lowell and Lawrence, 25 miles from here, they are short of help continually, while practically such a thing is unknown here in Manchester. It is unknown for the mills to be short of help here in Manchester. That is proof enough to me that Manchester is a much more desirable place to work in than Lowell, Lawrence, or Fall River. I hear less complaints among operatives. In fact I practically hear none here as to their treatment, whereas in Connecticut, where I worked, there was always more or less grumbling.
Q. Were you an overseer in Connecticut? — A. Yes; I went from Manchester to Connecticut and came back here again.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 13, 1883.

JOSEPH B. SAWYER examined.

By the C AIRMAN:

Question. Do you live in this city? — Answer. Yes; my home has been here since 1843.
Q. What is your business? — A. I am now a civil engineer, but was formerly an operative in the mills.
Q. For how long a time were you an operative, and in what mills? — A. I was in the Stark mills part of the time and in the Manchester mills a longer time, up to about 1851, I think.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

WAGES AND LABOR IN COTTON MILLS FORTY YEARS AGO.

The CHAIRMAN. You have stated that you could give some information in regard to the relative wages of labor then and now, and the condition of the operatives then and now. Won’t you please go on and give us that statement?

The WITNESS. In 1843, when I came to Manchester from a farm, I was about nineteen years old. I was not very strong though I enjoyed very good health. I went to work in the mills for 40 cents a day, a little while. They very soon raised my pay to 45 cents a day, and then after a little while to about 66 cents, then to 75 cents, and then to a dollar. The work that I used to do for 75 cents, they now pay, I am told, $1.20 for. The work that I did for $1 they now pay $1.50 for. I had five brothers, all younger than myself. My father sold the farm and brought us to this town as being a better opening for us than farming.

Q. Where was the farm?—A. About 25 miles from here. He was somewhat in debt, and had a growing family, and he judged it best to sell his farm, and bring his family to Manchester, as affording a larger scope. I went to work. What schooling I had was before I was nineteen, almost wholly. My brothers got part of their education in this town, most of them.

I think that the condition of operatives—the chances for operatives or for any laboring person, young people especially—to do well, may be exemplified by the career of my brothers, and by their course in life, and by their success. The old-fashioned virtues of industry, economy, and clean living will, I think, in all countries, lead any man to a reasonable degree of success. The man who serves his employer best, as a rule, serves himself best; he establishes a reputation which is valuable to him.

Q. Which would give most of the comfort and convenience of life—that wages received at that former time or the wages received at the present time?—A. Well, I don’t think there is much difference in that respect. My mother kept factory boarders for a while, and the price was $1.25 a week for girls, and $1.50 or $1.75, I am not sure which, for men. The prices now, I am told, are $2.25 for girls, and $3.50 for men. The board has advanced, I think, about the same as the wages.

Q. Let us sec. The board has advanced $1, has it, by the week?—A. Yes; not quite a dollar, I think.

Q. Now, how much have the wages advanced for the week?—A. What I did for 75 cents is now $1.20.

Q. That is, a week’s pay was equal to $1.50. The difference between $7.20 and $4.50 is $2.70. The wages, then, per week, have advanced $2.70, while the board has advanced $1. Is that it?—A. Yes.

Q. So that, you see, at the end of a week there is really more left.—A. So there is.

Q. So that really the purchasing power of wages is more.—A. Well, many things are now regarded as necessities that were then regarded as luxuries.

Q. Very well; then a person has so much more to buy those things with.—A. Yes, that is true. In those days, for instance, no laboring family thought it necessary to take ice during the summer. Nobody took the daily paper, or paid a gas or a water bill, and there are a great many things of that kind now that have come along with our advancing civilization, and they come to be necessities of life or nearly so.

Q. But they make us much more happy when they are supplied than
people were before they got them, is not that so?—A. Yes; I suppose that is true.

Q. Money is of no use to us unless it supplies our wants.—A. That is true.

Q. And if we get better wages now, and are in a situation to buy more, and make ourselves happier than formerly, we are, therefore, better off, are we not?—A. Yes; of course.

Q. It certainly cannot be doubted that we have more money left now, after buying all that we want, than was left before?—A. I agree with you; that is so, sir. My father paid about $10 a year for his pew rent in the church; I pay $24 a year for the same pew.

Q. Which had the best preaching?—A. Well, opinions might differ about that. I suppose I should be better suited with the present preaching.

Q. Then you have singing, which is more costly, and requires a higher degree of cultivation.—A. Yes.

Q. And there is the Sabbath school, and there are more things pertaining to religious worship than there were then; it is a more aesthetic ceremonial.—A. Yes; that is true.

Q. So that it costs more, and there is nothing you can get in life without money—so that the better the religious privileges you have, the more you have to give for them, just as with a farm or anything else.—A. Yes.

Q. Is there a free church in this city?—A. There is something that is called so; I don’t know whether preaching is maintained there steadily; I think so, however.

CHANGE IN THE CLASS OF FACTORY HELP.

The class of factory help has changed entirely since I first knew the mills and the work in them. I think that the operatives, perhaps, do not have quite that degree of cleanliness and good living in their houses that they did at that time, but that may be more due to the change of the class of people that worked in the mills. I think that factory work has been given up very largely by such people as were in it forty years ago when I first remember it. The coming in of foreigners has enabled Yankees to go into a higher class of employment; it has crowded them out, so to speak, from the lower classes of employment, and there has been less advance of price in the very lowest class of unskilled labor, such as digging, I think, than in labor requiring more skill.

Q. On the whole do you think that the coming in of the foreign laborers has been an injury or a benefit to the American laborers?—A. It has been a benefit; and still I can remember when the Irish in this town were regarded as jealously as, I suppose, the Chinese are in San Francisco. When the Yankees thought it was incumbent on them to mob the Irish for coming to do the digging.

Q. Well, the Yankees have learned to let them do the digging and to be satisfied with it?—A. Yes, and to do much of the mill work too.

Q. At the same time the Irish are going through that same process by being themselves lifted by other classes of labor coming in after them?—A. Yes, very much. I don’t know any class in the community that have bettered themselves more than the foreigners have.

Q. History repeats itself with these different nationalities as they come, one after the other, does it not?—A. Yes, I think so.
Q. Each one lifts the other?—A. Yes; but after all it is but very little that laws can do to make a man rich or industrious or frugal.
Q. But laws can hang him?—A. Well, yes; but that is a poor remedy.
Q. I mean by that that laws can be restrictive?—A. Yes, or they can protect him.

EDUCATION—THE GOLDEN RULE.

A great deal of attention should be paid, in my opinion, to the education of the young—more than is paid to it. More attention should be given to public and private morality—that should be taught in the schools. More emphasis, at least, should be laid on morality, in my judgment, in the schools. It is the foundation stone of our prosperity and national honor. Education should be not only intellectual but moral, I think.

Q. Would you teach sectarian and religious instruction in the schools?—A. No, I don’t think that is necessary.
Q. What would you do in the way of moral instruction or religious instruction in the public schools?—A. I would teach with great emphasis and iteration the law of “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you,” and that all men are accountable to God for their time and their influence—all children, of course, also. I would impress upon their minds, if possible, that they are soon to become men, and that they are laying the foundation for honor or dishonor, for success or failure, even in childhood.

Q. You would make that a part of the instruction in the common schools?—A. I would. I would care more about such training as that than I would about mere intellectual book learning.
Q. Would you require, then, of the teachers some qualification in that direction?—A. Yes; they should be clean, moral people themselves.
Q. Would you have a text-book which would inculcate these general principles that are common to all good society, whatever the religious faith may be?—A. I think I would; all that Christian and decent citizens generally agree to.
Q. You would have nothing in that book that either a Catholic or a Protestant would object to?—A. Well, if possible to make a book that both the sects would agree to, I think it would be desirable.
Q. They can hardly disagree about the golden rule that you have just spoken about?—A. No.
Q. Nor anything which is a legitimate and immediate outcome of it?—A. No. And then I think the outlines of political economy might be taught in advanced schools to good advantage, so that they should understand that there is no way of legislating a man rich or poor; that labor creates wealth, both individual and national.
Q. Do you think there is just a particle of danger that in this happy condition of affairs in Manchester, actual evils that may exist in this country are overlooked?—A. I don’t know that I understand you.

The CHAIRMAN. The operatives and agents and the citizens—everybody come here and tell us just one story, while, if you go elsewhere, at least in some other places in this country, the balance of proof is to a very different state of things from what prevails here; the proof is of evils that evidently have got to be removed by legislation, or they will continue to exist, because they have grown up and existed where there was no legislation that prohibited them. It is evident that they grew up from the operation of causes independent of legislation, and are not removed by causes that exist independent of legislation, and that if there is to be a remedy applied legislation must help.
PROTECTION OF CHILDREN AGAINST THEIR PARENTS.

The Witness. Well, perhaps I stated it rather strongly that legislation cannot do much. I don't see a great deal that national legislation can do to help our condition in this town. I think there are some things that the State legislature might do, very possibly—for instance, to protect some children against the cupidity and avarice of their parents. There is a law that does that to some extent now, but I feel safe in saying it ought to go further. Some foreigners do not fully appreciate the advantages of education. They want all the money that a little child can earn. I have sometimes, without really knowing much about it, thought that perhaps a plan—where a child is compelled to work in a mill—should be devised, which would require that he should work in a mill only half a day, and require him to go to school the other half of the day. I have thought that that would work well after it was once inaugurated.

The Chairman. I think it is pretty generally conceded that the most substantial remedy for the ills of this world for working people as well as others is to be educated; for knowledge is power, and a man gets what he can take by reason of the power which education gives, and he can take more wages when he is better educated. That is as true of a pauper as of a prince. Is there anything else that you wish to say?

RELATIONS BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES.

The Witness. Well, in the forty years that I have lived here I have been familiar with operatives, and have been an operative myself for a while, and I think I may say that generally there has been an excellent state of feeling; there has been no general discontent among operatives; there has been no general hardship practiced upon them—no tyranny worthy of mention over the operatives. They have been free to come and go, and are free now, and I feel that they are getting as much wages working in a mill, and are better off working in a mill than they would be anywhere else, and so they stay and work. They come here from Canada, or other parts of the world, to better their condition. When they come here they are glad of it, and are willing to give satisfaction and to remain.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

THOMAS L. LIVERMORE further examined.

THE AMOSKEAG COMPANY'S LANDS AND LAND POLICY.

By the Chairman:

Question. Please give some account of your company's lands and land policy.—Answer. The Amoskeag Company bought the mill privilege at the Amoskeag Falls about 1831. Then they had a little wooden factory in Amoskeag village. They afterwards built two more small mills there, which ran until their mills were established on the east side of the river. They then constructed two canals, which you see here, about two miles long altogether, the water from the upper canal running through a fall, 20 feet, into the lower canal, and from that into the river by another fall of 30 feet. They built first one of the Stark mills
and disposed of that to the Stark Mill corporation. Then they began to build mills for themselves, then more for the Stark Company, &c., until all the mills that are now in Manchester were constructed.

THE AMOSKEAG COMPANY'S LANDS.

The Amoskeag Company divided off their land on the east side of the river, which amounted to 2,000 or 3,000 acres, into regular lots, with streets running at right angles with each other. Then they sold their land at auction and established what was a fair price for land by such auction sales from time to time.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. How did you make the sale; by dividing the land off into lots by means of regular surveys?—A. Yes.

Q. What was the size of the lots?—A. Whatever size any one chose to buy; but a certain amount of land was laid off for blocks and business purposes, and the rest of it they arranged to be for dwelling purposes. Of those lots they never sell less than 5,000 feet (50 feet front by 100 feet deep) and restrict each such lot to one dwelling for each family for twenty-five years, so as to secure an open, well-ventilated city. The price of those lots for dwelling purposes became fixed at 8 cents a square foot. And to-day everybody knows, and has known for years past, that he can come and point out a lot on the map and buy it for 8 cents a foot. "First come, first served." In that way the land has been distributed.

Q. In fee-simple?—A. In fee-simple, with no restriction except what I have stated.

By the Chairman:

Q. The man who buys, however, is expected to build, and not to hold it for a rise?—A. We make no restriction, but with land so cheap as that it does not pay to buy it to hold.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Then has the purchaser the right to dispose of that property?—A. Yes.

Q. Has he the right to dispose of it before he builds?—A. Yes.

Q. Subject to the restriction you have named, of course?—A. Yes. All have the right to buy, by paying one-quarter down, the rest being carried on a mortgage payable in three installments, at one, two, and three years, at 6 per cent. interest. As matter of fact the company has not pressed any one if they haven't been able to pay them, but have let them run on if they have improved their land. There has never been any speculative combination to buy land. If there had been, the company would hold the land. They have land enough here to accommodate a city of 200,000 people—to be sold in that way.

So that, on the east side of the river all this land that you observe to be colored on this map has been sold [indicating by reference to the map]; probably 1,500 to 2,000 acres, and that constitutes nearly all of the present city on the east side. Then, on the west side the company owns as much more land, which is not shown on this map. They are now settling that up in the same way.

The company have given to the city of Manchester, from time to time, public squares and cemeteries amounting to several thousand dollars' worth in value.

Q. How did you conceive the idea? Were you ever anywhere where
such a thing was done?—A. No; it was the conception of the gentlemen who started this company, who were capitalists from Massachusetts mainly, of large experience and of magnanimous minds.

By the Chairman:

Q. Do you remember the names of some of them?—A. Yes; Mr. Sales, afterwards of the firm of Sales, Merriam & Co., Dr. Oliver Dean, and William Amory, who was the treasurer of the corporation for forty-five years.

Q. What was Governor Straw's relation to the company?—A. He came here very early in the capacity of surveyor, and rose from that capacity gradually to be the manager of the whole company.

Let me say in this connection that originally this company made the machinery for the mills; and they also made other machinery, such as locomotives, steam fire-engines, turbine wheels, &c. They also had this land department, and although owning the water-power, had to maintain and keep in repair the dams, canals, &c. The concern was divided into three departments, with a manager at the head of each; the machine shops being one department, the mills another, and the water-power a third. Governor Straw became the first agent of the whole concern, and remained so from somewhere in the 50's up to about 1879, when I took charge.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. What do you suppose is the value of these lots at this time to the occupants or owners?—A. Many of these lots, which were sold more than twenty-five years ago, from which the restrictions have been removed by lapse of time, are worth to-day to the owners from 50 cents to $1 a foot.

Q. And they gave 8 cents a foot for them?—A. Yes. I have here a photograph [showing it] of the mills, &c., taken from the top of our tall chimney, which is 267 feet high. From the perspective it looks as if the river were curved, whereas, in fact, it is straight.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

The committee met at 9 a.m.

WILLIAM STEARNS examined.

By the Chairman:

Question. You live in Manchester?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. For how long a time have you lived here?—A. Forty years. I came here when there was but one mill.

Q. We are instructed by the Senate to find out as well as we can the relations between capitalists and laborers—the employers and employees—and whether those relations are good-natured or otherwise. There are some other things which we are to do; but that is the first thing. I would like to ask your attention to that subject. You have been here forty years and have seen the development of the city from a sand-bank. What have you, from your observation, to say with regard to it?—A. I have to say, in the first place, that capital and labor have built up a flourishing city here.

Q. Could either have got along without the other?—A. No, sir.

Q. During this time what has seemed to be the relation between the
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working people and those who have been in charge of the work that they did—A. The first thirty years that I was here we were under practical men, as agents. David Gillies came up in the mill, and I worked under him. They paid their help what they agreed to pay. I had no fault to find with the agreements in that respect. When Mr. Straw took the place I worked under him; and I worked under Mr. Adams for fourteen years before he died; and, as far as agreements went, they always paid me what they agreed to. I have got out three patents while employed in the mills, and I think that in that respect I have not been used as I ought to be. I have got up a shuttle motion, and it has been in use for twenty-two years. I got it up outside the mills, but it is claimed that I was employed in the mills, and so they claim the right to use it. It is claimed that while a man is in the employ of a company they can hold his improvements; but I believe it has been decided both ways, both for and against that view. I have not thought that I was used exactly squarely about that. Where I got a thousand dollars, others got one hundred thousand. I “shook the bush,” and others caught the bird. But in other respects I have no fault to find as to the relations between employer and employed.

Q. What is the general condition of the working people?—A. Well, I think it is very different from what it was thirty or forty years ago. I have had experience in other places. I went to South Carolina and started weaving there, and have seen the conditions here and there; but I have been here thirty-eight years. When I first came here there was quite a restraint upon the people; their morals were looked after. Mr. Gillies was very particular to have his men and women board separate, and they had to attend meetings, &c. I think the conditions are not so good as they were then, as to help.

I can remember when the first Irishman came into the mill to work. We thought it was an awful thing. The mill hands were then all Yankees, and the girls would make any man a good wife. Now, I think 85 per cent. of the help is French, and it produces a great change here in regard to the interests of Manchester. They do not purchase real estate, and I rather think that in time the Yankees will be in a position somewhat like the Indians are at present—we shall have to go off when they predominate.

Q. You think they will get our heritage?—A. Yes; their labor is wanted, and they are encouraged.

Q. But I suppose we would hardly know what to do without them?—A. No. The fact is the Yankees do not want to work so hard as the French will work.

As to what the result of capital and labor will be on future generations, I do not know but what it will be the same here as upon the laboring classes in the old country.

Q. These Yankees are “right smart,” and they are not all dead yet?—A. No; but they won’t work with the others.

Q. What do the Yankees do now-a-days?—A. They have their businesses.

Q. There are a great many school teachers among them?—A. Yes; too many.

Q. And many civil engineers?—A. Yes.

Q. And they like to keep on top, do they not?—A. Yes; there are too many lawyers. I do not know that one of them believes in the Bible, and when they do not believe in that, their morals are not so good.

Q. So that, after all, these young Yankee lawyers are about as bad as the French Canadians?—A. Yes.
Q. How is it about the old Yankee lawyers; are they any better than the young ones?—A. Oh, yes; there are exceptions. "Present company" is always excepted.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I want you to waive politeness; do not spoil a good story for "company's" sake.

The WITNESS. I wish there could be a law that a man who would buy or sell a vote should go to State's prison. Our Government does not come from the people now; it comes from money. You know that when the old United States Bank was in action Andrew Jackson thought there was too much capital to be in one place—too much influence. Now, we have so many millionaires that money is going to rule until, in my opinion, there will be a revolution.

Q. What sort of revolution do you anticipate?—A. Well, I think sometimes that the right arm may go in against the dollar—labor against capital. I told the president of the Concord Railroad once, when I was trying to get coal freighted at something near what those corporations gave it to other folks for, that if I should see people tearing up the rails I would not raise a hand to stop it.

Q. He was charging you too much freight for coal!—A. I was paying 90 cents a ton more for coal than other folks were, and I found it out.

Q. How long ago was that?—A. Eight years ago.

Q. Have you had any trouble of that kind of late?—A. No, sir. The railroad companies are gentlemen to me now; I will say that; they use me well; but I had a considerable tussle.

Q. You had to assert your rights, and then you got them?—A. Yes. I was the one that got up a petition a few years ago which went to the legislature—seven hundred of our best citizens signed it—to have freight regulated. That did not have any effect, however, but since that time I have been used better by the railroads. But I had almost to fight to get good treatment.

Q. So the people get their rights if they work for them?—A. Yes. The representatives of the people do not make our laws for the benefit of the laboring class; the laws are all made by money. Then here are these millionaires that buy up the necessaries of life.

Q. Where is that?—A. In New York City.

Q. That is not done here?—A. Well, yes; we have a man here that would do it any time, and I have told him so, though he pretends to be a great friend of the laborer. I have been here thirty-eight years and have helped to build up Manchester, and many others have not. The coal dealers have even combined against the people, and I could not send to Portsmouth, as I did, to get coal for the laborer without extra charge. I have bought thousands of barrels of flour to save the laborers' money, but they combined against me.

Q. Who combined?—A. The traders and others who have not helped to build up this city. If I have a mind to send to Portsmouth and buy a hundred tons of coal and sell it for a dollar a ton less than others, it is my right to do it.

Q. Could you afford to do business that way if you had to get your living out of trade?—A. Perhaps not; but I was driven to do it.

Q. You were driven to do it to get things where they ought to be?—A. Yes.

Q. But you would not blame these people for getting a fair profit?—A. No; a fair margin.

Q. And since they charged too much, as you thought, you sent off and got some yourself?—A. Yes. They combine to keep up the price. When I commenced buying they had been paying $4.75 a ton, and were selling for $8 and $9 a ton. Now they pay $6 and charge $8.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Q. Have you been around in other cities? — A. I have, in Boston and Portsmouth.
Q. How do you think people are getting along now—as well as they did forty years ago? — A. I think they are living too fast.
Q. Are they getting along as well—living as well? — A. I think so, rather. When I went to Portsmouth I split wood for a few cents a cord.
Q. You would not do it now if you could get a better job; that is, if you wanted to work? — A. Well, I would; that is my nature.
Q. You would not think of working for anybody for 8 cents a day now; that is, you would not if you were as smart and young a man as you were then? — A. I would unless I could do better.
Q. But do you not think you could do a great deal better? — A. Oh, yes.
Q. So the times are better now for such men as you to make a living? — A. Yes.
Q. Do you think of anything else that bears on the questions which we are inquiring about? — A. No; I have nothing else to say. As I have said, I think labor and capital have built up a good city here. I do not know that they could have done any better, so far as management is concerned. I have never seen any cruelty in the overseers. I will say that for them. They have done by me as they ought to.
Q. You feel that you have some reason to be proud of this city that you have helped to build? — A. In one sense, and in another I have not. I think it is demoralizing. There might be more influences brought to bear to make it better. There used to be more restraint than there is now.
Q. That is, there are some people now who do more as they please? — A. Yes.
Q. Well, this is a free country? — A. Yes.
Q. And our ministers and teachers and the parents at home are supposed to look after the morals of the people, are they not? — A. I know they are; but the parents do not do it; that is the trouble.
Q. Then the mill owners and capitalists are not any worse than the parents around town? — A. No; the parents do not bring up the children as they ought to do. I say the parents are to blame in many things that are done.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

REV. JOSEPH AUGUSTUS CHEVALIER examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You are a clergyman of the Catholic Church? — Answer. Yes.
Q. Resident in this city? — A. Yes.
Q. How long a time have you resided here? — A. Twelve years and four months.
Q. You are, of course, thoroughly acquainted with the general condition of the people here—and by “general” I mean to include all that would be of a special nature? — A. Yes.

THE FRENCH-CANADIAN POPULATION IN MANCHESTER.

The CHAIRMAN. We have been instructed to make an inquiry, and to report to the United States Senate what we can learn, as to the relations between the employers and employed in this country, the rate of wages
paid for labor, as to the sufficiency of that compensation—whether the working people get their share of the joint production of capital and labor, and what we can learn of the real general condition of the working masses of the country. As you have, I suppose, had special relations with the French population of this city, which I believe is about one-third of the population, the committee would like your testimony as fully as you see fit to give it in regard to their condition and situation in Manchester and in the United States, as far as you know it. Perhaps, before you commence to state your views and facts on the matter, I ought to say that one witness who has been before the committee, somewhat violently aspersed the general character of the French working population here at the North, and we are quite anxious to give some one who can speak with authority for them the opportunity to state the matter from his and their standpoint. You may make to the committee such statement as you choose in your own way, and take your own time.

The WITNESS. I would like you to ask me questions.

Q. Very well: What is the French population of Manchester?—A. About 8,000 to-day. By the census of a year ago there were 5,500. There is less now than then.

Q. From what country do they come—from Canada, or from France as well as Canada?—A. Only from Canada.

Q. They are what is known in this country as the Canadian French?—A. Yes.

Q. Where and how are they employed?—A. In the mills.

Q. In the cotton and woolen factories?—A. Yes.

Q. From what part of Canada do they come?—A. The province of Quebec.

Q. What was their occupation, as a rule, while in Canada?—A. A great many were farmers.

Q. What has induced that immigration from Canada to Manchester and other portions of the northern United States?—A. Well, they expect to make a better living here, I suppose, than they do in Canada. Of course, it is the poorest class that comes to the States.

Q. That most need it?—A. Yes.

Q. About how many miles distant, as a rule, have they to come to get to Manchester?—A. They generally come from Montreal or Quebec. I suppose it would be generally called about 300 miles.

Q. They come for the purpose of bettering their condition. Now, under your observation, what has been the result? Have they succeeded in so doing or not?—A. They have generally succeeded. As a rule, they succeed very well; still they do not save much money. They generally live too well. They spend too much money to be able to save; but a good many save money.

Q. What wages would the men get per day in Canada at such employment as they could get?—A. Well, I could not tell very well now how much they would get. They used to get about a dollar a day when I was in Canada. I suppose they get a little more than that now.

Q. Was there sufficient employment there at that rate?—A. Oh, yes. If they have a farm or place of their own, they can live very well.

Q. But what pay would the same man who gets a dollar there get here in the mills?—A. I guess to-day they do not get much more than they do in Canada. Wages are so dull here now that it is not much better than it is in Canada.

Q. Is there much inducement for them to come now, do you think?—A. Of course, those who have many children that can work in the mills can make more money here; but those who do not have many children
to work in the mills live better in Canada than here, because wages are so low here.

Q. I suppose they have continuous employment here, or very nearly so?—A. Well, the men do not have employment all the time.
Q. They do not?—A. No. The girls have employment mostly all the time; but a good many men do not work all the time.
Q. The men who come here usually are men of families, are they?—A. Yes.
Q. Do many of them remain and settle here permanently?—A. Yes; a good many of them remain.
Q. What is the tendency among them—to remain more than they formerly did, or to return more generally?—A. Generally, I guess they intend to return; but a good many do not return.
Q. Are they purchasing real estate to any extent here?—A. Well, a good many have real estate, and I guess a good many more intend to remain, because we have churches now.
Q. If it is more like home for them?—A. Yes.
Q. As you have observed them, how are they as compared with other working people here in the city as to their industry, thrift, and general deportment and character?—A. I guess they are a good class of people, good working people. They work all the time as long as they can get work, and they are opposed to strikes and such things.
Q. They are not carried away in that direction?—A. No. Of course, if we should say something to them to strike, they would.
Q. If there was cause for it they would?—A. Yes; they obey the priests very well.
Q. They receive the advice of their clergymen in that matter?—A. Yes.

SCHOOLS.

Q. How about their children attending the schools, either private or public, or getting a reasonable education from some source?—A. They all go to schools. Some go to public schools, and some to the parochial schools.
Q. You have parochial schools for them?—A. Yes.
Q. Have you those schools sufficient to give education to all of them?—A. No; not yet.
Q. I suppose you increase the parochial schools as far as and as fast as you can?—A. Yes; we intend to.
Q. You give moral and religious training, I suppose, in those schools?—A. Yes.
Q. Such as the doctrines of the church require?—A. Yes.
Q. In addition to such training, what branch of what we call the intellectual or secular training, do you teach them?—A. Just the same line of teaching as is taught in the public schools. We use a good deal the same books; that is, readers, &c., as are used in the public schools.
Q. Do you use the same text-books throughout as in the public schools, in geography, arithmetic, &c.?—A. Yes.
Q. That is, the secular studies are the same?—A. Yes.
Q. And the text-books are the same?—A. Yes.
Q. How far do you carry them in secular education in the common or parochial school?—A. They do not come to school until, I suppose, about twelve or thirteen years of age. They have to go three months in the year after that time; but they work as much as they can, so that we cannot carry them very far.
Q. How long do they attend after they commence—to what age?—A. Those who go to school from twelve to fourteen have to go to school
six months in the year; from fourteen to sixteen three months in a year.
The rest of the time they work in the mill.
Q. Do they attend school any after sixteen?—A. No. Some go to
Canada to some colleges there if they want to learn more.
Q. But the laboring man who expects to get his living by manual
labor usually quits school at sixteen?—A. Yes.
Q. How is it with the girls?—A. The same.
Q. Do I understand that they do not commence at all until they are
twelve years of age?—A. Oh, yes; they go as early as about seven or
eight years; but they commence to work about twelve years of age.
Q. They attend all the time they choose until they are twelve, then
they work six months, if they can get the work?—A. Yes.
Q. And they attend school the other six months up to fourteen years
of age?—A. Yes.
Q. And after fourteen they attend three months at school and work
nine months up to their sixteenth year?—A. Yes.
Q. And that is the rule?—A. Yes.
Q. Is the maintenance of the parochial school attended with consider-
able expense?—A. Not very large expense, because we have the sisters
teaching.
Q. I would like to know whether you have of the sisters—who are, of
course, well qualified—a sufficient number of teachers for the school?—
A. Yes; but we have not room enough.
Q. It is the lack of a building rather than anything else?—A. Yes.
Q. And as the population gets stronger and wealthier I suppose you
will supply that want?—A. Yes.
Q. Now, there being some lack of parochial accommodations, to what
extent do the parents avail themselves of the public schools for their
children? Do the children, who cannot get parochial school accommo-
dation, attend the public schools?—A. Certainly.
Q. So there is no such feeling against the public schools as prevents
your taking advantage of them if they are unable to supply their wants
in the parochial school?—A. Oh, no; no objection at all.
Q. I suppose the objection you have is that the public school does not
include proper moral and religious training with the secular?—A. They
do not teach any religion there; and they do not teach the French lan-
guage.
Q. You teach French in the parochial schools.—A. Yes; we teach
both French and English; we want the children to learn both lan-
guages.
Q. To which language do the children who are born here take most
naturally as they grow up?—A. To English, I guess.
Q. Do they mix the two?—A. The children generally talk English.
Q. Hearing both languages indiscriminately, do they come to confuse
the two? In the same sentence will there be French and English
words combined; or does the child naturally, if he commences to express
himself in one language, carry the sentence through in that language?—
A. Oh, certainly.
Q. Then, young as they are, they learn the two languages separately,
catching the words from their parents and others?—A. Yes; but it is
more natural to them to talk English, because they hear English all the
time.
Q. Do not the parents continue to talk French at home?—A. Yes;
in the house the children have to talk French because the old people do
not talk English, as a rule; but out of the house they generally talk
English.
Q. What are the personal habits and actual condition of these people in their houses, and in daily life as to attention to sanitary conditions, neatness, thrift, economy, cleanliness, and the like?—A. In their houses they are generally clean people; but the tenements for them in the city are bad; their sanitary condition is awfully bad, I guess, in some places in the city.

Q. Some that you have inspected yourself?—A. Yes.

Q. In what condition did you find the tenements themselves?—A. They are too small; then they do not repair them at all for many years; and all around those tenements in the back streets all kinds of dirty things are allowed to stand. In many cases I have seen that myself. When they have good houses they live well, and their health is good; but in many places they get sick on account of the bad condition of the houses.

Q. How large a proportion of them live in houses that are in that condition?—A. Well, you might say at least one-third of them live in those tenements on the back streets.

Q. Can you give an idea of the size of the rooms—these are families, are they—large families?—A. Yes.

Q. How many children may there be in a family?—A. They do not generally have more than three or four rooms for one family—or four or five rooms; as a rule they are very small rooms.

Q. Can you give an idea as to the size of the rooms; how do they compare with this room?—A. They do not have as much room as this.

Q. The rooms are not so large?—A. No; perhaps about as large as half of this room.

Q. And some three or four or five rooms usually make a tenement?—A. Yes.

Q. How many persons in the family?—A. You might say seven or eight.

Q. The two parents, and then the children?—A. Yes. The bed-rooms are very small; generally 6 feet wide by 10 feet long, and some smaller than that; but as a rule I guess the bed-rooms are about 6 or 7 feet wide and 10 or 12 feet long.

Q. How do these compare with the houses that they came from in Canada?—A. They have good houses in Canada, large houses.

Q. They are farmers as a rule there?—A. Yes; they have very large houses there.

Q. Is there a tendency among the Canadian French population toward the United States, or is the tendency the other way?—A. A great many come to this State (New Hampshire).

Q. As among the French population themselves, which of the Northern States or what portion of the States do they prefer?—A. I know that a great many prefer to come to this State; but a good many go to Massachusetts, too. We do not have so many Canadians in this State as they have in Massachusetts.

Q. It is not so large a State, quite.—A. No.

Q. But do you know any manufacturing city in Massachusetts where so large a proportion of the people are Canadian French as here?—A. Yes; at Fall River they have more than we have here.

Q. But that is a larger city, is it not?—A. Oh, yes; and there are more in Lowell, too.

Q. What number are there in Lowell, or Fall River, or both?—A. There are about 12,000.
Q. In Lowell!—A. In Lowell and Fall River, too; the same in both.
Q. Have you visited among them in either of these cities?—A. No.
Q. As compared with other working people in the mills, do you know any reason why they are not as industrious and as desirable as any?—A. I think they are. As a rule, they are sober people. Of course there are some that are not, but they like to work, and they stick to it.
Q. Does any suggestion occur to you of what you would like to see done—what you think ought to be done to make them more comfortable, prosperous, and happy?—A. I think that the tenement houses ought to be kept in better condition.
Q. The tenements themselves ought to be made better?—A. Yes; then I suppose the wages are rather low; they do not get enough, I guess, to pay their expenses. Groceries are very high.
Q. What prices do they pay for groceries, so far as you know? You may be able to state something about that.—A. I believe they are very high; butter, eggs, &c.
Q. Are you able to give the range of prices; I suppose they buy as other people buy in the market. Do you know any reason why they do not get their groceries as cheaply as any other class do?—A. Well, I suppose they have to pay a little more because they can only pay for their groceries every month; and I guess grocers sell more if the customers take a book than if they pay cash down.

WEEKLY PAYMENTS.

Q. I suppose, from the way you state it, that you think they ought to be paid oftener than once a month?—A. It would be better; if they have money to buy groceries they would get their groceries cheaper, I think; anything that they can buy for cash down they would be apt to get cheaper.
Q. At the end of a month they are paid four times as much as they would be paid at the end of a week. Do you think they are more likely to spend money for other uses if they get it in larger sums?—A. No; I think not.
Q. You think they would be more likely to save money if paid weekly?—A. They could save a little more money if they wanted to save it.
Q. You think there is a tendency, having it all together in a lump, to waste more of it?—A. No; I do not think they waste more of it; but if they buy their groceries for cash they get them cheaper.
Q. But why do they not buy for cash when they receive cash every month?—A. They do not have money ahead. Every month they spend all the money they get.
Q. Could they not, by an effort, contrive to get a month ahead, and then be in advance?—A. They could, certainly, if they would; but as long as they have money they want to enjoy it.
Q. They are about like the rest of us in that respect, I suppose?—A. Yes.
Q. It seems a little hard to hold working people to rules that we do not obey ourselves, and ask them to exhibit virtues that others do not exhibit.—A. I think, too, that the wages are rather low.
Q. Does any other suggestion occur to you that might be made to help in the improvement of these people?—A. No; I do not think of anything else.
Q. Do you encourage them; do their leaders and clergymen and others that have influence with them encourage them in the idea of remaining and being permanent citizens here?—A. Certainly.
Q. That is your personal desire—that they should do so?—A. Yes, sir; that is my idea. If they come here they ought to stay and not be traveling all the time.

Q. And your teachings are having some effect upon them?—A. Yes; certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that the people here are very desirous that they should stay rather than that they should remain only temporarily.

The WITNESS. Certainly; it is much better.

The CHAIRMAN. There is plenty of room, and the second generation of course have many advantages that those who are now coming in with their families cannot have.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Q. As a whole, you think then that their condition is improving, and those who come with the design to stay, and do stay, do the best?—A. Yes; as a rule they live well in this city, and are pleased to remain here as long as they can. Of course some intend to return to Canada.

Q. Does anything else occur to you that you would like to state?—A. I think not.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

EMORY J. RANDALL examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In Great Falls, N. H.

Q. About what is the population of that town?—A. I think the population of our side of the river is about 5,500. We are divided by the river, and there is quite a population at Berwick, on the Maine side of the river, which is an adjunct to our place, and the interests of the two places are in common, although Berwick is in another State. The combined inhabitants are something like 7,200 to 7,500.

Q. What is the business of that place?—A. The principal business of the New Hampshire side of the river is the cotton industry. We have one small woolen mill, a ten-set mill; that is on one of the privileges that our corporation owns. The corporation is the "Great Falls Manufacturing Company," which I represent in part.

Q. What has been your connection with that company?—A. Well, I have been with the corporation since 1865. I went there, as you might say, an operative, and went into the packing-room and had charge of that when I first went there. I then became book-keeper, and have now charge of the disbursement of the funds at the mill, and am stockholders' clerk.

Q. How many employés are there?—A. We have about two thousand one hundred persons on the works.

Q. That is in the cotton mill!—A. Yes.

Q. Does this include all the cotton mills of the place?—A. Yes.

Q. They all belong to the same company?—A. Yes; the Great Falls Manufacturing Company. The average number of hands of course is considerably less; about one thousand eight hundred is the average number, allowing every hand to work all the time.

Q. Of what nativity are those people?—A. Well, without knowing exactly, my acquaintance with the operatives would lead me to believe that about 60 per cent. are French Canadians, and the other 40 about equally divided between Scotch, Irish, and American.

Q. Are there any Germans?—A. No, sir; we have no German population.
Q. Won't you state to us, in your own way, the general condition of these people; how you get along with them, and how they get along with their employers? I should like to have you give such a description of them as you would give in conversation to a friend who knew nothing about the circumstances. You have a general idea of what we want to find out and know how to express it.

CONDITIONS OF THE OPERATIVE POPULATION.

A. Well, in the first place, as to the condition of the people; I think that our population does not differ materially in its character from what you will find in any New England manufacturing town of the same class; that is, cotton operatives.

Q. They are likely to be about the same as in this city, for instance?

A. Undoubtedly. The general tendency of the French-Canadian population—at least that has been my observation—is to the larger towns. The country mill is generally a graduating school for the city mill. The French population of our place, for instance, has a tendency towards the larger towns, and I think that is so everywhere. The peculiar characteristics of the French are a desire to live in large settlements; they like show, and the accommodations and societies which they have in the large cities rather than the country. So that I think, if the facts could be obtained, Manchester, for instance, as being the representative town of New Hampshire in this line of business, would probably show that it was made up very largely of people who have come to it from the smaller towns. I think that the new hands, for instance, who come from Canada come oftener to the smaller towns at first than directly to the large towns. So I should say that in the country mills the French-Canadian population would not average quite as well as they would in the larger towns—that is, they have not been in the country so long.

A great many of our people are direct from Canada, and of course they come to the States in many cases—in fact in all cases—to benefit their condition. Heretofore in our own community the Canadian has come with no fixed purpose to remain. I am talking now of the larger proportion of the people. The French-Canadians heretofore have come to our place with the purpose of going back to Canada to stock the little farms which they own there, or to remain in our communities or such larger places as they may drift to, like Manchester or Lowell, until they shall have money enough to stock their farms and improve their condition at home. That I think is being changed somewhat in our own community at present. There are two parishes down our way, one for the English-speaking and one for the French-speaking Catholics. One is in charge of Father Doody, an Irishman, and the French portion is in charge of Father Dumas, a very faithful man. They are now building a new church, and since that movement has been in progress the tendency of the French people has been to look about them for homes, and there are quite a number of French people there now who are buying homes for themselves, so that the outlook at the present is that we shall have a more fixed population than heretofore. They are providing in that church that is now being built a very large room to accommodate two or three hundred, which they propose to use for a parochial school, and to prepare, I presume, the younger portions of their families for the duties of the church. Our agent, Captain Shaw, is very much alive to the importance of the education of these people, and so are the priests.
RELATIONS BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYÉS.

There is no dissatisfaction, so far as I know, between the operatives and the management at the mills. My knowledge of the management of the concern, covering the period that I have been there, leads me to believe that only this is desired: That the operatives should be well clothed, well housed, and have all their wants, spiritual, intellectual, and physical, well provided for. We have a reading-room connected with our works, which we support, which is open every night in the week, and we have connected with it a library, which is a private corporation; but the use of it is nominal to the mill operatives, to which the corporation contributes for that purpose, so that it practically makes it a free library. There are some 6,000 volumes in it. We have in the reading-room all the popular publications of the day, such as Harper's Weekly, and the daily and weekly New York and Boston papers. There is no antagonism between the employé and the employers. Strikes we have had in one or two departments. I think during the years that I have been there we had but one strike. That was only in a single department, and it was only for a couple of weeks. The matter was then adjusted. That was several years ago.

COMPETITION AND WAGES.

The tendency in all the large towns to-day of all the people is, I think, toward the amelioration of the condition of the poorer class of people. There is no doubt that the cotton-mill operative is among the poorest paid class of labor in the country. That is in the very nature of things; the close competition in cotton manufacturing compels that; but there is very little difference in the prices paid in one community compared with another. There is a common labor market in the cotton business that compels one manufacturer practically to pay the same price that his neighbor pays. It is one of those things which the very nature of the case would compel; for instance, we are on the same stream with the Salmon Falls Manufacturing Company, and the Biddeford Mills, and the Saco Mills, within 25 or 30 miles, and within 40 miles of Manchester.

Q. And Lewiston?—A. Lewiston is further away; but there is a general uniformity of prices in all departments of mill labor. For instance, if Great Falls did not pay as well as Salmon Falls, the best help would go to Salmon Falls.

Q. And if Salmon Falls did not pay as well as Biddeford, or Biddeford as well as Lewiston, the best help would go where they would get the best pay?—A. Yes. So that, practically, while there is no combination on the part of employers, there is a general uniformity of pay. For instance, in the carding-room the card-grinders, section-men, and fly-frame tenders receive about the same price for similar work in all those places. Frequently, in order to learn what our neighbors are paying, the heads of departments visit other places, and while, as I have said, the pay is not regulated by any combination, yet, if we are paying a little less than others, we have to come up on the price of labor. It is, of course, the tendency of the country mills to pay a little less than the city mills, for the price of living is a little less than it is in the city.

OPERATIVES’ TENEMENTS, RENTS, AND RATES OF BOARD.

We furnish tenements for a large share of our operatives. Most of the American, and quite a number of the Irish, in fact most of the old
Irish families of our place, have homes of their own; they are a very thrifty class of people, and the larger portion of the tenements are occupied by the French-Canadians, who, as yet, do not own their own homes. The price of board is fixed at a very low figure. We have one large boarding-house, where the price of board, by the assistance we give to boarding-house keepers—giving them their rent and other considerations, and guaranteeing their board—is, for girls, $1.75 a week. Of course, that does not pay the boarding-house keeper, but we make up the deficit. In the men's boarding-house (for we have a large house where the men are boarded exclusively) they board the men for $2.50 a week. These places board other men for $3 to $3.50, and where women are boarded they board other women for $2 and $2.50, the ruling price with the corporations being $2. Large tenements of eight or ten rooms rent for $8 a month, and the smaller houses for something like $4 to $6 a month.

FRENCH-CANADIANS AS OPERATIVES.

I understand that the French-Canadian people, who are the largest portion of our mill population, send a very large amount of money home, amounting in some cases to several hundreds a year to a family. I have been informed of that fact through the express companies, that they send home to their people quite large sums of money. The tendency, as I have said, then, is that there is rather an emulation among that class of people to live better, to dress better, and to be, on the whole, better citizens than at any other time during the last twenty years.

Q. I think you stated that the larger portion of the help were Canadian French.—A. Something like 60 per cent. at present.

EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN OF OPERATIVES.

Q. How about their attending schools; to what extent do their children get educated?—A. They do not attend the schools so well as they ought to. We are undertaking to compel attendance as much as possible, and we have the hearty co-operation of the parish priest in that direction. Of course they evade the school laws to some extent. The better portion of them avail themselves of schools. All of our Irish and Scotch people are as interested in the schools as the American population.

Q. In the public or parochial schools?—A. The public schools.

Q. The parochial school exists there, I suppose?—A. It is not started yet. It will be started the present fall. I do not think that they are strictly parochial schools that are in progress there, though I say this qualified. I am not certain that those schools are assisted by the church. There are private schools, where the French Catholic children attend, and have been attending for two or three years; but not large schools.

Q. Do you think this parochial school, when it gets into operation, will draw off the Canadian children from the common school?—A. No.

Q. Or will it simply make room for a class that has not attended anywhere?—A. I think that will be the fact. There are quite a number of the older residents there, we have quite a number of French families who have lived there for several years, and the longer they live with us the more they assimilate, and adopt our customs and habits, with the exception of the language. Very few of the older people speak any language but French.
Q. What should you say of the desirability of the French as a laboring element there?—A. I think they are a very good class of people. Of course they differ entirely in many of their characteristics from the Irish and American, but they are apt and quick to learn and very smart workers. They are not so constant, however.

Q. Are they frugal in their habits?—A. I do not think they are nearly so frugal as the Americans or Irish. I think they spend their money more freely for show and for dress. They are a more pleasure-seeking people than either the Irish or the American, in my judgment; that is, from my observation of them. They could not be called a dissipated class of people, however. Of course among our mill operatives we have some people that would be called dissipated.

THE GROG-SHOP AND THE OPERATIVE.

About all the disturbance and dissatisfaction that arise, in our local community at least, arise through the grog-shop more than any other place. If men in a community, whether believing in total abstinence or not, but believing in temperance and frugality, would take hold of the grog-shop question in our large manufacturing towns, it would very soon settle itself. I believe it is one of the things that our best citizens of all nationalities, without regard to religion, or to anything but sober, temperate habits, should look after. Whether men are total abstainers or not, if they would take hold of this question of temperance in our local community, especially among our mill population, I think there would be a great change at once for the better among that class of labor. As an illustration, I will say that our local community has taken that matter into their own hands. The best citizens of the town, regardless of the question of total abstinence or of signing pledges, are taking hold of the question. There is an organization in our community composed of practically all the business men of the town, having the hearty support and sympathy of the clergy of all denominations, that undertakes to prosecute flagrant violations of law, and to restrict as far as possible the groggeries of the place. I think a very marked change has taken place in our community within the last year, under the influence, very largely, of the moral support which that movement has received from the whole people of the community. There is no doubt that that is one of the vital questions relating to the welfare of the mill populations of this State. Where it is possible in a country community of 5,000 or 6,000 inhabitants to have fifty or sixty groggeries that do not purport to be anything else than tippling shops, and where they are allowed to remain undisturbed, there will always be people poorly clothed, poorly fed, and poorly housed, and there will be children ragged and running about the streets. I believe that the question of to-day among the laboring people of this State, for all men that want to better the condition of labor, whether they profess to be total abstainers or not, is to regulate this traffic by local organizations. I do not believe in indiscriminate prosecutions, but I believe in judicious prosecutions, the prosecutions of men who keep disorderly places. That should be attended to by the local communities, and it will in large measure rectify many of the evils that now exist.

Q. Have your observations extended to the surrounding manufacturing places—say to Dover, or other portions of the State—to Keene, Hillsboro', Laconia, or other places—to know whether in a general way these remarks of yours, in reference to the condition of the working people in Great Falls, would be generally applicable?—A. I think it
would to our class of labor. The city of Dover has a more diversified industry than our town. Our place is smaller, and the cotton industry is the main one. The woolen and cotton mills of Dover are the main industry there, but the industries there are more diversified. From all the information I can get through the Bureau of Labor Statistics of Massachusetts, and my general acquaintance with manufacturing towns throughout the State, I think that what I have said in reference to groggeries is true; that the want and poor condition of the people, or of the operative portion of the people, can be directly traced to intemperance.

Q. Berwick is on the other side of the river from you?—A. Yes.
Q. How is it as to liquor laws there, or the condition of the people as to the consumption of intoxicating drinks—is there a local supply, or do they get it from New Hampshire?—A. Well, I presume it is sold on the Berwick side, but most of it is sold on our side of the river. I presume that at the public house there may be a bar, but there is not what you call a grog-shop—not a tippling-shop on the Berwick side.
Q. Are you acquainted with Saco and other manufacturing centers in Maine?—A. Yes.
Q. Sufficiently so to have observed whether this evil you complain of exists there to a considerable extent?—A. Yes.
Q. And Lewiston?—A. Yes.

PROHIBITION.

The great trouble, I believe (of course this is somewhat foreign, perhaps, to the general thought), in the correction of some of these evils has been in the unbusinesslike and extremely radical measures which good temperance people have intemperately undertaken to enforce, and which have not been backed up by the sentiment of the community. I speak of this because, while I do not claim to be a total-abstinence man myself, I do believe that temperance is essential for everybody; and I believe that to-day it is the question of all questions in our large towns for the good people of every community to meet—to take the practical enforcement of laws in this direction out of the hands of enthusiasts and impractical men and put the whole question in the hands of practical and reasonable men, who look to practical work rather than theory. Every community should be the judge of what is proper to be done, and what can best be done in that community. Now, I do not suppose that the society that we have organized in our community meets the disapproval of men like our hotel-keepers, for instance, who, we all tacitly admit, are obliged, to a certain extent, to sell more or less wines and liquors that are prudently used, or our druggists, for instance, who properly sell liquors to proper parties, and such men as have no conscientious scruples against drinking a glass of wine, are in sympathy with the movement to curtail as much as possible the groggeries and to punish properly those people who make intemperate and improper use of stimulants, and persistently do so to the neglect of their families.

WORKING HOURS.

Q. How many hours do your operatives work?—A. Sixty-six hours a week when they work. There is one point, too, that I am glad you have called my attention to: the question of hours of labor. While nominally all the mills throughout the State work eleven hours (I presume that in most of the mills it is the same as ours), about 25 per cent.
more names are on the pay-roll than the average number of hands, and the inference is, and it is practically true, that people in the cotton mills work throughout the year about 75 per cent. of the time. That is, I mean, that a hand would be out about 25 per cent. of the time, or in that proportion throughout the year. The names upon my pay-rolls amount to about twenty-five hundred. That is about the number that appear on my pay-rolls from month to month—between twenty-four hundred and twenty-five hundred. And yet, taking into account the people who come in for a day or two, whose names would appear upon the pay-roll, I have at different times looked the matter up without making accurate figures, but getting at it as nearly as I could, and I should judge that the difference between eighteen hundred hands and the twenty-three hundred hands on our pay-rolls would fairly indicate the average time of the average "outage" of the people who work constantly. The mill operatives are made up very largely of families. For instance, as a rule, the French Canadian that comes to the States, or the Scotchman who comes from Glasgow, adopts the mill business in a very large measure, because his family is particularly adapted to that line of business. A man who has six or seven daughters, as is frequently the case, and two or three sons, will naturally come to the States, and the girls will make good wages in the mill. Immediately a family of that character can earn $5 or $6 a day. I have families in my mind that have not been in the States more than a year. I know one family in particular, that came to our State when green hands, that are now earning $6 or $7, in the family, per day.

Q. What is done with that money—it supports the family, of course; but what becomes of the surplus?—A. It supports the family, and in a very large number of cases they send the residue to Canada.

Q. Where they are accustomed to sending it to Canada, you expect that family to return to Canada?—A. Yes.

**SAVINGS OF OPERATIVES.**

Q. Do they deposit to any extent in the savings institutions of the place?—A. They are beginning to do so. I am connected with our savings bank there, and I find that there are quite a number of our French people depositing now. Our bank was one of the "sailed" banks, and we have lately resumed. And the shadow that has been over the banks has modified their operations somewhat, perhaps, during the last three or four years. But I noticed during the present summer that deposits are beginning to come in from the French-Canadians. The other classes are natural depositors.

Q. As a rule, are the working people becoming thrifty and saving, and really making accumulations?—A. I think so. In many cases that would appear to be so from my own knowledge—families that would seem to have poverty at the door have really very nice fat bank accounts, in many cases.

Q. Poverty is the form in which economy exhibits itself with them?—A. Yes.

Q. That is, they pinch themselves in order to save money?—A. Yes, I have known them to do that. It has been the custom in the mills to send out among the poorer class of people, during the holiday season, somewhere between 1,600 and 2,000 pounds of geese and poultry to distribute, and by accident I happened to notice the names, and I knew that in many cases those names that were so carefully handed in were those of people who had a larger bank account than I had.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

ANNUAL PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY OF MILLS.

Q. What is the product of your mills annually?—A. We have been running for the last three or four weeks on short time. Our capacity is about 8,000,000 pounds per year, or about 30,000,000 yards of cotton goods.

Q. You usually produce about that?—A. Yes. Our product is seven to eight million pounds, usually.

Q. You think these observations of yours are in a pretty close degree applicable to the manufacturing interests in your vicinity?—A. I think so.

Q. Does anything else occur to you to state?—A. Nothing.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

Rev. William McDonald examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You are a Catholic clergyman!—Answer. Yes.

Q. How long have you been engaged as such in this city?—A. Thirty-two years; I have been forty-two years a clergyman.

Q. Where were you before you came here?—A. In Saint John, New Brunswick.

Q. You have seen nearly the whole growth of this city, then?—A. Almost; yes—they were building an Advent church here, to go to Heaven by, the year I came here.

Q. Did they all go that year?—A. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us the story as to the creation of this city.

The WITNESS. There is nothing that I have seen in or about the corporations that meets my disapproval that you could rectify.

The AUTHORITY OF THE COMMITTEE.

But I was going to dispute your right to come here. I think you are a trespasser in coming into our State. These mills and corporations here have been brought into existence by us; our State legislatures brought them into existence and incorporated them. They are State institutions, and what right has the United States to come in here and interfere with these things?

The CHAIRMAN. The Senate has appointed us as a committee to inquire into the conditions of labor.

The WITNESS. Well, you are sent around the country as a committee. Is that committee made up of five, ten, or what number of members?

The CHAIRMAN. There are ten in the whole committee, and some are taking testimony here.

The WITNESS. Who gave the committee power to subdivide?

The CHAIRMAN. The resolution of the Senate gives them that power.

The WITNESS. That resolution I did not see—only what covered the subject-matter.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the resolution.

The WITNESS. I did not know that two ordinarily formed a committee. I think we ought to have an odd number. "There's luck in odd numbers," and we ought to have three at least.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we are directed to take testimony, and have
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the right and authority to do so. There is no question about that. I do not wish you, however, to make any statement that you do not desire to make. We have not asked any gentleman whatever to answer any question that he did not feel inclined to answer, and it will not be necessary for you to say anything to us if you do not wish to do so. But there is no doubt of the power and authority to compel the attendance of witnesses by the Senate, and of the power of imprisonment for contempt, but that question is not raised, because we have said substantially to every gentleman that he could answer such questions as he pleased; and where anything was unpleasant to him to say, either for himself or the people he represents, to withhold it, and I want you certainly to do the same. I knew that you understood more in regard to the condition of the laboring people here than almost any other citizen of Manchester, and I know your very close relations with one particular section of the people, and it seemed to me rather proper that you should speak for them and tell what you know that should be said.

The WITNESS. If you were a committee of our State legislature then I would not dispute what you have said; but the State legislature brought these corporations into existence, and the same power can destroy them.

The CHAIRMAN. Every man in this State, while being a citizen of New Hampshire, is also an American citizen, and votes for President and Vice-President, and constitutes a part of the nation as well as of the State. It is on that theory that the nation claims to have some right to learn the condition of the people with reference to legislation, if it thinks necessary. Besides, it has always done this, and where it does not legislate it does much in the way of collection and distribution of information for the benefit of the States and of the people at large, as in the case of the census, for instance. Investigations of this kind are very frequent, indeed, not exactly in the line of what might be as beneficial to the people, perhaps, as this investigation may be, but the power to investigate is very frequently exercised by the national Congress.

The WITNESS. You state that, but I do not see any evidence of the statement. Where does the United States Congress get power to come into the State and inquire into the State institutions?

The CHAIRMAN. I simply say that it exercises the power to inquire into the condition of the people.

The WITNESS. But is that implied in the Constitution?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it has always been exercised, and I suppose it is fair to presume that Congress would not exercise it if it did not think it possessed it. However, that is a discussion of the principles of constitutional law. I have my views, and I suppose you have your views in regard to it.

The WITNESS. That is the reason I hesitated to come in.

The CHAIRMAN. I would not undertake to convince you on that subject, because I might not succeed in doing so. I simply say that if there is any fact that you know in regard to the condition of the working people that you think might be stated to the public——

The WITNESS (interposing). Oh, I do not think there is.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything that might do good——

The WITNESS. Any fact that I know I am not obliged to make known to anybody, except to such body as might be in power to use the information I give for the benefit of the parties that I speak of.

The CHAIRMAN. I say I will not raise that question with you at all.

The WITNESS. I think I am altogether in a fog in coming in here and
answering questions with reference to these matters; I think I am in the wrong place. I think the State of New Hampshire should call upon me for answers to such questions. [To a gentleman in the audience.] What do you think about that, Mr. Smith; if three or four men want incorporation here they must go to the State legislature and get it; and if they go beyond their power, the State legislature and nobody else has the power to call them to account. That is my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. I repeat that I do not want to raise any question in regard to that with you. Congress believes that it has the power to investigate, and it sends us out to take testimony.

The WITNESS. As to national testimony—testimony concerning affairs between the States, I admit—things that concern the whole nation; but this is a local matter. All these men, Mr. Smith, that are sent about the country here, are generally men learned in the law and up in the "quips and quilllets" of the law, and we are not able to compete with them in that matter. But the only thing that can come out of this matter would be to instruct the committee that there are many things in commerce, trade, &c., that they do not know anything about. Therefore they are going to get a good deal of useful information at our expense.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are matters that it is not necessary to raise a discussion upon. If you are disposed to give us any account of the condition of the laboring people as you have seen it, or make such suggestions as you think useful to any tribunal, we will be very glad, indeed, to have you do so. It is entirely at your own option.

The WITNESS. There is nothing that I could say that has not already been well said by my predecessors at this table. Mr. Livermore and all these agents know everything about these mills—more than I do. Here [indicating Mr. Smith] is a man that spent twenty or thirty years among them.

Mr. SMITH. I came here about the same time you did.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you know of any ill will or lack of harmony in the intercourse between the employers and the working people of this city?—A. Oh, there is always in any country in the world dissatisfaction on the side of the employed, no matter how well they are paid.

Q. Do you know of any injustice or grievance or hardship that our laboring people suffer from here that could be rectified?—A. I do not know of anything that is in your power to rectify.

Q. Do you know of anything that anybody could rectify?—A. Yes; I think the State legislature might rectify some things.

Q. What might that legislature do?—A. Well, sir; I do not care to answer that question.

Q. You do not propose to state what might be rectified by the State legislature?—A. If the State calls upon me I will tell them what I think about the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I do not wish to ask you any questions that you do not care to answer. Do you think that the general condition of the working people in this city is improving or otherwise, or has been improved since you have resided here?

The WITNESS. I think they are improving. There is an improvement all over the world, I guess, and all over the State.

Q. How is it in the matter of general intelligence among the working people here in the city; are they improving in that regard?—A. Our State has done what it could. My old friend, the State of New Hampshire, has legislated well for the rising generation, and wishes all the children to be educated.
Q. And, as a rule, their condition is improving, you think?—A. I think so.

Q. How is it in regard to their homes; as a rule, do they live in better houses than they did formerly, or in better tenements, or with better accommodations in the way of shelter generally?—A. Mr. Smith here knows more about that than I do.

Mr. Smith. Well, it is yourself that must respond to it.

**Operatives' Tenements.**

The Witness. I always thought that these tenements should have flat roofs, and that there should be steam through every tenement on the corporations, so that those rooms in the attics should be warm and comfortable in the winter as well as those in the lower floors. I look at it as a crying grievance to have these poor girls for eleven hours in a steamed atmosphere, and then oblige them at night to go up into an attic where there is no heat of any kind.

Q. Are there any other improvements that might be made?—A. That is one great grievance.

The Chairman. Yes. There is a great deal of complaint of that in New York. We took a great deal of testimony of that kind. How is it as to their sanitary conditions; are there any improvements that occur to you that ought to be made?

The Witness. No; I do not know of any.

Q. You think the tenements ought to be warmed?—A. Yes. Especially the upper rooms?—A. Yes. Then, in the summer time, when these poor girls get sick, or, in the fall, when they are down with autumn fevers, they are obliged to lie in these hot attics in a temperature of 80° to 90°, perishing with thirst and fever, under these slate roofs; it is terrible. I have been oftentimes in there and have been melting while talking to a poor, sick patient. [To Mr. Smith.] Have you anything to do, Mr. Smith, about bringing into existence this great hospital that is being talked about? [To the chairman.] Have you seen it?

The Chairman. No, I have not.

The Witness. I must say the United States senatorial committee has not made good use of their time if they have not visited that hospital.

The Chairman. I want you to describe it to us.

The Witness. It is down here at the end of the street, and you can see it. I tried in part to make up for the absence of that hospital by having a place at the foot of Hanover street, and I never received a yard of cloth for it. Nobody has ever said to me, "You have a large number of people there, and I will help you." Such a caricature of the word "hospital" as this institution is I have never before seen. When the news came up in magniloquent language from Boston, through the newspapers, that the Amoskeag Company had a great hospital for the operatives, I had a good laugh at the expense of Mr. Livermore. That hospital has yet to come into existence. It is one of the great deficits of the corporation.

Q. You think there should be improvements in the way of heating the tenements, and there should be some hospital for the operatives?—A. Exactly. And I think there should be some agent of the corporations to see that the operatives should have proper mattresses to sleep on, and that the food given to them should be properly cooked, and so on. There is too much arbitrary power in these corporations and board-
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Q. How is it in regard to the clothing of operatives, as a rule?—A. They are very well clad, indeed.

Q. There is no difficulty in that respect?—A. No, I always take the ground that no persons in Manchester need want anything if they are sober, frugal, and proper in the use of their money. This is a constant theme of mine. I speak of it in church and everywhere.

THE EVIL OF SHUTTING DOWN MILLS ON CHANGE OF SEASONS.

However, there is one thing that comes up to my mind that Mr. Smith here knows more of than I do, as he is connected with the Amoskeag corporation, though I only use the language in a hesitating way and do not very well know how to express it. When you have an order, Mr. Smith, on the works, for the coming styles of fashion—for those things that are going to be the styles—you go to work and employ men and fill the print works of the Manchester corporation, and other corporations, to get up these new fabrics for the coming styles, and you get men to work, not only the legal day, but also at night. That is done in the print works, is it not, sometimes?

Mr. SMITH. I have forgotten.

The WITNESS. Is not that done in the print works?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The WITNESS. Has it not often been done in the print works?

Mr. SMITH. It has been said so.

The WITNESS. Well, if I went on to talk vaguely in that way, there would be nothing said here. You are a party to it, are you not?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The WITNESS. They fill the print works up in that way, and give no extra pay, either, for working at night. Then, afterwards, all these extra men, and many of the ordinary men, are sent out, as there is no work for them. Perhaps they will then be a month or two months idle, and there will be no employment at all, because the owners of the print works want to make dividends. As the old farmer says, “While the sun shines the hay must be looked after.” So the print-works people drive the operatives in while they want them, and when they get the number of goods off they say, “We don’t want you any longer.” Instead of doing that, in my opinion, they ought to be obliged to employ the operatives only in the daytime, and not do any work at night at all, so that this day employment would continue. Instead of the order requiring the two months’ time, the order should require four months to get it up.

Q. Can the corporations control that?—A. They can, of course.

Q. Is there not a great deal of competition between them and other manufacturers in regard to their business?—A. Of course; among all the corporations throughout New England, if not elsewhere.

Q. The corporations that do not do that, as the saying is, “get left,” and lose the chance to make their goods?—A. That may be.

Q. And the working people would lose their work altogether in such case?—A. That could not apply universally, because these goods are special and the order is limited, requiring only a special amount. Therefore the other corporations could not be affected. That is all that I can say that gives any additional light to what has been said here. But I question your right to send after me, or any other man, I think the United States Congress has no right whatever to come into New Hampshire and ask how the mills are working in the State, because the State made those corporations, and if there is any abuse in them it is the State
that must remedy it. That is my doctrine. Then I doubt very much if two men make a committee to investigate anything. Here are two men that come here and call upon citizens of New Hampshire to listen to certain interrogatories. I doubt their right. There ought to be at least three members to form a committee.

The CHAIRMAN. As I have said, that is a matter I do not care to discuss, except to state the facts. Everybody has a right to have his views about State rights.

The WITNESS. But the act of Congress—has it given you power to divide your committee into twos or threes, or anything of that sort?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; or ones, for that matter. What we are doing is taking testimony to be submitted to the full committee, and by that act upon before any report is made to the Senate. It is the same as a suit at law, in which a deposition may be taken before one man in one State, and before another man in another State, and a third man in a third State, all that testimony being brought finally before the judge, which, in this case, would be the full committee; and whatever it does will be presented to the Senate, and whatever the Senate does will be sent to the House of Representatives; and if the House does anything about it the whole result will be sent to the President.

The WITNESS. There will be nothing done about it. If I live ten years or more, I shall not see these tenement houses improved a bit.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be; but they probably have been improved since you came here.

The WITNESS. No; it is the same old thing.

OPERATIVES' TENEMENTS.

Q. Have you been through the new ones that have been recently erected?—A. These flat-roofed ones over the river are perhaps a little improvement, but very few have been built by the Amoskeag corporation—very few good ones, I assure you. These attic roofs and apartments never ought to exist, for the reasons that I have stated—never. They have no heat in winter, and they have too much of it in summer. There is no heat distributed through the buildings, and when the operatives are at meals they have to eat half-congealed food. The butter on the table is half ice for want of proper heat in the house. Every tenement ought to have steam heat throughout, so that it would be distributed upstairs and downstairs, through the dining-room and all parts of the house. That is my idea.

Q. Does any other improvement occur to you that ought to be made in any respect?—A. No; but I repeat it is a great evil, this rushing men into a factory to do a certain amount of work in a given time, and then rushing them out again with nothing for them to do, doubling the day when they are at work, and it ought not to be allowed. The law ought to say what time a man shall work.

HOURS OF LABOR.

Q. How long do you think that time ought to be?—A. What we have now will do. Of course some have one idea and some another. When I came here first the working hours were thirteen or fourteen, and the only good that I ever saw come out of a New Hampshire strike was that strike which reduced the hours of labor. When they were forcing men to work fourteen hours a day the men got up and protested against it and they struck, so that the mills had to come down to eleven hours.
Q. How long ago was that strike—A. Mayor Bunting was then mayor; somewhere about 1852 or 1853; in the old “Know-Nothing” days. I do not know whether Mr. Smith was involved in that or not—when they were trying to drive all of us English-speaking Catholics and foreigners out of the country, and when they burned the Pope in effigy; when President Pierce, it was said, was about to become a “Romanist,” and took James Campbell, a Catholic, into his cabinet, and all the secrets of American diplomacy were going to be revealed to the Pope! That was all in our papers here. There was a General Abbott, who was then the editor of a little paper called the Boston Bee; he was a “patriot” of the worst stripe. He is dead now, however. What is the name of that man that goes round now lecturing for Irish patriotism?

A VOICE (in the audience). James Redpath.

The WITNESS. Yes; he was a “burning patriot” on the Boston Bee. By the way, I have a suggestion that I ought to leave with these gentlemen. I have been here thirty-two years, and I know that there is in all the mills skilled labor belonging to my creed, and never have they got an overseer. In the Stark corporation there are one or two men that have got a little limited, something that might, perhaps, by a legal interpretation be called an overseership, but nothing much; never has one of our men been appointed overseer.

Mr. SMITH. You are mistaken in that.

The WITNESS. Who has been appointed?

Mr. SMITH. O’Donnell was one of the best of our people.

The WITNESS. Well, he was no Catholic.

A VOICE. The appointments are controlled mostly through Odd-fellowship and Freemasonry.

The WITNESS. I have never known a Catholic to be appointed overseer.

Mr. SMITH. He was an Irishman, and I supposed he was a Catholic.

The WITNESS. There has been no Catholic appointed, although we have had labor, skilled, and as well qualified to do the work as any men in the mills. There is the great stumbling-block against us, and, therefore, that is why the mass of the population here cannot feel friendly to the society managing these mills. Hence, it is that I manifested some unwillingness to come in here at all. We have never got a single thing from them. Do you remember, Mr. Smith, when that old gentleman, Dr. Dean, was president of the Amoskeag Company? William Amory and some others of these gentlemen, gave me a hint that if I would come into one of their annual meetings, they would give me a subscription to build a church. Dr. Dean said he would be there, and make a few introductory remarks. I went into that meeting of the Amoskeag board. (That Dr. Dean, by the way, was worth a million dollars at the time, and when he died, afterward, he provided in his will that so much money should be spent down at Amherst for the Universalist Meeting-house.) Well, I made a speech to the gentlemen, and said that I had indirectly contributed more wealth to the Amoskeag Company, and all the other companies in Manchester, than any other individual, by protecting their property. I told them that they never saw any Irishman coming in there bringing wool mixed up with goat’s hair and little stones so as to make it weigh more. Dr. Dean had a regiment of these little stones on his desk, and I said, “What are these little stones for?” and they said, “We keep these stones to show you and all other people how dishonest these New Hampshire farmers are.” I hope, Mr. Blair, you are not a New Hampshire man.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I am.
The WITNESS. I am sorry to hear it. These gentlemen told me, "Father McDonald, there are a number of rocks that have been sent to Manchester in wool bags, and they have been weighed and paid for as wool." I asked the question, "Do you ever find such dishonesty as that among our people?" He said, "No; as a rule the Catholic operatives are the most reliable and honest that we have in this community." The company is obliged to pay $2,000 a year to a man to see that the operatives do not steal. Frequently they found operatives filching little things out under their clothes. I stopped that. However, at this meeting I said to Dr. Dean and Mr. Amory, "I have come here not as a beggar; I have done all I could to forward the interests of this company, and, I think, as matter of right, you ought to consider our claims, particularly when I tell you this, that the result of my ministry over my people is to make them honest, truthful, and straightforward in all their dealings. Many a yard of cloth and pound of wool might have been taken out of your corporation were it not for my preaching and instructions. You give $2,000 a year to a man to look after these dishonest operatives; you ought to give me some donation that would appear to be liberal, to help build this church that I am now trying to erect." "What do you say?" said Dr. Dean to Mr. Amory. Mr. Amory said, "I will give him a hundred dollars." I thought that was a pretty "scaly" offer. Mr. Straw was there, and did not say anything. "What do you say?" said Mr. Amory to Mr. Dean. "I say," said Dr. Dean. "That is a good act of yours." "But what will you give?" said Mr. Amory. "I won't give anything," said Dr. Dean. There was not another member of that board that would offer to give a dollar. However, Mr. Amory was pulling out his hundred-dollar bill to give me; but I thanked him and declined, and I went on and built my church, and have it to-day, and many other churches and institutions here; and now I am not only not driven out from Manchester by the "Know-nothings," but I am almost in a condition to see that we are driving somebody else out.

Now, sir, will that be satisfactory!

The CHAIRMAN. Anything that you wish to state we shall be glad to hear.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

JOHN D. SWAIN examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Question. You are a resident of the city of Nashua, I believe?—Answer. Yes, sir.
Q. About how far is that south of Manchester?—A. Seventeen miles, I believe.
Q. What is your business?—A. I am superintendent of the Nashua Iron and Steel Company.
Q. How long have you held that position?—A. About four years.

THE NASHUA IRON AND STEEL COMPANY—ITS WORK, ETC.

Q. Is that a stock company?—A. Yes.
Q. What is its capital?—A. Four hundred thousand dollars.
Q. Won't you describe its business briefly—state the number of work-
men that you employ, the prices you pay for their labor, and what is their general condition as to health, education, and the comforts of life—
A. We employ from three hundred to four hundred and fifty men and boys. The pay will average, for boys, $1; for men, from $1.12 to $7 a day. That embraces skilled and unskilled labor. Our employés consist of Americans, Irish, and French. I should think the Irish might predominate in numbers, perhaps, over other nationalities; and I don't know but what the French outnumber the Americans. Our business is strictly iron and steel, employing men in the various callings pertaining to such business, embracing all kinds of material of work in iron and steel that is generally used in ship-building, railroading, and steam-boating, in fact everything in which iron is required. Our work is considered heavy work. We find our laboring class of people to be a repetition of what has been said before the committee with regard to their habits, with perhaps some exceptions.

I TEMPERANCE.

I want to indorse heartily the remarks (without going over them in detail) of Mr. Randall, from Great Falls. I believe intemperance lies at the door of all the trouble we have with our laboring class of people. My experience with operatives is, that our troubles are wholly caused by men who are intemperate, and I have little or no difficulty with them in any other respect. The trouble comes about always when they have been imbibing freely. Some of the best men we have, who give us as little trouble as any when they are sober, become troublesome and unmanageable when they have been drinking. We have with us, as men of the best skilled labor now, men who came with the corporation many years ago as gate-boys, to whom I then paid perhaps $1 a day; and they have worked themselves up to positions of trust and responsibility by attention to business from boyhood. They are very valuable to us, and have raised up families and become forehanded, and now own the houses they live in, and have money in bank. That will generally apply to our skilled labor. Of course with our unskilled labor we have men coming and going all the time. Since I have been there I have had many people whom we have employed three or four different times—that will apply perhaps more to the French population than to either the American or Irish. The French have a habit of going back and forth between the States and the provinces sometimes two or three times a year. At this season of the year they will come in after they get through the harvest work, and stay with us through the winter; and in the spring they will go back. That applies to a certain class, I suppose, that intend to live in the provinces rather than in the States. They come here and do what they can through the winter, and send their spare money back to Canada.

Q. About what are the gross earnings or production of your works yearly?—A. Eight hundred thousand dollars to nine hundred thousand dollars.

Q. You have stated the extremes of your rates of wages. You mentioned some to whom you paid $7. For what work is that paid?—A. That is skilled work, such as hammer work, in our steel department.

Q. What is the lowest you pay men?—A. One dollar and twelve and a half cents for laboring men, which is not a very high class of labor.

Q. Of course that is a business in which no women or children are employed?—A. No; we do not employ any females.
HOURS OF LABOR.

Q. How many hours do your men work?—A. We cannot be governed by any special number of hours' labor in certain of our departments, while in other departments we can. In our machine shop we work ten hours. When we come to our forging departments, they are governed by their "heats." That would depend, of course, on the size of work that we were making at the time. They may get out a "heat" in an hour, or it may be three hours. The same applies to the steel department. I should say that in that we would not average nine hours a day—taking the average of all the departments; it would run from seven to ten. Our steel department frequently gets through its day's work in seven hours; sometimes in six; seldom over eight; and the forging would not average over nine, if they do that. In the smith-shop they work ten.

Q. Would a law which would limit the hours of labor to eight be one that could be practically enforced without great injury to your business?—A. No. It could not be!—A. No; it could not.

Q. As I understand you, you do get on by working generally less than ten hours?—A. Yes; I do not think the time would average nine hours a day.

Q. Are there instances in which it would be necessary to work longer?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you been troubled with strikes at all?—A. Not to any extent. Shortly after I went there I had a strike in one department, but it was not general.

CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

Q. I suppose the families of your working people fare, on the average, about as the rest of the community do who earn a living by the sweat of their brow?—A. Yes.

Q. The children have the same opportunities for schooling?—A. Yes.

Q. They have the comforts and conveniences of life about the same as the rest?—A. Yes.

Q. How about owning their own houses?—A. Many of the Irish with us own the houses they live in.

Q. You have some, I suppose, that have been in the employ of the company for a considerable time?—A. Yes; forty years.

Q. How, as to those men who have been there a considerable period, have they accumulated property?—A. I find that when temperate they accumulate; otherwise not.

Q. What amount of property do you know of having been gained by any of your working people?—A. I have not the means of knowing the amount.

Q. You know they own their homes?—A. Yes.

RELATIONS BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYÉS.

Q. What is the feeling that exists between the working people and their employers in your own and in other branches of business there and elsewhere in New England—and, for that matter, in the country—as you have observed it?—A. As far as I know, the men feel comfortable. Of course, there are exceptions, and those apply generally to the unskilled labor. The most difficult thing is to convince unskilled laborers that they do not stand on an equality with skilled labor. I have no trouble
at all with skilled laborers in satisfying them that they are paid well for their work; but the difficulty comes with the man who is unskilled and compares himself to those who are skilled.

Q. Do any suggestions occur to you in the way of legislation—or other things that could be done by practical men without legislation—to improve the condition of the working people? Do you think of any legislation that you imagine would do good?

HELPLESSNESS OF CORPORATIONS TO COMPEL WORK.

A. I could think of a good deal, but I do not know whether it would be practical or not. It looks to me as though the present laws were one-sided. The corporations have not any power at all. If a man or a body of men work for a corporation they can work this morning, and if they choose to work this afternoon they can do so, and if they choose not to work they can leave you, and you are powerless in the matter. They can do just as they please, and you are powerless. That is one of those delicate things that I could not suggest anything about how to regulate, or anything of that sort. Of course, we have those cases.

Q. You think sometimes the corporation is injured by the laboring man quitting his employment abruptly when he ought not to!—A. Yes.

Q. But, owing to the want of responsibility, there is no remedy!—A. No remedy. Of course, we have seen that illustrated in the strikes that were so general last year over the country.

Q. There are other iron and steel industries in your city, I suppose?—A. Not like ours. The city is filled up with manufacturing interests of all kinds, more so than, I think, any other place of its size that I have been in.

Q. What other manufacturing industries are there in Nashua?—A. I do not suppose I could name the half of them. But there are boiler shops, brass foundries, novelty works, steam-engine works, cart-making factories, ice-cream-freezer factories, and so on.

Q. What is the population of Nashua?—A. About 15,000.

Q. Pretty much everybody who works there is occupied in manufacturing?—A. Yes; very few people lie about the streets.

Q. How long has it been settled?—A. It is an old town. I think the manufacturing interests have grown up gradually from the settlement of the town. It is a very good railroad center. I should presume that this growth may have been more rapid recently, within the last ten or fifteen years, perhaps, than it was previous to that time. I am only speaking now by guess work, of course.

FREE TRADE WOULD RUIN NASHUA.

Q. What effect would free trade have upon your industries? I do not care to go into a discussion of principles, but merely ask for your opinion in brief.—A. It would starve us out. It would shut the town right up.

Q. As a business man, that is your idea?—A. We should shut our gates right up, probably, and that would apply to all manufactures. Our establishment is the only one of the kind in the country that makes heavy steel forgings. We have a contract to make all the shafting for those new steel cruisers of the Government. In the line of goods that we manufacture we consider our work second to none.

Q. What is that manufacture—that line of goods?—A. We work in Siemens's and Marten's steel—and we manufacture all kinds of machinery—homogeneous boiler plate, &c.
By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Do you sell entirely to the American market?—A. No, sir. We have a trade in Cuba and in the West Indies, to some extent, and we sell to the parties who sell to those places, and to brokers as well—agents for those countries.

Q. Then you sell here for export abroad?—A. Yes; and our trade extends all over the United States and Canada. As to quality of work we think we can compete with Krupp. Our reputation for steel plate with the United States Government "ranks" with anybody else's as to quality for boiler purposes. No plate comes up to ours under the United States inspection laws. Iron boilers will soon be out of date. Steel boilers are comparatively a new thing, having come into use within the last fifteen years. About fifteen years ago I was in the Government employ—had been there for fifteen years. They were having some new boilers and wanted to introduce steel, but I opposed it bitterly. I was prejudiced against steel. I had an idea that steel was steel, and would not answer for boiler purposes; but I was overruled, steel boilers were furnished, and I had supervision of those boilers. They were under my charge for twelve years; and when I left them, they had just as perfect a surface, inside and out, as when they were bought. That surprised me, and, of course, I "gave in," and become an advocate of steel boilers at once. We have in our place quite a large plant, our capital being about $400,000. Our corporation located the first steel open-hearth furnace in this country; so that we feel that our experience has taught us something. We can handle heavier steel forgings than any other concern in the country—forging hammered on the steel hammer—and we can forge the largest steel shaft in the country; larger than any other establishment in the United States. These Government cruisers have got the largest shafts of anything ever made.

Q. You may state anything else that you wish the committee to know in reference to the character of your work.—A. I have pretty well stated what I had to say. The general interests of New England are similar. Our classes of mechanics have about the same habits as others, and when one testifies his testimony has a general application to the whole.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

TIMOTHY CROWLEY examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You reside in Nashua?—Answer. I do.

Q. For how long have you lived there?—A. Thirty-four years.

Q. You are engaged in manufacturing iron?—A. I am at present; have been for two years past.

Q. In a private capacity, or are you connected with some company?—A. I am connected with the co-operative company, so called.

THE CO-OPERATIVE COMPANY OF NASHUA.

Q. Please describe that company; give an account of its organization and its method of practical operation. I have several times heard of it, and its method may be of interest to other parts of the country.—A. The company was organized under the co-operative system, copying its law from the State of Massachusetts, as there are no laws governing
such organizations in this State. We were obliged to organize under the voluntary corporation act, and consequently, strictly it is not a cooperative concern.

Q. That is to say, it is not a legal entity, that can enforce its contracts like an ordinary corporation. Can you sue or be sued?—A. We can under our organization. We are incorporated under the voluntary corporation act.

Q. Then you are a legal body?—A. Yes.

Q. You have the usual rights afforded by the voluntary corporation law?—A. Yes.

Q. Now go on and tell us what your company is, theoretically and practically.—A. Practically the workmen—all those who are shareholders or stockholders—have a voice in the management of the company, and are, I think, more interested than they would otherwise be—they would be if they were employed by others. The company started with a very small capital—$4,000, and the cause of the starting of the company was the embarrassment of the concern which employed the men and failed to pay them. They started with the sum of $4,000, and they increased it about a year ago to $8,000, and have now increased it to $16,000.

Q. How is that invested?—A. That is invested in the stock, buildings, and tools of the concern.

Q. It includes what is called fixed, and also quick capital?—A. Yes.

PLAN OF THE CO-OPERATIVE COMPANY.

Q. Please describe the plan.—A. We have the same officers that have been customary with other corporations, but the foreman is an officer who is chosen by the stockholders at their annual meeting, and the stockholders are governed by the same rules as other workmen. We are obliged to employ some persons outside of the stockholders, not having a sufficient number of stockholders to carry on the business.

Q. When you hire help which does not belong to the corporation or society, what wages do you pay, as compared with other employers?—A. Well, I think we pay about the same wages as are paid in the foundries throughout the city and in other places.

Q. You are regulated as others would be, by the labor market?—A. Yes; we pay the stockholders the same way—according to the amount of skill they have, and the amount of labor they do—no more than to non-stockholders.

Q. How many stockholders are there?—A. Thirty.

Q. Do you exercise any particular care in the selection of those stockholders, or can any workingman of that occupation become a member by complying with certain conditions?—A. Well, the original stockholders are very anxious to keep the stock where it is and not let it get out. They want to control it themselves—the workingmen. And I will say one thing for the concern, I don't think there is a concern of the kind in this country to day that has as many temperate, industrious, sober men, in the same number of men, as that concern has.

Q. How many are there in all?—A. We employ fifty-five persons—men and boys.

Q. That includes the stockholders that work?—A. That includes all that work; yes.

Q. Have you any stockholders that do not work?—A. Yes; there are some outside. The stock is all owned in the city.
Q. Were they originally stockholders, who assisted in starting the concern?—A. Yes; mostly those who assisted in starting the concern.
Q. I suppose they did it as an experiment, and with the hope of helping others, or did they think it would be profitable to themselves?—A. Well, I think those that invested originally did it with the idea of helping the men.
Q. Do you find that you are able to control the distribution of that stock, or does it get into the hands of others who are not laboring men?—A. No, sir; only last week they voted to double up their stock from $8,000 to $16,000, and to issue $5,600 of it, and that is all taken now by the original stockholders.
Q. In issuing new stock would you give any preference to workmen, or is there a preference to existing stockholders?—A. A preference is given to the workmen. It was the vote that the workmen should have the first privilege—those who might choose to take.
Q. How would it be as between a stockholder who does not work and workingmen who are no stockholders; would you give to an outside workman a chance before you would give a stockholder who does not work a chance to take the new issue, or have you no rule about that?—A. We have given the preference to the stockholders who work in the concern to take all the stock that they desire to take, or could take.
Q. And they took it all?—A. Not all the stockholders that are employed, but all the stockholders took all that they desired to.
Q. But no stock was taken outside of the original stockholders?—A. No.
Q. I take it you have made some money?—A. Yes; we have done very well.
Q. How long have you been in operation?—A. It will be three years next April.
Q. Please describe your shop and the work that you do.—A. We do fine iron castings—small castings—as a specialty. We hardly ever make anything larger than two hundred pounds, and we make castings as light as half an ounce.
Q. Is it work that requires considerable skill?—A. Yes; it requires considerable skill to produce fine castings; as much skill, if not more, than large castings.
Q. You find your work stands well in the market, of course, and hence it finds ready sale?—A. Yes; we have a good reputation.
Q. What was the gross value of your product as sold last year?—A. Between $50,000 and $60,000.
Q. But I understand it is increasing with rapidity, or you would not issue this new stock?—A. Yes; the principal reason for issuing the new stock was to purchase the building in which we are doing business, and we have just concluded a trade by which we get possession of it.
Q. What would be the value of that property you are purchasing, with its furnishing of machinery, tools, &c.?—A. Somewhere in the vicinity of $20,000.

NO DIFFICULTY IN CO-OPERATION IN IRON INDUSTRIES.

Q. This concern has been in operation three years, you say. Have you found any practical difficulty in the running of the business more than other corporations usually have in the management of their business?—A. We have found no difficulty.
Q. You have found you could do as well as anybody?—A. Just as well; and I think, as a rule, the men are better satisfied than they could be under any other system.
Q. I take it from what you have said that up to this date you have made no distribution of proceeds beyond wages, have you?—A. Yes. The first year we did not make any distribution. The second year we made a distribution of 10 per cent. on the capital stock. That was last May.

Q. Have you ever ascertained or calculated what percentage of increase of wages that would make to those who work, or could you judge? If you knew the aggregate amount distributed and the amount of wages paid to stockholders you could judge pretty well.—A. We pay our stockholders who are employed there as good wages as they could get anywhere else; and then, in addition to that, we pay a percentage on the stock which they hold.

Q. How much of the money paid for wages the year previous to the distribution of the 10 per cent. was paid to stockholders, and how much of it was paid to those outside who worked for you, should you think?—A. I think about one half of the number of men employed in the concern are stockholders, and they are generally the most skilled workmen we have. They would probably get the larger share of the earnings.

Q. What was the amount that was distributed that made up this 10 per cent.?—A. Eight hundred dollars was 10 per cent. on the capital.

Q. That went round among about thirty men?—A. Yes.

Q. And it was for the year?—A. Yes.

Q. What effect has this upon the habits of the men? I suppose these men were all temperate and of good character before?—A. I do not know of more than one man in the concern that drinks to excess. He has given us considerable trouble. He is a good workman and we have cautioned him several times, and very lately he has behaved himself better.

Q. They were all men of such correct habits, with that exception, that I suppose you cannot judge whether this has any tendency to make them more prudent and saving.—A. It has a tendency to make them more prudent and saving; but as a rule I know that they were men of good habits before they went into this concern.

Q. Do you have in your regulations any provisions in regard to personal habits or character which your stockholders must possess before they join you?—A. Yes; all workmen and stockholders are supposed to be temperate, industrious men.

Q. Do you make a regulation of that kind with reference to those whom you employ?—A. We do; yes.

Q. As it has begun and gone on, do you see developing any indications that if you should enlarge its scope and increase its stockholders it would get to be unruly and unmanageable, or do you think you could expand your operations largely?—A. I think the system could be expanded largely under proper management.

Q. Do you think it would be any more difficult to transact the business in that occupation, and perhaps others, in that way than to do it as it is now done?—A. I think it would be more difficult with a larger amount of capital and greater number of stockholders, because working-men, as a rule, are not possessed of the intelligence that people are who invest money.

Q. But still would it not come to be the fact that among them there would be some men who would have the requisite skill and intelligence?—A. Oh, yes; but the larger the concern or institution the harder to handle.

Q. There would be more likelihood of disagreements arising?—A. Yes.
Q. Then, you think that within certain limits the system is entirely practicable?—A. I do, sir.
Q. But you doubt whether it could be expanded indefinitely or for very large operations?—A. I do not think it could be expanded indefinitely.
Q. You hardly think that any of the great transcontinental railroads of the country could be managed or built by that system?—A. No.
Q. Do you have meetings in which you decide business questions?—A. Yes; the directors are obliged to meet at certain times, and a business committee meets monthly and examines all the accounts of the concern, and sees that everything is properly carried out.
Q. Where do you find your market for castings?—A. Principally in Boston.
Q. I suppose you have given these labor questions some thought and study. Are there any suggestions that you can make to the committee that would be useful, either by securing publicity or possibly leading to legislation, State or national?

INTEMPERANCE.

A. I have not given it much thought, not being engaged in manufacturing until within two or three years, but I agree heartily with Mr. Randall and Mr. Swain, that the cause of a great deal of the trouble and mischief is too much drink—the intemperate use of liquor; and if that could be properly regulated there would be no difficulty, or there would be much less difficulty, in getting along with the workingmen than there is at the present time.

WORKINGMEN'S WAGES.

Q. What do you think of business, as actually managed at present; do the workingmen get fair pay, or are their wages lower than they ought to be, compared with the general profits of business?—A. I think they are fairly paid; I think they are well paid in comparison with the people abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me that the experience of your society, transacting business as you do, and comprising in yourselves the capacity of employer and employed, and getting out of the business such profit as comes from the sale of the product, you must be able to look at that question pretty fairly from both stand-points.

The WITNESS. I should think so.

Q. And you think, considering the risks of business, that the wages paid are fair wages?—A. I do; and I think when the intelligent workingman is brought face to face with the figures, and shown the profits that are made upon the goods, he is more reasonable than when he knows nothing about it. In our system the men know all about it; they learn what the profits are on the goods that they make, and of course we can very much better manage the men; they are satisfied. But when they do not know what the profits are, and imagine, as workingmen do, that the manufacturer is making immense profit upon them, while the laborer gets but a small per cent. for his labor, they become dissatisfied. In our system they have a voice in the management, and know the profits on the work, and they are reasonable and can be managed much better in that way.

Q. Then you think that if employers generally would take pains to give a fair and honest exhibit of the results of the business that they
and their employés carry on they could do something toward preventing dissatisfaction!—A. I think so.

Q. You do not find any general disposition among working men to be exacting or unjust, or to exact more than belongs to them, if they only know it?—A. No, sir; not among intelligent working men.

Q. Do not the intelligent working men generally lead the unintelligent?—A. Well, I do not know.

Q. These men, who are sometimes called agitators, are nearly always brainy men; perhaps they do not always lead them honestly; they may misrepresent some times.—A. Those agitators have axes to grind.

Q. You have taken this matter up among yourselves as practical working men, having had your attention turned to it because your employers failed to pay you, and so you worked this problem out among yourselves!—A. Yes.

Q. And it has been harmonious and satisfactory!—A. Everything has been perfectly satisfactory.

Q. It has satisfied you that the general rate of wages is about right!—A. Yes; and I am satisfied that our workingmen believe the same thing, because they know the profits that are made upon the products of their labor.

THE TARIFF.

Q. What effect would a reduction of the tariff, or the application of the principles of free-trade, have upon the work in which you and your friends are engaged?

The WITNESS. What do you mean by “free-trade?”

The CHAIRMAN. A repeal of the tariff.

The WITNESS. Of the present tariff?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

A. I do not know how they can make any reduction in the tariff. A reduction of the tariff may make a reduction in the cost of pig-iron; but you can buy iron now 5 or 6 cents cheaper than you could a year ago.

Q. There was a reduction a year ago; but have you ever given attention to the matter of customs dues and the effect of that upon the home and foreign market, and the effect of the tariff upon labor generally?—A. Yes; I have given considerable attention to the question of protection and a tariff.

Q. Well, what is your judgment as to whether the existence of the tariff, on the whole, helps laboring men and the business of the country generally, or not?—A. I think the business of the country generally would be benefited by free-trade. As to the effect it would have upon our particular industries, I think it might be injurious; but I think the business of the country generally would be benefited by free-trade. That is my opinion.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

THOMAS SANDS examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:


Q. Please state how long you have resided there, and the kind of business in which you are employed or interested.—A. I moved from Laconia, N. H., down to Nashua about two years ago, having been burned out at Laconia.

15—0 3—(5 LAW)
ICE-CREAM FREEZERS.

I am engaged in the manufacture of ice-cream freezers. It is a new industry in this country, probably the only establishment in the New England States where ice-cream freezers are manufactured. Five or six years ago the industry was almost unknown. I started in the business about twelve years ago with a very small capital, say about $1,500.

Q. You started at Laconia?—A. Yes; and did most of the work myself. I was a mechanic originally, and am now I suppose. I invented this ice-cream freezer myself, and put it on the market, and now employ about seventy-five men. It is a very peculiar business in this respect: that we have a number of different trades in it; that is, we must have tinkers (that is, tin-plate workers), and machinists, and galvanizers, and tin platers, and foundry men, and tub manufacturers—all in one establishment. We produce everything out of the raw materials in our own yard. I do not know whether this point would be particularly pertinent to mention, but we occupy at this time about two acres of land. We there employ foundry men, and a whole line of trades that come into our work—everything that enters into the manufacture of an ice-cream freezer—wood, tin-plate, hoop-iron, round-iron, pig-iron, &c. We use all the different metals—zinc, pig-tin (or spelter), and the kinds of iron that I have enumerated, all of which enter into our manufacture. Our goods are sold now all over the country, in fact all over the world. I am shipping freezers to-day to British India. I have shipped perhaps three car-loads of my goods this year to Egypt. I am shipping to Turkey, Mexico, South America, and Cuba. I mention this because the industry is an entirely new one, which has sprung up within a few years, and we are probably the largest manufacturers in the world in this line of business.

Q. This is your particular invention, you say?—A. Yes.

Q. There are other freezers, of course?—A. Yes, but this is the latest one. There are other freezers manufactured, but not all in the same works. You can't call such a business a manufactory. For instance, those freezers that are manufactured in Philadelphia are only put together there. The tubs are made in Baltimore; the castings are made at some foundry outside, and from there taken to a machine shop and there finished; then taken to a galvanizing establishment somewhere else, and there galvanized; the cans are made at one place and taken to another place and put together. Now, we make these all under one roof, from the raw material, and we have built up quite a business.

Q. What is the prospect of its enlargement?—A. Ten years ago, when I first started, I thought that the manufacture of a thousand freezers in a year was very good, but my manufacture this year will reach about 30,000.

Q. It is the same invention?—A. Yes, the same invention; but I have improved it somewhat, of course. The principle is the same.

WAGES.

Q. What wages do you pay?—A. I pay my foreman in the foundry $3.50, my foreman in the main shop I pay $3 a day. I pay my galvanizer $3.50, and my machinists $2.25, $2.50, and $1.50, according to skill. For general outside work in the yard I pay $1.25. I have some boys to whom I pay 80 cents or 85 cents a day—small boys to carry things about—only two or three of them, however.

Q. Is there anything else that occurs to you to state about this business?—A. I do not think of anything else.
By Mr. Pugh.

Q. What do you sell those freezers at? — A. They rate all the way from $3.50 up to $200.

Q. Of what sizes are they? — A. All sizes — some 2 gallons, 8 gallons, 10 gallons, 12 gallons, 14 gallons, 18 gallons, 20 gallons, 25 gallons, and so on up to 100 gallons. The large ones are run by power. I have never had any trouble with my help. I have help now that I had six or eight years ago.

INTEMPERANCE.

As far as the temperance question is concerned, I have a very simple rule. When I hire a man I ask him if he drinks, or if he is a temperance man. If he says he drinks, and wants to quit, I try him. If I afterward find him drunk or getting intoxicated I discharge him at once. I had a very good man, a tinker, to whom I gave $3 a day. He drank some, and I told him that the stand I took on temperance would necessitate either his stopping drink or quitting the shop, and I would give him three months to make up his mind, and that if he did not stop in that time I would discharge him. I gave him ample time to quit. He did not quit, and I discharged him. I do not know any better way than that for a manufacturer to do — to put the question boldly, and then when he finds a man getting drunk, discharge him. I do not believe in the old idea that because a man drinks he is a better workman than a sober man. That used to be the old cry, "He is a splendid man and fine workman, the best in town, no matter how drunk he is." I do not believe in that at all. I believe that a temperate man is a better man, and a better workman. I do not take any stock in that old saying.

Q. You don’t want a man to “take a little and leave a little”? — A. No, sir; I do not want a man to take any. It is not necessary.

Q. If a man would use it in moderation and temperately would you make that a ground for discharge? — A. I have tried it both ways myself.

Mr. Pugh. Yes; but you may do one way and another man may do another. I have seen men that lived to be eighty or ninety years of age and never neglected their business or any duty, yet took a drink or two when they chose, perhaps for fifty years past.

The WITNESS. Well, I know that, too; there are perhaps a few men with constitutions like the Constitution of the United States, but others can’t stand it. That does not change the fact, however, that temperance is the better way to live. We see it all through the country.

Q. You think, then, it is intemperate to take a drink at all? — A. I do; even cider. It is liable to affect a man some day. If he takes cider and has any trouble he may possibly take something a little stronger to drown his trouble. I know that when I was on the Western frontier I saw enough to set me against the liquor business, and I have always remembered what I saw.

Q. You had as much as you wanted? — A. Yes; I was brought up in Arkansas, and my early recollections are there — around Fort Smith. My father built that fort for the Government. It was a wild country in 1842-43, when I was a boy around there, and I saw enough of the liquor business to satisfy me. It was when Zachary Taylor had a regiment there, and the worst thing he had to contend with was the liquor business. I remember what I saw there, and so I do not drink. I do not believe it is necessary for any man to drink. If he wants a stimulant let him take a little ginger tea instead of whisky. It is just as active a stimulant.
The Chairman. We gave that Fort Smith Reservation to the schools at the last Congress.

The Witness. Did you?

The Chairman. Yes; almost all of it. There was reserved to the United States from the gift to the schools the fort—I believe about eleven acres. It was quite a large reservation originally, was it not?

The Witness. Yes, it was. I can remember those stones taken out at the junction of the Portan River and the Arkansas. My father took one hundred men and went out there and built that fort to keep the Indians from the settlers, and they began to civilize the Indians. He was there some eight or nine years, and then moved back to Boston.

Q. That was before the Mexican war!—A. Yes, that was about 1840.

**THE MANUFACTURES OF NASHUA.**

Q. How much manufacturing is done in your place now?—A. A great deal. It is varied in its industries too. They have large cotton factories there, large iron and steel interests—probably the largest in this section of the country—that which Mr. Swain represents, who has given his testimony here this morning.

Q. How many operatives are employed there altogether in the mills and foundries?—A. I could not tell you.

Q. Can you give a rough guess?—A. No; I could not.

Mr. Crowley. There are some two thousand in the two cotton corporations.

The Chairman. Is there anybody here who represents the cotton interest?

A Voice. Mr. Maxwell had intended to be here to-day, but had an engagement and could not come.

The Witness. I think we have there the finest cotton mills to be found in the section.

Q. Do they beat these mills up here in Manchester?—A. Well, they are as nice. These are fine mills here, though; but we have them in Nashua as good as anywhere.

Q. What goods do they make?—A. Cotton goods.

Q. Prints, or drillings, or sheetings?—A. Cotton goods generally.

Q. They do not make any fine goods there?—A. No print goods, I believe.

By the Chairman:

Q. Do you know whether their rates of wages are substantially the same as here?—A. I do not know much about the mills.

Q. I suppose there cannot be much difference?—A. I suppose not.

Mr. Crowley. I am inclined to think they are a shade higher there than here.

The Witness. Nashua is a "billing" point for the railroads. This place (Manchester) is not. For instance, you cannot bill goods from here to Alabama, but you can from Nashua to Alabama. That makes Nashua really a very important place. That is one reason why we moved from Laconia to Nashua.

Q. Transportation is cheaper from that point, is it?—A. Yes, I got my freight sent from Nashua to Chicago last year at but a very little more than I used to pay from Laconia to Nashua. So it makes it quite an item. Then our freight is all heavy freight; machines weighing from 15 pounds up to 100, and freighting bills make quite an item. It is a very good point for shipping, and being a billing point, we can bill
from there to every other point in the country, and know just how much it is going to cost. I found that I was saving considerable money by knowing what the freight would be.

Q. By “billing,” you mean that you can get through bills? — A. Yes. That is quite an item. We know what we have to pay. But before that, we had to leave it to the different railroads, and they do about it just what they choose.

Q. You say people cannot get through bills from here? — A. No, sir; there is no competition here in the railroad line. You cannot bill anything from here. After I got burned out, Mr. Moore, of the Union, and ex-Governor Weston, and Mr. Rogers, of the Boston Hardware Company, and Mr. Daniels up here, united in sending me a letter wanting me to move down here with my business. My answer was that I did not see any difference between this place and Laconia as to railroad facilities, and they could not see it either any better than I could.

Q. Do you recollect what the population of Nashua is? — A. Between 16,000 and 17,000; I think it is now rated as the second city in the State.

Q. Is it increasing pretty rapidly? — A. Yes, sir.

CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

Q. How as to the condition of the people who work by their muscle for a living, is it improving or otherwise? — A. Well, I think that Nashua is a very quiet city; I was a little surprised on moving away from Laconia down there. I had formerly lived in Boston before going to Laconia. When I went down there I saw that they have better control of the intemperate class down in Nashua than they have at Laconia. You would not see so many people drinking in Nashua in a week as you would see in Laconia in one day and Laconia has about one-third of the population — Laconia and the next village. Almost all the mill help at Nashua are well dressed. You will see them going out on a Sunday, and you would not know that many of them are operatives. As a general thing the men dress well too, and make a good appearance on the street.

Q. You have solved the problem of finding a foreign market, have you not? — A. Yes.

Q. How do you send your goods — by foreign vessels or American? — A. We get that trade by advertising largely; and through these exporters, or commission merchants, of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, and along the coast; these parties that they are dealing with send an order to them to buy thus and so; they send the order to us, and guarantee payment; we allow them a small commission for doing the business for the New York or Boston parties.

Q. And they ship? — A. Yes.

Q. Your connection with them ceases at New York or Boston? — A. Yes, the business is growing; it has doubled within this last year.

Q. This business of yours? — A. Yes, the foreign trade.

ICE MAKING.

The CHAIRMAN. One would think there would be no end to the demand for ice-making machines in these foreign countries.

The WITNESS. I have had many inquiries about ice-making machines from foreign countries; they see our advertisements of ice-cream
freezers, and they want to know if we can make machines for making the ice.

Q. What has been done in that direction?—A. Ice is made successfully to-day by machinery. They can make ice in New Orleans, and set it out in the sun in summer, side by side with the natural ice, and the artificial ice will stand the heat longer than the natural ice. And they can make that ice cheaper than they can get the other. It is getting to be a success all over the country.

Q. It could be made under the equator, I suppose, could it?—A. Yes, in any part of the world.

Q. Anywhere where they can get water?—A. Yes; it has spoiled the regular ice trade somewhat—this trade in ice-machines has.

Q. It will affect the ice trade of the State of Maine, I suppose?—A. Yes.

Q. They can probably make ice even from hot water?—A. Oh, yes; in making ice-cream I would just as lie: the cream would be hot when it is put in. It will freeze just as well. It does not look reasonable, but it is the fact.

Q. But you cannot reverse the process, can you; you have not got a thawing machine?—A. We can do that without a machine.

Q. Can you get water from the ice as well?—A. That can be done by friction.

Q. For what price do the cheapest of these freezers sell?—A. Three dollars and fifty cents.

Q. And that weighs how much?—A. About 15 pounds. It is composed of a tin can, a wooden tub, an iron frame, and an inside “beater” of malleable iron.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

BENJAMIN C. DEAN examined.

By Mr. PUGH:

Question. You are superintendent of the print works here, I believe?—

Answer. Yes; superintendent of the Manchester Print Works.

THE MANCHESTER PRINT WORKS.

Q. Do you do all the printing for the other mills?—A. There is no printing done except in the Manchester Print Works. Fabrics made by the other mills are not for printing.

Q. You print all that is made to be printed?—A. Yes; the Manc-chester Mills corporation has one print mill. When running full they manufacture about six thousand pieces of print cloth per week. We print all this, and then we also print whatever surplus of cloth over and above that the print works want to run. They are bought at Fall River, or in Rhode Island, or wherever they can be got, and put into the general market.

Q. How many departments are there in the print works?

THE PROCESS OF PRINTING COTTON GOODS.

A. We receive the cloth in the gray from the mill. The cloth is first sheared, then singed, and then bleached. Then it is prepared for printing. We then engrave the patterns upon the copper rollers. They
are engraved in the engraving department. They then go to the printing-room, or "machine-room," as we call it, where the printing machines are—the cloth is delivered from the cloth-room to the machine-room and put through the printing machines, such patterns being printed upon it as have been selected by the agent or by the selling house for that purpose.

Q. The selling house selects the patterns!—A. The selling house selects the patterns or styles, as we call them, and they send the patterns here for engraving or printing, and dictate what combination of colors shall be put upon the cloth, and our business here is simply to execute the orders of the selling house.

Q. It is run over the rollers and the colors are put in. Then what becomes of the cloth?—A. In the style of work we are doing now the colors are fixed upon the cloth by a stamping process. The colors are put on in the machine-room, and then they are stamped; they go from there to the soaping and washing process—through the open machine which you saw this morning. Then they are dried, starched, calendared, folded, and put into the box.

WAGES IN PRINT WORKS.

Q. Which is the most difficult department, requiring the most skilled labor?—A. Both the engraving and printing departments require skilled labor. The color-making is not skilled labor—that is, the preparation of the colors for printing upon the cloth—the labor in the color-shop is not skilled, except so far as the overseer and his assistant are concerned; they have to be skilled help; the rest of the help there do not have to be skilled. That help generally gets from $7.50 to $8 per week. In the engraving-shop the labor is substantially all skilled labor. The men in the sketch-room—the room where the sketches are made from the designs—such as you saw done this morning—enlarged, of course, for the purpose of practical working in the engraving machines—are all skilled men, and are paid from $22 to $28 per week; in the engraving-shop the men get from $22 to $26 per week. The women, or girls, who run the pantograph machines in the engraving-shop, are paid $6.50 per week, and we have some apprentices there who are learning the trade who get anywhere from $7 to $12 per week while they are learning their trade. The apprentices are started at $6 a week, and get a dollar a week rise every year until they have finished their apprenticeship, and the apprenticeship is seven years. When they have finished their apprenticeship they are considered journeymen, and if they want to stay with us, and we have work enough in the shop for them, we pay them what we consider them worth. If they are not satisfied with what we offer them they seek a shop elsewhere. In the machine-shop, where the printing is done, the printers are all skilled workmen, and get $28 per week. If for any cause the works are stopped—as for the usual stop between seasons, from light to dark, or dark to light-goods, they get half time—that is, they get $14 a week when they don't work, and $23 a week when they do; we have a few men to whom we pay full time whether they work or not, unless they should be out on their own time and on their own account. There are five men who get full pay for any time they lose on the company's account; the others get half pay. In the machine-room we have also two apprentice printers on a five-year apprenticeship. The younger one gets now, I think, $8 a week and the other $12 or $13 a week, I am not certain which. The rest of the help in that room is all unskilled help, and all the help
throughout the works, other than those three rooms, is unskilled labor. There are about three hundred and fifty people employed in the print works now. Now, that the work is steam work, it does not require so many men as when the work was dyed work.

Speaking about unskilled labor, I omitted to state that we have a repair-shop where men get anywhere from $1.50 to $2 per day, the price of the labor varying.

**HOURS OF LABOR.**

The hours of labor of the print works are only ten; they run ten hours every day except Saturday, and eight hours on Saturday, making fifty-eight hours for the week, with the exception of the repair-shop hands, who work the same number of hours as they do at any of the machine-shops in town.

The sketch-makers have shorter hours than anybody else, coming in at 8 o'clock and working until 6, which gives them nine hours a day only, and on Saturday they work only seven. They have the shortest hours of anybody in the print works. There is another element that enters into the matter of time for the engraving-shop and sketch-room, and that is the shortness of the days. The nominal hours for the engravers are 7 in the morning until 6 in the afternoon, with an hour at noon; and the sketch-makers from 8 in the morning until 6 in the afternoon, with an hour at noon. But in the winter time, when the days are short, the stopping time for both is "lighting-up" time. That is, they won't work by gas-light. But, although on some days it is dark before 5 o'clock, we do not allow them to go out till 5, and they may stay there a half an hour or twenty minutes and do no work, as they sometimes do. Then, if they have to do any overtime the sketch-makers get paid really one and a quarter days for a day, as all overtime is reckoned on the basis of eight hours per day, notwithstanding the high wages that they receive and the short hours. If they work overtime their overtime pay is written up on a basis of eight hours work for a day.

Q. What seems to be the condition of your employés in point of health?—A. They are very healthy, I think, as a rule. They seem to gain in flesh. The color-shop is the only shop where one would seem to think that there was any liability to injury—by reason of the drugs worked there, but even there I do not know of anybody who has been injured by working in the place. They all seem to thrive and gain in flesh rather than lose. Our help seem perfectly contented and happy. We have never had any trouble except in one or two instances where we had small strikes—where they left their work. The last instance was in the machine-room, where the back-tenders left work, just after starting time in the morning, because there was a certain man put on as an apprentice. They thought that somebody else should have been put on instead of the man that was put on; and they left their work. It only delayed the printing-machine a couple of hours, and before morning they wanted to come back again. It was not any discontent about the wages, but simply because they thought this man that had been longer in their own room should have been put on as an apprentice rather than the man that was. But as there was no rule or custom about it, I decided to put on the man that, all things considered, would make the best apprentice.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Your help is very largely of foreign extraction, is it?—A. Yes.

Q. Your skilled labor?—A. Yes; although in our sketch-room all
our sketch-makers but one is American born, and most of them have been raised right in our own shop.

Q. How does the American artist or workman in your department compare, after he has had the proper training, in the matter of skill, efficiency, and whatever pertains to success in the art, with the foreigners?—A. Well, he certainly is just as good a workman; but great care has to be taken in the selection of a man, in the first place, to put in as an apprentice. A man has got to have brains to make a good workman in either branch of the business as an engraver, sketch-maker, or printer. Of course, the more intelligent a man is the better workman he becomes, because he will exercise some thought and some reason in the work he is about.

APPRENTICESHIPS.

Q. Do you take young boys—do you commence the training while they are quite young?—A. Well, yes; the apprenticeship is so long a term that we like to get them as young as we can.

Q. How long is the term?—A. In the engraving-shop seven years, and in the print-shop five.

Q. Do you take them by regular articles of apprenticeship?—A. Yes.

Q. What are the ages?—A. Any age, but I think sixteen is the youngest we have ever had in the engraving-shop; and in the machine-shop a man is never set down as an apprentice unless he has been a certain time kept as back-tender or working in behind the machine. He there acquires a certain familiarity with the machine before he goes to the front of the machine, and that is of great service to him.

RELATIVE WAGES IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

Q. How does the pay of these men compare with the pay of like men in the same art in England?—A. They are paid more than 100 per cent. more in this country than in England—the same men. A year ago last spring, when I was in England, I found that the best printers in England do not get more than an equivalent of $12 in our money, and we pay ours $28.

Q. How as to the purchasing power of the necessaries of life?—A. I could not testify as to that accurately, I think, but it seems to me that so far as many things are concerned there they pay as much for them as they do here. I think our help live very much better here than in the old country. You don't find any of our help going back there, and you do find their help, every day, coming here. And they would not come without bettering their condition. I know one establishment in England where the manager told me that he had half a dozen young men who were going that week to America, and they were good men. The difference in wages is undoubtedly greater here between skilled labor than unskilled.

CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

Q. Do you know of any suggestion that you could make to the committee of things that may be done by legislation, or by individuals without legislation, to improve the condition of the working people?—A. I do not know that it would be possible to improve the condition of the working people of the city of Manchester. I think they are as well off as they can be made.
Q. In any case where the individual is prudent and economical, does he lack the necessary wages for a good living? — A. No, sir.

Q. Is there any difficulty, as a rule, unless he has many others dependent upon him, in making savings or accumulations? — A. I should think not. The fact that the deposits in our savings banks are so large as they are, and that they are so largely by the operatives, is an evidence of it.

Q. How long have you been here? — A. About eight years.

Q. During that time has the condition of the working people improved? — A. I should think it certainly has improved. It is certainly not any worse than it was eight years ago.

Q. What provision do you make in case your operatives are injured by accident or distressed by sickness in their families? — A. We always try to do the best we can for them. If a man is injured by his own reckless carelessness inside the works, we do not consider we are under any obligation to take care of him, but if injured by his co-workers, or by defects in machinery, of course we do. I should not feel that it was my privilege or duty to spend any of the company’s money to take care of any poor who might be suffering, who were in our employ; but I have always, personally, taken a very great interest in such people, directly through my own self and family, as well as through the medium of the Ladies’ Aid Society here, who do a great deal for the poor. The poor are well taken care of. I do not think there is any city in the world where the poor are better taken care of than they are in this city.

Q. Did you have any opportunity of observing the condition of the working people generally in England? — A. No, I did not. I inquired especially with regard to the skilled labor, for the sake of comparing it with our own.

Q. Is there any well founded complaint among the operatives here as to being overworked in the matter of time, or the shortness of wages? — A. I have never heard of any complaint as to either.

Q. Or being driven without proper consideration in their work? — A. I never heard of any.

Q. You have not known of any fact of that kind existing? — A. No, sir.

DRUGS CONSUMED IN PRINT WORKS.

It has occurred to me that it might be of interest to know the value in dollars and cents of the drugs consumed in these works. We consume every year $250,000 worth of drugs, and, in my judgment, three-fourths of that amount is imported.

Q. Upon which you pay heavy duties? — A. I should say the duty would average at least 25 per cent. The duty on some things has been increased under the last tariff act.

Mr. MCDUFFIE. The manufacturing department uses about as much more.

The WITNESS. And we use about $25,000 worth of coal each year.

Q. Do you print any but Manchester work? — A. No.

Q. How does your printing compare with that of the old countries? — A. I think our printing is as good as any in the world.

Q. How is it considered in the markets of the country or of the world? — A. In the markets of the country our works stand up to the best.

Q. What other print works are there? — A. There are two in Lowell, the Merrimac and the Hamilton; the Pacific, at Lawrence; the Cocheo, at Dover, N. H., and the American Print Works, at Fall River.
Q. The consumption of drugs must be enormous then?—A. It is.
Q. Have you ever known any distinction to be made, or any preference to be shown to any operative here by any of the agents or managers of the factories or mills in Manchester on account of religious faith or practice? If so, state fully in regard to it.—A. I have not. I believe in all instances that merit and ability alone are the grounds of promotion or of appointment to important positions. The highest paid overseer in the print works is, in religious faith, a Roman Catholic, and a number of our printers, who receive the highest wages of any of our employés, are of the same faith. I think that in their treatment by their associates and fellow-workmen no feeling against them is ever manifested on that account. I know I have never stopped to ask a man what his religious faith or his politics were in any appointments to positions in our mills.
Mr. McDuffie (agent of the Manchester Mills). I have heard the last statement of Mr. Dean, and I fully confirm it in all respects.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

MRS. ABETAS BLOOD EXAMINED.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You reside in this city?—Answer. Yes.
Q. How long have you resided here?—A. For thirty years.

CHARITABLE ASSOCIATIONS IN MANCHESTER.

Q. Will you state, if you please, to the committee what charitable associations there are in this city, if any, or what means the ladies or others here, have instituted for the care of the poor, and of the sick or disabled, or those without help from the more fortunate in this world. I understand you have been at the head of all that work, or very largely interested in it.—A. Well, not exactly at the head of it all. We have a city commissioner here who looks after the poor somewhat, and the aid society also looks after them. The city commissioner is more to get them into Sabbath schools, and look after them in that way; and our work is for their wants in sickness and health.
Q. How much do you have to do?—A. We have a great deal to do.
We have a hospital, where we accommodate twenty persons. We have fourteen, sixteen, or eighteen there most of the time.
Q. In what part of the city is the hospital?—A. In the south part of the city.
Q. Who owns the building?—A. The Amoskeag corporation.
Q. Is that what is spoken of as the Amoskeag Hospital, sometimes?—A. Yes. In Mr. Straw's time they gave us the use of the building, if we would use it for that purpose. Then the agents contributed very liberally to have their people cared for. And we have an aid society that looks up the poor and aids them outside with clothing, food, and the like. We never give any money; we always give orders, so as to be sure not to be imposed upon.
Q. Have you any idea of the number of persons that were thus relieved during the last season, or last year?—A. No; I could not tell
exactly how many. There have been over sixty in our hospital last year. Some have been there all the time, and some a part of the time.

Q. Is it understood by the poor in the city that if they are in distress they can have help from the Aid Society? — A. Yes.

Q. They make application without waiting to be found? — A. Yes; when we first organized we districted the city, and went around from street to street to find them, but now that we are better known, we suppose they will find us without our doing that.

Q. They understand that they can call and ask? — A. Yes. There are about thirty directors, and the streets are districted, and each one has certain streets, so that we do not get imposed upon by the same person coming to different individuals.

Q. Do you make any discrimination on account of denominational differences? — A. Well, no; we do not have any denominational tests, but we do not help the Irish as much as we do the others, because when we first organized we invited them and they refused, saying that they took care of their own poor, and preferred to. We went to the priests, and they told us that those who came to us were frauds. They said that they took care of their worthy poor. That was Father O'Brien, when he was here, and Father Bradley. But we take care of their poor if they come to us outside, though not so freely, because we were told that we were imposed upon by them.

Q. But any case of distress you help? — A. Yes; whether Protestants or Catholics, foreigners or Americans.

Q. If you hear anything of a case, you investigate it and give aid? — A. Yes. We do not give when they come to the door without investigating the case, to know whether we are imposed upon.

Q. How long has this hospital been in existence? — A. I think this is the sixth year. The Aid Society was formed two or three years before.

Q. Have you reason to think that this provision which has been made for the poor and the distressed is sufficient to meet all cases of real want? — A. Well, I think we should have something more in the city; I think it is necessary. The Catholics have an Orphans' Home, and they have an Old Ladies' Home, but I think they are very cautious not to take any but those who can pay into the Orphans' Home if sick; but in the Old Ladies' Home they do take those who cannot pay — they take as many as they can accommodate in that house. I think we should have a hospital that could accommodate more.

Q. You mean a city hospital? — A. Yes.

Q. Maintained by the city? — A. Yes; I think that is necessary.

Q. You think it hardly right, I suppose, to put that heavy burden on those who have to carry it now? — A. We are willing to do all we can, but we feel that we cannot do what is sufficient for the city.

Q. Is there any prospect or probability of such a hospital being erected soon, or provided in any way? — A. There probably will be one before many years. There is some property left for an old ladies' home that is to come in use, I believe, in the course of a few years; I think in 1890.

Q. From your knowledge of the condition of the working people of the city, what should you say in regard to that condition; state it generally; are the people that work for a living here fairly well off, or is there much suffering? — A. Well, I don't think there is much suffering for a place as large as this is. I think those that are willing to work can usually get a very comfortable living.

Q. Do you hear much complaint among them as a class? — A. No, I do not; any more than you will always hear probably.
Q. Will you please append to your testimony a statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Manchester Women's Aid and Relief Society for the year ending November, 1882?—A. I will.

The statement is as follows:

Annual meeting of the Manchester Women's Aid and Relief Society, November 7, 1882.

The annual meeting of the Manchester Women's Aid and Relief Society was held Tuesday afternoon. The annual report of the treasurer and secretary were read, which are here given:

TREASURER'S REPORT

Of the receipts and expenditures of the Women's Aid and Relief Society from November 1, 1881, to November 1, 1882:

RECEIPTS.

Balance in treasury November 1, 1881 ........................................ $927.41
Permanent fund (life membership) ........................................ 450.00
Permanent fund (memorial) .................................................. 250.00
Interest on permanent fund from April 1, 1881, to April 1, 1882 .... 36.30
Interest on deposits in bank from April 1, 1881, to April 1, 1882 .... 69.45
Memberships and contributions ........................................... 3,329.74
City appropriation ............................................................ 410.75
Of county commissioner for hospital and poor ............................ 327.70

Total receipts ................................................................. 6,269.95

EXPENDITURES.

Deposited in People's Savings Bank to account of permanent fund ... $700.00
Cash expended per order of directors .................................... 813.84
For hospital:
Paid Mrs. James Morse, matron, for board .............................. 1,626.78
Paid Mrs. James Morse, salary as nurse ................................. 394.00
Paid assistant nurse and watchers ....................................... 282.38
Paid for extra labor at hospital .......................................... 111.75
Cash expended for medicines ............................................. 256.41
Cash expended for repairs on hospital .................................. 1,122.00
Paid for necessaries and furnishing .................................... 201.85
Balance in treasury November 1, 1882 .................................. 714.94

Total expenditures ......................................................... 6,200.95

Interest since April not credited on bank book.
Respectfully submitted.

Mrs. ARETAS BLOOD,
Treasurer.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

HENRY P. PRIEST examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. What is your connection with the Manchester Cotton and Woolen Mills?—Answer. Assistant paymaster.

(Witness produces a paper.)

Q. What is the statement which you produce?—A. It is an average of the wages paid during 1883, as compared with the wages paid in 1850 and 1853, as nearly as I could get at it.
The statement is as follows:

Average of wages paid the employees of the Manchester (N. H.) Mills, 1883.

Overseers average $100 per month; second hands average $2.50 per day.

**COTTON CARDING.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grinders</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Railway boys</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other men</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>Roving-tenders</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drawing-tenders</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other women</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COTTON SPINNING.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section hands</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>Frame-spinners</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doffers</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other women</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOOL WASHING AND COMBING.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing and drying</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carding and doubling</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combing</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other men</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>Preparing and drying</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carding and doubling</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drawing and finishing</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other women</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOOL SPINNING.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section hands</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>Frame-tenders</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doffers (little girls, 12 to 14 years)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRESSING.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section hands</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shasher-tenders</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>Spoolers</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warpens</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drawing in</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other women</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEAVING.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section hands</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other men</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>Room girls</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other women</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other women are scrubbers and cleaners, who are employed not over nine hours per day.*
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

HARNESS-ROOM.

Males:
Varnishers .............................................. $1.86
Other men .............................................. 1.30

Females:
Harness-brushers ...................................... 95
Harness-knitters ...................................... 1.16
Harness-pickers ...................................... 95
Brush-maker ............................................ 1.83
Other women ........................................... 92

CLOTH-ROOM.

Other men ................................................... 1.19

Females:
Inspectors ................................................ 1.19
Seamers ................................................... 1.15
Burlers .................................................... 96
Other women .............................................. 1.07

OTHER HANDS.

Dye-house and finishing men ............................ 1.30
Carpenters, machinists, and painters .................. 1.89
Wool-sorters .............................................. 1.90
Boiler-house men ........................................ 1.82
Yard hands (watchmen, laborers, &c.) ................ 1.39

Wages paid during 1850 and 1855.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1855</th>
<th></th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1855</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseers</td>
<td>$2.43</td>
<td>$2.37</td>
<td>Spinner</td>
<td>$0.32</td>
<td>$0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool-sorters</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Spooler</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picker-men</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Warper</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carders</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loom-fixer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearer</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamster</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. From what data did you make up that statement?—A. Directly from the pay-rolls of the company.

Q. They have been preserved from the early times?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you made any examination to show you how, taken as a whole, the wages of 1850 and 1855 would compare with those of the present time?—A. No, sir. At the present time they are classed in departments, better than they were in the early time of the corporation.

Q. Your classes are just the same?—A. Yes; but they are now subdivided more than they were formerly.

Q. How long have you worked for the corporation?—A. Six years.

Q. Are you a native of this city?—A. No; I am a native of Massachusetts.

Q. Have you always worked in this city?—A. Not in this capacity. I studied civil engineering, and worked at that for a while, but for the past six or seven years I have worked in my present position.

Q. How does the condition of the workingman in this State compare in this industry with that of the workingman in other States?—A. I have no personal knowledge of that. What I know or think of it, I have only read.

Q. Have you heard that matter discussed much among the operatives?—A. No, sir; more particularly among overseers and agents.
Q. What is the talk among them? — A. They think that of the poorer classes of help that we have in New England, the hardest to get along with is the Fall River help. Lowell and Lawrence and this place (Manchester) have the best class that they know of anywhere. I have a friend who is superintendent of a cotton mill in Saint Louis, and he has a low class of Germans working for him. He said he would give a good deal if he could have the Canadians of this place to work for him, as the Germans do not turn out the amount of work per day that we do here.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

Miss Lillian Maynard examined.

By Mr. Pugh:

Question. In what mills are you employed? — Answer. In the Amory Mills.

Q. What kind of work do you do? — A. I attend the fly-frames.

Q. How many are employed with you in that? — A. I could not tell exactly, sir, how many. There are some thirty to forty, I should say, of ladies.

Q. How many hours do you work in the day? — A. We work from half past 6 in the morning till 12, and from 1 to a quarter of 7 at night.

CONDITION OF OPERATIVES.

Q. Is there any complaint of the length of time you have to work? — A. I have never heard of any.

Q. You have never complained yourself? — A. I never have; I am perfectly satisfied.

Q. Do you work by the piece or “cut,” or by the day? — A. By the piece.

Q. What does your pay amount to per day, or per week? — A. Well, generally, I make from $7.25 to $7.50 per week.

Q. What rent do you have to pay, or what board? — A. Two dollars and twenty-five cents, where we take our meals on the corporation. But I don’t take my meals on the corporation.

Q. You do not take your meals in the corporation boarding-houses? — A. No; I pay $1.25 a week for my meals, and $6 a month for my room.

Q. Are you able to save anything from your wages? — A. Well, I do generally.

Q. Are you satisfied with the amount of pay you get for the work you do? — A. I am, perfectly. I think we are paid well.

Q. You hear no complaint among the ladies who work with you about the pay they get? — A. No, sir; I never have. They all say that they think they are paid excellent for the room they are in.

Q. Do you think you get your board and rent cheap enough? — A. I think I do, and am well satisfied.

Q. The health of the female workers is good, generally? — A. It seems to be.

By the Chairman:

Q. Where were you born? — A. In Lanesville, Mass.

Q. How long have you worked in the factory? — A. I have worked in this mill three years. I went into it about a month after it was started.
Q. Have you worked in mills before this?—A. Yes; I worked in Suncook.
Q. How do you spend your evenings?—A. I study books that I have and read papers that I take; that is all.
Q. There is a public library here if any one wants it, I suppose?—
A. Yes.
Q. Is it used by the operatives any?—A. I do not know; I have never visited it.
Q. Do the girls generally board in the boarding-houses, or have rooms on the street as you do?—A. I guess most of them board in the board-
lug-houses, who don't live at home; I think the majority of them do.
Q. Who is your agent?—A. Mr. Whitman.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

Miss Lizzie McClure examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where were you born?—Answer. In Glasgow, Scotland.
Q. When did you come to America?—A. I came here nine years ago,
last June.
Q. Where do you work now?—A. I work for the Amory Manufact-
uring Company.
Q. How long have you worked there?—A. About two years and three
months.
Q. Did you work in any factory before?—A. Yes.
Q. Where?—A. The Langdon Mills.
Q. That is another corporation here?—A. Yes.
Q. How long were you in the Langdon Mills?—A. I was in the Lang-
don Mills about four years in all.
Q. Have you worked in any other factory besides these two?—A. No,
sir; not in this city.

FACTORY WORK IN SCOTLAND.

Q. Did you work in any factory in Scotland, or do you know any-
thing about factory work there?—A. Yes. When I was a little girl I
went into a mill there.
Q. How old were you when you went into the mill there?—A. Thir-
ten years of age.
Q. What did you do?—A. The same work that I do now. I "back-
tended."
Q. How long did you work there?—A. I worked there about three or
four years.
Q. What time did you begin work in the morning there?—A. Six
o'clock.
Q. At what time did you leave off at night?—A. Six o'clock at night.
Q. What intermission did you have during the day?—A. We had
from 9 o'clock till 10 for breakfast, and from 2 to 3 for dinner.
Q. That made you ten hours in all?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. You had supper after you left the mill?—A. Yes, sir; at 6 o'clock
we get through.
Q. What pay did you get when you first went in?
16—c 3—(5 LAW)
The WITNESS In Scotland?
The CHAIRMAN. Yes.
A. About 5 shillings a week.
Q. Is the shilling the same as ours?—A. It takes 4 shillings to make $1.
Q. Did you work ten hours when you were a little girl?—A. No; I had to go to school part of the time.
Q. I mean did you work ten hours when you went to work?—A. Yes.

SCHOOLING OF FACTORY CHILDREN IN SCOTLAND.

Q. When did you go to school?—A. One half the little girls went one week, and the other half the other week. We took a week about. We had to go in turn.
Q. How long did you continue in this way, going to school one week and working in the factory the next?—A. About two years.
Q. That was up to when you were fifteen?—A. Yes.
Q. What did you study at school during the time that you were in the factory?—A. Reading and writing, that is about all.
Q. No arithmetic or geography?—A. Well, there was arithmetic.
Q. Much?—A. No, sir; not much.
Q. You studied addition, I suppose, and subtraction, multiplication, and division?—A. Oh, yes; I studied all that when I was a little girl, before I went to work. I went to school first when I was about six years old.
Q. Did you attend school most of the time till you were twelve?—A. Yes; most of the time.
Q. Then you began work for the first time?—A. Yes.
Q. Did you go to school any after you were fourteen?—A. Not after I was fifteen.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking this from curiosity, but simply to learn how the people are situated there.

Q. You had five shillings a week when you began; how much did you get when you got through, or while you were attending school?—A. When I was fifteen I had from 8 to 10 shillings a week, because I had more work to do.

WORKING HOURS IN SCOTLAND.

Q. Did you work more hours or did you simply work harder for the same number of hours?—A. I worked harder in the same number of hours. I did not work any more hours.
Q. Ten hours is all that anybody works there, is it?—A. Yes.
Q. Where did you live; with your folks, or did you board somewhere?—A. I lived with my father and mother.
Q. Did your father or mother, either of them, work in the mills?—A. No; my father died shortly after I went to work. I had two sisters, and we all three worked in the mill.
Q. You three took care of yourselves and supported your mother?—A. Yes; my mother did no work, except house work, but she had a brother that helped her some.
Q. Did your sisters remain, or did they come over here?—A. One of them is here.
Q. Is your mother living? — A. Yes, sir.
Q. There? — A. No, sir; here.
Q. You have brought her over here? — A. Yes, sir.
Q. And the other sister remains there? — A. Yes.
Q. Is she coming? — A. No, sir; she has a large family, and I don't think she could come.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps the rest of you may bring her over.

The WITNESS. Perhaps so, sometime.
Q. Your family then are all here except your sister? — A. Yes.
Q. Are many of the Scotch people coming over in this way? — A. There are a good many people here that I am acquainted with.
Q. That you knew over there, too? — A. No, sir; I didn't know them over there, but have become acquainted with them since.

WAGES AND COST OF OPERATIVES LIVING IN SCOTLAND.

Q. Can you tell what girls who boarded in Scotland had to pay for their board; those who worked in the factory with you? — A. I could not tell you, sir; because most of them had homes of their own.
Q. Do you know what anybody pays for board there now — such people as work in factories? — A. Yes; the girls pay 5s. a fortnight; that is 2s. 6d. a week for their board.
Q. Does that include their washing and everything? — A. Yes, sir.
Q. When you were fifteen, could you do as much as anybody? — A. Yes, I think I could.
Q. You did a woman's work? — A. Yes.
Q. Then that is the pay of a woman? — A. Well, yes.
Q. And it costs 2s. 6d. for board out of the 8s. or 10s.? — A. Yes.
Q. Do you know what men get over there? — A. Well, it is according to the trade they work at.
Q. I mean in the same mill? — A. Grinders get, I believe, about 2s. a day; but I can hardly remember, because I was so young.
Q. What are grinders? — A. Men that grind the cards.
Q. Where do you like best to live, there or here? — A. Here.
Q. Why? — A. Well, people are paid better here, and you can save more money.
Q. Can you live as well? — A. I can live better.
Q. You can dress as well, and feed as well, and have as good a home to live in? — A. I think one can live better in this country than in the old country.
Q. In all these particulars? — A. Yes.
Q. How do you get on here with the mill agents, and how do the help generally get on; do they have any trouble with them? — A. No trouble at all.
Q. Do you know of any discontent or of any grievance among the working people here? — A. No, sir; I never heard of any, not in the room that I work.
Q. Among the operatives generally? — A. Not that I know of. I have always heard them say that this is about the best paid factory place that there is. I have never been in any other factory place, but that is what I hear.
Q. You don't want to try any other place; you are satisfied to stay here, are you? — A. I am satisfied.
JOSEPH SHORT examined.

By Mr. PUGH:

Question. Where were you born?—Answer. In Canada.

Q. When did you come here?—A. I came to this city two years ago last spring.

Q. Where do you work?—A. In the Amory card-room.

Q. Have you ever worked in any other factory in this country?—A. Yes.

Q. Where?—A. In the Amoskeag.

Q. What work do you do?—A. I am an oiler; I oil the frames.

OPERATIVES' WAGES AND CONDITION.

Q. What wages do you get?—A. One dollar and forty-five cents a day.

Q. Have you any family?—A. No, sir.

Q. What board do you pay?—A. We don't board out now; we pay so much for the trouble of cooking and every thing, $0.50 a week; it comes to about $20 a month we have to pay, me and my woman.

Q. Does your wife work with you in the factory?—A. Yes.

Q. What wages does she get?—A. She gets about $1.25 a day.

Q. What does she do?—A. She works on a frame in the card-room.

Q. The same class of work that you do?—A. Yes, in the same room.

Q. Do you save any money after paying all your expenses?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you got anything in the savings bank?—A. Yes, some.

Q. Have you come here to stay?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you want to go back to Canada?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you intend going back?—A. Yes.

Q. Why do you prefer Canada to this place?—A. It seems home. There is all the difference. I suppose it is just as good to work here, but that is my home. There is where my folks are now.

Q. Do you get better wages here than in Canada?—A. Yes, we do, take the year right around, that is, winter and summer. Down there in winter wages are smaller.

Q. How is the life here and in Canada; is it cheaper to live here than in Canada?—A. It is about the same, I think.

Q. Is that the feeling among the Canadians that you know here, that they want to go back to Canada when they have worked enough, and that they do not intend to remain here any longer than they can get enough money to go back on?—A. I guess so.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is Canada a better country to be in, do you think?—A. Well, I don't know; it may be it is not any better, only I like it because my folks are there, that's all. I like to go out of the mill, too, because I am pretty well "played out" sometimes, when I have been working a good while, and, as long as I am going out I would sooner go to Canada, where my folks are, than anything else. That is the only difference. I like it here first rate.

Q. Are your fellow-workmen well treated here or are they badly treated?—A. They are well treated.

Q. Do you find any fault with your treatment?—A. No, sir; none at all.
CORNELIUS CRANE examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Do you live in Manchester?—Answer. Yes, sir.
Q. How long have you been here?—A. Three years.
Q. Where were you born?—A. In Ireland.
Q. How long have you been in this country?—A. I came to this country when I was probably four or five years old.
Q. Have you ever worked in factories anywhere but here?—A. Yes; I worked in Lawrence.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Where are you at work now?—A. In the Amory Mill.
Q. What kind of work do you do?—A. I work on cards, repairing cards.

OPERATIVES' WAGES AND TREATMENT.

Q. What do you get for pay?—A. One dollar and twenty-five cents a day.
Q. Have you any family?—A. No, sir.
Q. What do you save out of that?—A. I save, probably, half of it.
Q. Do you put it in the savings bank?—A. No; I have not got any money in the savings bank now.
Q. Have you any complaint to make about the wages you get?—A. No, sir.
Q. Or your treatment?—A. No; I am perfectly satisfied.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

GEORGE A. WASON examined.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. How far is that from Manchester?—A. Fifteen miles.
Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am a farmer.
Q. Do you belong to any organization of farmers; if so, what is it, and what is your connection with it?

THE NEW HAMPSHIRE GRANGE.

A. I belong to the grange, for one, organization.
Q. How many of these organizations are there in this State?—A. Some sixty or seventy.
Q. What is the total membership?—A. About thirty-five hundred.
Q. What is your relationship to the organization in this State?—A. I am master of the State grange.
Q. In the discharge of your duties do you have occasion to visit different parts of the State and become acquainted with the condition of the farmers?—A. I do, more or less.
Q. And have you more or less knowledge of the condition of the farmers in other of the New England States?—A. I have some.
CONDITION OF FARMERS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Q. What is your knowledge of the present condition of the farming population of New Hampshire? — A. I think that there are two classes; those that are remote from any village, in the rural districts, are rather going behindhand. Their farms are not in good condition and their buildings are running down. The other class, I think, are improving.

Q. The other class being those that live near villages or cities? — A. Yes.

Q. What is the occasion for this difference in the condition of the two classes? — A. Special farming makes it. That is, they are nearer markets, and can raise some special productions that are not transported from a distance, such as milk. Where they sell milk the farms are in better condition.

Q. They raise more or less fruits and garden sauce, vegetables and the like for the markets which the villages afford? — A. Yes; wherever the fruit culture is successful farming is in the ascendency; it is growing better.

Q. What is the condition of farmers in the northern part of your State; is it affected by what we call the summer travel, the incoming of visitors from abroad for their health and recreation? — A. Yes; that has improved the condition of the farmers; it leaves a good deal of money with them.

Q. Of what nativity are the farmers in this State as a rule; are they natives or foreigners? — A. Natives, mostly.

Q. There are not a great number of the foreign population engaged in farming? — A. Very few.

RELATIVE CONDITIONS OF FARMERS TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO AND NOW.

Q. With regard to these farmers of the first class you have mentioned — those who do not find convenient home markets in the villages and cities — do you think that these people lacking that market are as well off as they were twenty-five years ago; say, before the war? — A. Well, yes; I don’t know but what they are. But the introduction of farming machines has made it not expedient to cultivate rough, rocky farms, and they have gone to waste, and to pasture and to woodland. I don’t know but that time will make it square.

Q. What has become of those farmers; do they remain on their farms and cultivate portions of them? — A. No; they have left them.

Q. Turned them out? — A. Turned them out. Gone into the villages, many of them.

Q. They have changed their occupation? — A. Yes; some have gone West. In some towns the population has diminished one-half since just before the war.

Q. To what do you attribute that change? — A. I would mention that their farms were hard to cultivate, and to do it by manual labor you could not make it pay; and then they were remote from market, somewhat.

AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY — ITS INFLUENCE ON FARMING.

Q. Do you think that the introduction of agricultural machinery has made good the place of manual labor which was formerly employed? — A. I do not quite understand your question.
Q. I will ask you, first, if you think that as many hands are employed in the farms of the State in doing the same amount of work as used to be employed before the introduction of labor-saving machinery?—A. No; I do not think there are.

Q. Do you think there are as many workingmen on farms now in the State as there were twenty-five years ago, before machinery was so much introduced?—A. No; I guess not.

Q. Then the question I asked was, if you think that the machinery so introduced in place of the help which is thus diminished—the manual labor which is thus removed—has made good the place of manual labor, so that, on the whole, there is as much work done in the State on farms as there was before the change?—A. I should say the result of it is as much as it was before.

Q. The result is as much production as we had before?—A. Yes.

Q. To what extent; of course, I do not ask for mathematical precision, nor do I expect it to be accurate, but, generally, to what extent, in your judgment, has labor-saving machinery relieved the farmer of manual labor in production during this quarter of a century?—A. Well, I take it one-fourth or one-third.

WAGES OF FARM HANDS.

Q. How do the wages of those who work upon farms compare at the present time with what was paid before the war?—A. They are higher.

Q. About what does a good hand get on a farm who hires for six months, say, at the present time?—A. From $20 to $25 a month and board.

Q. Does such a hand ordinarily find employment in the winter months?—A. Yes.

Q. What do they find to do in the winter?—A. Lumbering; and some farmers hire them right through the season; more than they used to.

Q. Do you think that, generally, the men who work for wages on the farms in the summer time, through these six months, get work in the winter, or is there considerable idle help of that kind?—A. Well, it is about as difficult to get help in the winter as in the summer.

Q. Are wages as high in the winter as in the summer?—A. Nearly as high; that is, if they work full days.

Q. Then, I understand you that the condition of the wage-workers upon farms has improved during this quarter of a century? That is, you think they get more pay?—A. I think so.

Q. Do you think they can buy as much with what they get, or more, than they could then?—A. Yes.

Q. Is it as easy to lay up a little money?—A. I think it is.

SCHOOLS IN FARMING DISTRICTS.

Q. Have you had occasion to observe the condition of schools in the farming country as compared with what it was at that period?—A. Somewhat I have.

Q. What do you think of that condition?—A. I think the schools are a great deal smaller. I don't know but what they are equally good. With so limited a number as some of the schools have, they do not employ such good teachers as they would if they had more. The advantages are equally as good as they were twenty-five years ago, if they wished to give their children an education.

Q. On the whole, do you think farmers in New England have as good a chance in life as they had a quarter of a century ago—1850, and along there?—A. I think they have.
Q. What is the general feeling among them as to contentment with their lot in life, as compared with what it used to be? Is there an increasing love for farming or rural life, or is the regard for that form of life lessening? — A. Well, I think that just at the present time, within the last five years, there has not been so much desire to go away as there was before that.

Q. What has made this change? — A. Well, I think the farmers are discussing their situation more and are learning how to farm better, and the introduction of machinery has done much to lighten their labors, and if they have no desire to be rich they can enjoy themselves on a farm as well as anywhere.

Q. I suppose you must think that a tendency of that kind is very much for the public good? — A. I think it would be; I mean a tendency to throw away the desire of being wealthy, of making gold their god. I think they would be better off if they did not wish to be rich.

Q. I understood you to say that it is your judgment that there is a growing inclination on the part of the farmers themselves to be satisfied with life on a farm? — A. Somewhat, yes.

Q. I suppose that is not a very rapid change? — A. No, it is not.

Q. We are a people slow to change in this State; the farmers, perhaps, are? — A. Farmers are slow.

FARMING AND MANUFACTURES—THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS.

Q. Do you think it is of any consequence what may be the relation between the farming industry and the other industries in their vicinity? — A. Yes, I think it is very material.

Q. What effect would it have on the farming interest of New Hampshire if the manufacturing interest should be destroyed or seriously injured? — A. Why, farming would be worth nothing. We should then have to compete with the prairies of the West in our productions, and that we could not do. At the present time we can raise what they do not ship here, and make it profitable.

Q. The farmer himself has to buy a great deal, I suppose? — A. Yes.

Q. In our State what do the farmers purchase that is produced on other farms, the farms of the West, for instance? — A. They purchase a great deal of corn, feed, shorts, and middlings; flour, of course; for our farmers do not raise that.

Q. Do you think the farmers might profitably raise their own wheat in this State? — A. I think they could.

Q. Are they beginning to think more and more, or is it hard to convince them of that? — A. As far as I have learned, they are thinking so more and more.

The CHAIRMAN. When I used to work on a farm we raised one year 48 bushels (threshed) on 2 acres. I do not know whether that is a large yield now or not. We thought it was large then.

The WITNESS. I have raised 40 bushels.

Q. To the acre? — A. Yes.

Q. The wheat I refer to was what we called black seed wheat; is there such a wheat as that known now? — A. No.

Q. Then there was what was known as the tea wheat. Is that gone, too? — A. Yes. The farmers in the southern portion of the State are sowing winter wheat, I think, with good success.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Q. With what obtained from the Agricultural Department? — A. Some of it.

The CHAIRMAN. They have some fine varieties. At least, I know the Commissioner claims that they are very fine, and could be well cultivated in our State.

The WITNESS. We sow two or three varieties; one of them has done very well, the others do not succeed at all.

INFLUENCE OF THE GRANGE ON FARMERS.

Q. Will you state to us what influence the granges you speak of exert on the farmers of the community; what they do.—A. They increase their social capacity, and by so doing they elevate the whole farming interest; by discussing the matters of farming, and becoming better acquainted with each other, they have the advantage of each other's experience, not only in the immediate vicinity, but all over the State.

Q. Do you ever discuss any legislative questions? — A. Anything that is of general importance.

Q. I mean, that is connected with the interests of agriculture? — A. Oftentimes.

Q. I do not mean with regard to partisan politics at all. I suppose politics are excluded from the grange? — A. They are excluded.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are any suggestions that you think farmers would desire you to make to the committee in the way of legislation or measures that might be taken by the Government for the promotion of the interests of the farming people, I would like you to state them to the committee.

THE FARMERS' VIEWS OF THE PATENT LAWS.

The WITNESS. I think the farmers generally feel that our patent laws are rather injurious to their interests, and they would like to have them made a little different.

Q. Wherein are they hurtful to them? — A. Whenever we buy a machine, as most farmers do, it is very difficult for us to know whether the man that sells it owns the patent on it, and farmers are liable to be sued or to have to pay a royalty. They think that the innocent purchaser should be protected.

Q. You think they would like that to be made a general law—that the innocent purchaser of the tool that he uses should be protected? — A. Yes; as I understand the law the using of it makes him an offender against the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. It makes him liable if there is an infringement upon the patent—if some other party has the right; and then the party who sells to him is liable to be sued by the party whose right has been infringed. There is no doubt that there has been a very great abuse of that. I suppose that it has been carried to a greater excess in the West than in the East, but, of course, we hear of cases in the East also.

The WITNESS. Well, it is liable to occur wherever a machine is sold, almost.

FARMERS' DESIRE FOR A DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Q. What other suggestions would you make? Is there any general feeling among the farmers in regard to the establishment of an Agricultural Department of the Government? — A. There is a very strong desire on their part to have such a department.
Q. Do you think that they prefer that it should be an entirely distinct department, or would they be satisfied with a department of general industry, including such occupations as would come under the head of mechanical, manufacturing, agricultural, and mining interests, and not including the professions?—A. They would want to be alone, to have a distinct interest.

Q. Why do they think that that ought to be so? Why should the agricultural interest, in their judgment, be separated from other working and manual industries and occupations, like mining and manufacturing? What reasons do they give, as you hear them express their reasons?—A. Well, the farming interest is about the largest, and there is a vast difference in the paying results of the farming interest and of the mining. One may run away with the other. They think that there is enough in the farming industry to take the time of one officer of the Government.

Q. Is there any other matter of legislation that you think the farmers would like in this country?—A. I think they would like that something should be done about the transportation, that they might know, when they raise a crop, what it can be shipped for and not have it fluctuate up and down with these corporations as now.

Q. They would have the power of corporation, to frequently change their rates stopped or restricted?—A. Restricted.

Q. Does any other suggestion occur to you to make to the committee? I would like to ask you considerable in the way of statistical information about this State, but I understand you have not time to go into it. If there is any other matter that occurs to you, or if there is anything that you have talked over among the farmers that they would like to have done, please state it.

LAND OVERTAXED—INCOMES UNDERTAXED.

A. Well, we believe that taxation is not really right as it is.

Q. I would like to know what they think is right to be done about that?—A. It is a very difficult thing to handle. I don’t know as the farmers really have a definite idea yet what they would like to have adopted, but I believe they think it falls heavier on the land holders than on the man of stocks and bonds.

Q. Do they talk as if they were in favor of what is called an income tax?—A. Well, it is not very much talked of, though a man that has an income could afford to pay the tax better than he who is laboring for it.

Q. But you do not think the feeling has taken the form of a preference for an income tax?—A. No.

Q. Do you hear any talk that they desire generally a larger exemption of homesteads or of personal property?—A. That is being talked a little more than it was.

Q. Exemption as against debt, and exemption from taxation, too?—A. Yes; not so much against debt. They believe in paying their honest debts.

Q. As a rule they are a class of people who believe in paying their debts, are they not?—A. Yes.

Q. Are many of the farmers of New Hampshire subjected to mortgage or incumbrances now?—A. A great many.

Q. Are they getting out of debt, or further in?—A. I cannot say. I know that there is a great deal of property that is mortgaged.

Q. It must be pretty difficult for a farmer to pay off a mortgage from the product of his farm now.—A. It is.
Q. How are the prices of farms; do farms sell quickly?—A. Not very.
Q. Is there any population beside our native population that own farms in this State; do any of the foreigners buy them?—A. In some sections. Foreigners, however, do not go back into the country very much as yet. Farmers talk some about the scale of taxation, a gradation-tax on property.
Q. That is, increasing the amount?—A. Increasing the tax as the amount increases.

By Mr. Pugh:
Q. All the farmers are rather poor, as a class?—A. Well, rather so.
Q. Their farms being pretty generally mortgaged, you say.—A. Considerably so.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

ALPHONSO CROSBY examined.

By the Chairman:
Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. I reside in this city.
Q. How long have you resided here?—A. Thirteen years.

INTEMPERANCE A CAUSE OF DEPRESSION OF WAGES.

Q. Have you had occasion to make any observations upon the habits of the people here as to the use of intoxicating drinks?—A. I have.
The Chairman. I understand you have some data, some statistics or facts, which you can give; so please proceed to do so in your own way, with a view of showing the bearing of intemperance upon the sufficiency of the wages received by working people for their labor.
The Witness. I would only speak especially of it in my own line. I am a carpenter. I have worked at that business for forty-one years, and it has always been my study to advance the efficiency of journey-men carpenters. I was called here somewhat hurriedly, so that I have not a full opportunity of affording you actual figures, but there is, I think, among the carpenters about here, 25 per cent. that are total abstainers, that do not drink at all; those that moderately drink, and that drink to excess would make up the remainder. The habit is so strong among a few that it injures all. We are actually working, not only in Manchester but elsewhere—and I have taken pains to make inquiry, and have had some experience in Chicago and Boston—and I am convinced that nearly all mechanics are working to-day for the prices established by the drinking men, because the drinking men are improvident, and are obliged to sell their labor at the lowest figure, and when there comes a pressure they have nothing to fall back upon, and so must go into the market, and those who have labor to buy will, of course, buy it as cheaply as they can.

INTEMPERANCE AND STRIKES.

There is another thing that has had a tendency, as far as my experience has gone. Drinking men have been at the bottom of strikes. I was once a member of a carpenters' association, formed in 1861 or 1862 in Boston, and it was all that the sober men could do to keep the drinking men from a strike. We had no strike, however; we laid our case before the employers, and they acceded to our demands readily without any trouble.
As far as the carpenters are concerned the employers and employés have never been far apart in New England. When the employer has an hour or two of leisure he takes off his coat and goes to work with his journeymen, but the agitation of the labor question has tended to push the employer and employé farther apart, as I look upon it from my stand-point, and the drinking habit is at the bottom of it. But I think that we are, as a class here in Manchester, not troubled with that as much as in most places in New England, with the exception of Maine. In Maine whisky is not so easily obtained, and of course the people are not annoyed by it as we are here and in some other places. There is a great deal of perplexity caused among employers by the drinking men, who do not turn up as they ought to do after they have been paid. Very often they do not put in their appearance for a day or two. What the percentage of loss is I am not able to say, but I know that in one shop, of which I had charge, in Massachusetts, the men left work on Saturday night, and the 4th of July came on Monday. My crew didn’t get back to work before the next Monday. And my loss on that job (which was a $5,000 job) was $50 then, and I judge that if I lost as much as that, that other men doing a larger business must suffer much greater than I did.

Q. What is your observation upon the effect of the drinking habit upon other classes of workmen in this city or elsewhere?—A. My observation is, that when the habit becomes confirmed in a man his advancement in any mechanical business is stopped. He does not advance at all. He will either remain where he is or deteriorate.

Q. Do you think that that habit prevails to the extent of absorbing the wages of the working people in the city?—A. Yes; my observation, of course, is limited, but at least there is 10 per cent. of the proceeds of labor in this city that goes for alcoholic drinks. I think I am setting it quite low, but there is a large number that do not drink at all.

Q. You feel confident that 10 per cent. of the entire wages earned goes for drink?—A. I do feel positive that 10 per cent. of the entire wages earned in Manchester goes for intoxicants.

Q. Do you think that there is that proportion of the wages earned which is deposited in the savings banks?—A. Well, I could not say whether it is or not, but it may be more. There are some that are very economical; others spend the whole and are continually in debt.

Q. From your observation of wages paid labor in this city, during the time that you have lived in it, thirteen years, you say, is it or not your judgment that it has been reasonably well paid; that is, to such an extent as to give a good, fair, comfortable support, with the opportunity of saving something for disability and old age?—A. Well, I think that the wages for labor have been reasonably well paid here in Manchester; during the pressure, during the hard times, as we call it, I think the wages here were rather in advance of what they were in any of the cities around us. But since times got better the wages of the carpenters have not come up here as elsewhere. I know of no case where the habits have been good where they are not comfortably well off, and some are accumulating property.

Q. Is there any other fact that occurs to you that you would like to state?—A. I don’t know that there is.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. How are we going to arrange this difficulty; we all know that it exists everywhere; how are we going to suppress this great evil?—A. My idea would be to commence with the President and follow on down,
and have all to be total abstainers. As the old cock crows the young one learns. If the men put into the professions drink, the people about them, and so on down through the different grades, will drink.

Q. How are you going to prevent them from drinking?—A. We cannot prevent them by law unless we take away a man's personal liberty.

Q. Have you not a prohibitory law here in Manchester?—A. Yes; there is a prohibitory law.

Q. Is it not a criminal offense to sell liquor here publicly?—A. I think it is.

Q. Is it not sold here publicly every day and night?—A. I presume it is.

Q. Where are the grand juries, that they do not indict these men?—A. I can only answer that in one way: it is hard to convict men of sheep stealing in a community of sheep stealers.

Q. If they are all sheep stealers you cannot make up a jury?—A. I believe that in one county in this State the panel was broken up. The judge discharged the jury because, as he said, they were drunk; but when it was afterwards fetched down it was said that only one of the jury was drunk. But that didn't go down with men, because where there are twelve to work together one man will not get drunk in their presence alone. That is something that was never heard of.

Q. Do they not sell liquor here in a public hotel, one of the largest in the city, without any restraint?—A. I believe they do.

MANCHESTER, N. H., Monday, October 15, 1883.

Rev. CYRUS W. WALLACE examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. How long have you lived in this city?—Answer. Forty-four years in this place; I lived here before it was a city, part of the time.

Q. What was the condition of the place when you came here?—A. Well, it was a very small village here. There were no spindles running here when I came, though there were some mills up at Amoskeag, on the other side of the river, that have since been burned down. There were no mills running here in this portion.

Q. That was forty-four years ago!—A. That was in the spring of 1839.

Q. Now there are nearly 40,000 people here?—A. I believe 35,000 to 38,000.

Q. What has made this change?—A. Manufacturing, of course, is at the bottom of it, and other things have grown out of that. If you stopped the wheels of the mills the city would be scattered at once, of course.

Q. If you were to take away that water power, or for any reason render manufacturing impossible, do you suppose that Manchester would sell for ten cents on the dollar?—A. No, sir.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES.

The CHAIRMAN. Won't you give us, doctor, your observations on the relations that have existed between capital and labor here during this long period of time—what has been the general condition of the working people—whether there have been disagreements and troubles as between them and their employers, or otherwise; and, if so, to what
extent; and give us, in such way as you choose, an idea of the industrial, the educational, and the religious development of Manchester.

The Witness. Well, I should a little prefer to have you put questions. I am afraid I should ramble from the text, if left alone. But as regards the relation between the laborer and the employer, I think, as a rule here, it has been very good, very satisfactory. There are certain facts that hold true everywhere. Our manufacturers of course have to manufacture a specific article, say cloth. They buy their machinery to manufacture as low as they can. They go into the common market, and buy up the material as low as they can, I suppose. Then they go into the labor market, and buy that as low as they can, I suppose. Here are great laws, and they submit to them. They sell their goods in the common market, and they of course have to go to the common market to buy the material. I have no doubt there are cases where there may be oppression, but I think, as a whole, it is very far otherwise, and I think the property that you may find here will spring from another source. You do not ask why. If you do, I will tell you.

The Chairman. Tell us why.

RUM AND TOBACCO AS CAUSES OF POVERTY.

The Witness. Then I tell you the causes are rum and tobacco. Those are at the bottom of the poverty. But of course there are cases of sickness also.

Q. A man like you does not arrive at such a conclusion without reasons. We would like to ask you why you came to such conclusions?—
A. Well, you might ask me also why the sun shines.

Q. You think it is perfectly apparent?—A. Oh, yes; everywhere.
Q. In every day life?—A. Everywhere.
Q. And if those who consume rum and tobacco in this city saw fit to abstain from both, speaking now of the working people, what effect would it have upon their pecuniary condition?—A. Why, it would make them independent. I lay it down as a fact that a man cannot run the business of smoking cigars short of 10 cents a day, putting it at the lowest, and that will furnish a family of four with flour all the year round. I do not speak without figures; I have looked at them.

Q. What as to the expense of maintaining the drinking habit?—A. That is very much greater than the tobacco habit; but put the two together, and it is enough to put a large portion of our community down to a mere starvation point; very low.

Q. Do these habits prevail to any considerable extent in this city?—A. I cannot say to what extent, but to a wide extent.

CONDITION OF WORKING CLASSES.

Q. But notwithstanding the existence of those habits, taking the working people as they are, what do you think of their condition in this city; I mean their pecuniary condition?—A. Well, I think, as a whole, the community here are well off. I will state a fact to illustrate my meaning. Years ago, when I was a pastor here, I thought the common habit of getting credit—and it is a very common habit here—was affording a premium for dishonesty, and I tried to talk with some of our traders about trading on the cash principle, not to trust anybody, either me or anybody else. I remember that one of the grocers told me that it could not be done, because the laboring men of this city must have credit for a month; they could not live without it. “Why,”
said I, "do you mean to say that any considerable portion of these people are within a month of the poor-house?" "Yes," he said; "I mean to say just that." Well, now the trouble is in these leaks. Men earn enough, as a whole, to support their families, and support them well, but these leaks make the trouble. And, having seen it so long—over forty years—you will not be surprised if I am a little radical, as I suppose I am; at least people think I am.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know that a man can be called radical who simply states facts. If there is anything radical about it it is the facts.

BAD EFFECTS OF SATURDAY PAYMENTS.

The WITNESS. Well, there is a large manufacturer down here in Rochester named Wallace (no connection of mine, however), who told me that he had to change his pay-day from Saturday to Monday, because so much of the pay went into the hands of the liquor sellers. It was found that the change was a very great advantage.

Q. The payment on Saturday gave more leisure for the bad expenditure of the money?—A. Yes; and not only bad expenditure of the money, but many of their men would fail to come back on Monday; some not till Tuesday, and a few not till Wednesday, causing a great loss of time.

Q. Would there be any serious inconvenience to corporations from changing their pay-day from Saturday to Monday?—A. Well, in large corporations it would take several days to pay once a month, and I suppose it would be very inconvenient for them to pay every week.

Q. Do you think that if they paid every week there would be a better application of the wages by those who have them?—A. I never thought of it as an improvement.

Q. It would be four times the work to make the payments?—A. Yes.

Q. And I suppose, of course, the corporations would object to that; that must interrupt the time of the laborers somewhat, too, doesn't it?—A. I could not answer that question. The paymaster, I believe, goes to the laborer and pays him at his work. His time is made up and the funds are prepared and taken to the operative.

THE SCHOOLS IN MANCHESTER.

Q. What should you say of the school system of the city?—A. In the early years of my being here I had some personal acquaintance and something to do with the schools, but my work was so great that I had to decline anything of that kind, and have had nothing personal to do with the schools for thirty or thirty-five years. My general impression, however, is that our schools are good, and that abundant facilities are afforded to every child in the city. I don't know how they could be much improved.

Q. Do you think there is any considerable element among the children who do not attend these schools or take advantage of them?—A. I presume not; I think not. They have a law in this city that requires attendance, and I have thought the law was pretty well executed.

Q. Does any other matter occur to you that you might suggest to the committee?—A. I do not know that any does.

The CHAIRMAN. We would be glad of any suggestions from a gentleman of your experience and position.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

INTEMPERANCE.

The WITNESS. Anything that would suppress the use of these destructive articles, stop their manufacture and sale, will elevate the community and be a far-reaching advantage.

Q. What would you think of a law that aims to suppress the manufacture instead of one which aims only at the sale after the manufacture has taken place?—A. Both should be excluded, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Temperance laws—the prohibitory laws that we have been accustomed to, so far as I know—have never in any instance prohibited the manufacture until very recently.

The WITNESS. The law in Maine prohibits the manufacture of liquor.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes; I recollect now that it does.

The WITNESS. It is not manufactured in that State, and there is no State in the country where temperance has been such a blessing to the community as in the State of Maine, notwithstanding all that has been said against it.

Q. At the same time, do you think it is practicable to make an efficient law against the manufacture unless it is a general law throughout the country?—A. Oh, undoubtedly, it must be general.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, if they do not manufacture in Maine but want to drink there, the railroads will take the liquor there if it is manufactured in New Hampshire.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Q. If the General Government then should have control of interstate commerce it would seem almost indispensable that the Government should pass such a law, would it not?—A. It would seem so. I believe in law, and I believe in its execution, but the party in power will never execute the law as long as they can hold power without executing it. I have no special curses for either party.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand, except so far as the responsibility is on the party in power to execute the law.

The WITNESS. Yes.

TAX ON WHISKY AND TOBACCO.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. As long as whisky and tobacco are made do you not think they ought to pay part of the burden of taxation in the way of internal-revenue tax?—A. I think they ought to bear about all of it.

Q. You are then in favor of increasing it instead of wiping it out?—A. Certainly.

MANCHESTER, N. H., Monday, October 15, 1883.

JAMES O. ADAMS examined.

The CHAIRMAN. You know about what we want to learn about the farming interests in New Hampshire and New England, or in the country generally. We are instructed to find out the general condition of all who work for a living, not only the manufacturing but the agricultural classes, and it is not often that we find a man who comes officially in contact with that half of the community that consists of the farmers. You may proceed in your own way to give us such views and information with regard to the agricultural interests as seem to you desirable or necessary.
The Witness. My knowledge of the farming people generally ought to be as good as any man's. For ten or twelve years I held a public school position here, and visited every city in the State, and I am now secretary of the State Board of Agriculture. I have heard Mr. Wason's statement in regard to the condition of agriculture, and I thought he made a cautious and very correct estimate generally. We are a working people. We have not many drones in New Hampshire, as you know, Mr. Chairman. The women are as faithful workers and perhaps more faithful workers than the men, and they do not waste so much of their earnings, as has been represented by some of the witnesses, so much as the men do. They waste very little, I think. I do not quite indorse the statement that one-tenth of what they earn has been expended in the way that has been said.

The Farmers Who Succeed and Those Who Do Not.

I suppose that in regard to our farmers there are, as Mr. Wason has said, two classes, but I should classify them a little differently from him. He has classified them in their relation to railroad lines; those near and those farther away. I should classify them as those who use their brains as well as their muscles and those who do not. We have a class of farmers, even those who live away from our great thoroughfares, that are successful farmers because they think and act upon some principle in doing their work. They study and experiment in their quiet and unpretentious way, and then work out the result of their experimentation and get good results. There is one class of farmers that do as their fathers did, but not quite as well. They adopt the same plans, but do not execute them quite as vigorously, and so, of course, are failures, while the other class will study an adaptation of the crops to their own localities and to the character of the soil they have, and adopt the crops that will be suited. Such a farmer will decide what class of animals it is best for him to keep as well as what class of crops to grow, and so he will go through the whole machinery of planting and adopting whatever he knows that his situation and circumstances will enable him to use to best advantage. That class of farmers succeed; that class of farmers have no incumbrances on their farms; they have money, and, as a whole, I believe there is more money to-day in the hands of farmers in New Hampshire than there was twenty-five years ago. There is certainly more money in the hands of the young farmers—in the hands of those who work upon farms for monthly or yearly pay, and as a consequence they are very likely to be, perhaps, less economical. They may spend more, and may not in the end have so much. Years ago, when the laborer got his pay for the year, or for whatever portion of the year he worked, he took a portion of his pay in cattle or in crops. Now it is in money. Therefore the employer must have money or he cannot pay. Farmers pay more money for their purchases where they get them than they used to do. They do not like the matter of barter as much as they used to, and there is, no doubt, now very little barter.

Improvement of Farmers’ Homes.

So far as this goes I think it must be considered to mean elevation. They must live in a very comfortable and attractive style. I believe that in three-fourths of the farm houses in this State there are far more
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attractions in the houses than there were years ago. You will find pianos or musical instruments of some kind in three-fourths of the farm houses of this State. You will find either cheap pianos or small organs; you will find more books than before. I can remember the time when it was rare to see an agricultural book on the farmer's table, while it is now very rare indeed not to see one, even in the farthest towns of the farthest counties. I find in every town intelligent women and men who attend the farmers' clubs and perhaps the grangers' clubs, though I am not a member of that organization and do not attend it, but there are numbers of intelligent men and women attending the farmers' clubs and taking part in the discussions, and intelligently so. So far as that goes, therefore, the farmers of the State are improving.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. The secretary of the State Board of Agriculture is the executive officer of the Agricultural Association, I suppose?—A. Yes; he is required to spend his time at it, and has an office in the State.

INVESTMENT OF MONEY BY FARMERS.

In regard to this matter of money, I have said that the farmers have more money. Here is a question which it may be worth the while of your committee to consider; whether they make the best use of that money when they invest it; whether it is best to go West and buy county or city bonds, hoping to get a large per cent. in interest, rather than invest it at home in improvements. There is a tendency among our farmers to send their money away. They put it in savings banks and that generally may be considered good enough. So far as it goes it is, unless they deprive their farms of the use of money that they ought to be expending upon them. But if they could use all the money here, even though they loaned it to others at 6 per cent., it would be an advantage to the State as a whole. Possibly, indeed undoubtedly, a few individuals would be benefited by the present course of sending it West, but the public at large would be benefited by their investing it at home at legal rates of interest.

The CHAIRMAN. We complain because the Canadian comes here and sends his money away, and yet we send our money away on precisely the same principle.

The WITNESS. Exactly. I make that comparison sometimes. In fact, I have no doubt that the farmers are worth more at the end of the year than at the beginning, speaking of them as a class. Of course there are exceptions. But I think that is true of them as a class.

WAGES OF FARM HANDS.

On a great many farms in this State—on dairy or milk farms, and on the farms of gentlemen who farm for the pleasure of it, who have been born here and who have a love for the old homestead, and come back and keep a summer residence here, and keep men on their farms all the year round (and there are hundreds of them)—men get from $25 to $30 a month and board through the year, because it requires a first-class man to do that. Other laborers receive less. I have a little farm that I live on in the summer time, and I cannot find a man to work on that place for less than $25 a month and his board. Farm hands near villages and cities are not worked more than ten hours a day, and they will not do any chores. Back in the country towns they expect to
work ten hours, and they expect to help mornings and nights to do the chores necessary about the house; and they expect to do so on the Sabbath. If the man or woman of the house wants the horse harnessed, these hired men would expect to do it, if in the country; but in places near cities they will not do it. The workmen near cities want more pay, and work less. That gives a tendency for the country workmen to get to the cities, leaving the farms proper unsupplied.

LESSENED FORCE EMPLOYED ON FARMS.

In regard to this matter of lessened force employed on a farm, it is utterly impossible to get manual labor now (without the aid of machinery) adequate to the demand. The girls come into the mill, and the boys go somewhere, you know probably where. Now the farmer is compelled to use machinery instead of the muscle of his boys, and with this machinery a girl will do a great deal of work, and do it very handsomely, out doors, and it will not be any discredit to her. I have a girl sixteen years of age that likes to get on a harrow and drive a pair of horses around with it. That saves me a man a half a day at a time, and I do not believe it injures her.

EFFECTS OF MACHINERY ON FARMING.

Without this machinery farmers would have to give up growing the crops that we are producing. There is as much produced now as before, as Mr. Wason said, but there are less men engaged in producing, because machinery takes the place of muscle. If there could be such a thing as drilling into the minds of our farmers just what the grangers and our board of agriculture, and various other organizations are attempting to do; if we could translate it at once from our knowledge to the practical use of the farmer, we could double our crops very easily. We could raise better cattle.

EFFECTS OF VARIETY OF FODDER ON CATTLE.

When we can convince the farmer that he can make more product in milk or butter or beef by feeding a variety of food to his cattle rather than keeping them all the time on one kind, we shall gain a point that will be very valuable; but that is very difficult to do. It is the practice among all uneducated, unintelligent farmers to feed all their poor fodder at the first part of the winter, and so let their cattle be so reduced that it takes the value of the fodder to bring them up, and if they can be convinced that a little mince pie with the soup will be good for them, it will be a point gained. Therefore we make a point—our board does—to give plain, practical instructions, to stand and talk with the farmers, and convince them by actual talk, without any attempt at rhetoric, that that is the best course for them to pursue. Speaking of rhetoric, I used to think, when I was first elected secretary of the board, that I must write every speech, and deliver it with every gesture. I have had to give that up. I now talk with them in a plain, practical way, in such a way as they can say that they understand it, while they used to say that they did not understand it when they read what I had to say.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES.

I think our agricultural colleges are helping somewhat, but too many of them have the idea that their students must be scholars rather than
workers. Trustees of agricultural colleges, as a rule, do not know anything about running the institution that they attempt to control. One good worker, like a man we had up here, Mr. Sanborn, is worth more than forty boards of trustees. We so regard him, away from us. Instead of allowing such a man to go, we ought to see him well, and the more we can get of such men the more we shall move forward in the right direction.

Q. Is he the dean of the Agricultural College of Missouri?—A. Yes; in Boone County, Missouri. We were paying him $1,000 here. He is now getting about $3,000. If we could get and keep such men, we could redeem our State, though I don't think that it needs any redemption. It is safe now; but we can raise it up higher; we can do a great deal more.

**TAXATION ON FARMS.**

Q. How about this matter of taxation, that Mr. Wason alluded to, and the incumbrances upon farms? Take that matter of taxation up, or take either of those subjects in such order as you choose—A. If men have property on paper, the assessors cannot see it, but they come to his place and see his farm, and then they take pains to quiz him about his notes and bonds, and everything of that sort, and they get out of him all the taxes that he can pay. They do not get it out of the moneyed man in the same proportion. If that could be remedied, it would be a wonderful help to the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder how it would do to abolish all taxation from lands and personal property in the States, and collect the whole by customs and internal revenue, and let it go to the people at large, and pay all the expenses of the State and National Governments alike in that way.

The WITNESS. That would be the fairest way; for a man would be taxed then according to what he owns or holds. There is a difference between paying a tax on what he earns and on what he actually possesses. If you could tax his property, all of it, it would be a good plan. That very matter has been discussed to a limited extent. I do not know that any one is really an advocate of it. I do not know that they would feel like advocating it, but there is a sort of justice in it.

Q. This great surplus that is perplexing people so would only have to be increased, perhaps doubled, to answer all the needs of the State and nation alike?—A. Yes.

Q. Farmers really feel that they are taxed more than anybody else in the community?—A. There is no doubt about it; but I do not know how our State legislature can help it. The State legislature have exempted certain reclaimed lands for a while. They passed a law last year—provided it is not declared unconstitutional which gives me the right, as a private individual, to go through your swamp and drain it, and have the use of it, if you don't do it. The lawyers all say it is unconstitutional, but if it is constitutional and will be sustained, it will help many men.

**WOODLANDS.**

There is another matter that is not touched upon here; it is the matter of woodlands. I am not prepared to say much about it, but we are cutting off very much of the land. There is now less growth than there was twenty-five or thirty years ago; and it is not so valuable because not so large.
EFFECTS OF SUMMER BOARDING ON THE FARM INDUSTRY.

The question was raised about the benefit of summer travel. I have a different idea from most people on that point, and I would be perhaps called heretical about it. A certain class of men are benefited by these summer boarders, but the communities where these summer boarders are not benefited as a whole. Take our town of Quincy, a beautiful town; the young people there adopt those stylish fashions or notions of city people, and then in the winter they waste their time. It is a point, I think, that our people ought to look after a little, and see that it is kept within proper limits. I don't know that it is bad around Plymouth, but there is something of the kind there. I think Conway and Bethlehem, and a few such places, are perhaps pretty badly affected in that way. Has it ever occurred to you, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. I have observed that tendency, but nevertheless I have been of the impression that, from the aspect of things, on the whole, the people are better off.

The WITNESS. Well, perhaps they are. There is a culture that goes with this thing that is worth something besides the money.

The CHAIRMAN. If along with that culture they could retain a love for their work, that would be a great benefit. Still the people retain their houses, and they certainly find a much better market for whatever they produce; in fact, back in those glens, and remote from any possible market, they will get the highest prices that can be had anywhere.

The WITNESS. That has suggested another point. These very boarding-houses and hotels get nine-tenths the meats that they consume from the Boston markets, or places of that character. Now, why cannot our farmers have capital enough—indeed, they have it if they would only use it—and develop facilities for getting such things in the neighborhood.

Q. And any amount of high priced poultry could certainly be produced, could it not?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And in fact those who keep the horses, the landlords or boarding people, as I have frequently heard them, express a decided preference for the home product, if they could only get it, because it is fresher and nicer, but they cannot get it, and that shows that the farmer has not got the home market that he ought to have, though he is perhaps endeavoring to get it more and more.

The WITNESS. Yes; we endeavor to urge farmers to produce early lambs.

Q. And early peas and vegetables?—A. Yes; everything as early as possible. By having their early lambs and vegetables, they can anticipate the season a month or so.

INCUMBRANCES ON FARMS.

Q. What should you say in regard to the incumbrances upon the real estate of the farmers?—A. I do not know as I should be a proper judge of that, but when it was remarked here that they were heavily encumbered, I inferred that more than half were mortgaged. I don't think there can be more than half. I don't believe that more than 25 per cent, have any mortgage of any importance. I think there are more city buildings mortgaged than country buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. Your knowledge of the State is more recent (and it is a general knowledge) than mine, and I am glad to hear that your view is so favorable. When I was a boy I knew how it was then.

The WITNESS. I think that in your section of the State there are
more mortgages than in the eastern or southern section. Perhaps Carroll and Belknap have more mortgages than in Stratham, Rockingham, Hillsborough, and Cheshire.

Q. There are very few manufacturing villages in that region that you have mentioned.—A. Yes; a great many of these mortgages have been lifted by the daughters of the farmers, and it is a noble thing to record of them. They have gone to Manchester and earned money when their fathers owed $100, $200, or $300, and they have lifted the mortgage in many cases.

Q. Then they have done better than the boys!—A. Yes; when the boys have had money they have generally got some other girl to spend it for them.

Q. The boys are more generally the emigrants, too!—A. Yes.

CONDITION OF FARMERS IN NEW ENGLAND.

Q. What should you say with reference to the farming population in other parts of New England, in a general way?—A. Well, I do not know that I am familiar enough with them to say. I go into Maine, Vermont, and Massachusetts and I meet occasionally with their agricultural people, but I do not think that I am capable of expressing an opinion. Vermont has better land than ours. Its farms ought to be a little higher in the scale of comfort than ours. I do not think that the farmers are anywhere more intelligent or their homes any more happy, but I suspect that they have more money. Massachusetts has more money, too.

Q. Do you believe the people there are any more intelligent than our own?—A. No, sir; I do not believe they are. I find that I can go to Massachusetts and talk in a plain, simple, and unpretending way and hold them as well as I can in my own State. Now, whether that is because they really know a great deal, and think they will get something more, or whether it is because they do not know much, and think they will get some information, of course I do not know.

Q. Do you hear the farmers talking about wishing any legislation?—A. Not very much. There are a few cranky men among them who will be sure to grumble. They like the idea of grumbling a little, and they get in the way of it, and think it is all right.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Q. Do you hear much said about the Agricultural Department as a cabinet office?—A. It is talked of.

Q. Do you think it is based on any substantial reasons?—A. Well, I do not believe our people know anything about it. I do not hear any positive expression about it, though it is talked of. My impression is this: Our people would say that if the Department of Agriculture were made a cabinet place they would bring politics in more than they do now, and that it ought not to be a political office at all; that if there was a cabinet officer at the head of it, it must necessarily be a political place, and have some political bearing with the administration, but as it is now it is not necessarily so. It may be that the head of it would always be of the same party as the administration, but it is not necessary that he should be so.

Q. And even if he is, he is not necessarily a constant member of these gatherings for determining state policy?—A. It looks to me as though there would be quite as much prejudice against the Department of Agriculture if it were erected into a secretaryship or cabinet position,
and rather more, perhaps, than now. I do not know how you feel about it. I have never heard you express your views of it; but that is my fear.

The Chairman. I was in favor of and voted for the bill, because there was such a general demand for it. It was one of those matters as to which I could never see for myself that much good would be likely to come of it. But still if the farmers thought that it was something that would bring them good, I was willing to vote for it. If I were satisfied that the farmers were really anxious for it I should be strongly for it myself. I helped to frame the bill, and supported it in the Senate, and should have stood by it throughout, for that matter; but it seems to me that the purely industrial pursuits of the country are really upon the same level, and to discriminate in favor even of agriculture, and make it the basis of a cabinet officer and thus to give it more elevation or distinction than other vocations might not be just consistent with our institutions.

The Witness. One question you asked of Mr. Wason I have been thinking of, whether it would not be better to have all the industrial interests combined. I am rather inclined to think so; still I have no settled convictions in regard to it.

The Chairman. I have been of that conviction, but it is claimed by those who say they know more about the farmers than our folks that the farmers want one for themselves.

The Witness. I think you will find many who claim to speak for and know a good deal about the farmers, but when you come to question them on different points they don't know just where they are.

Q. They may not have thought it out!—A. Yes; and if they come to a conclusion it is what somebody else has said.

Abuse of Patent Privileges.

Q. Has there been much complaint in the matter of abuse of the patent laws?—A. I have never heard much—very little. Mr. Wason made a point which was good; but if we had the intelligence that we ought to have these men would not be taken in in the way they are. They would not allow themselves to be taken in as they do, especially after the exposures that have been made in the agricultural papers.

Q. Do they take this into consideration in regard to the matter: that if there is no right of action against a farmer, or a comparatively poor man, for the use of an infringement, a poor inventor is necessarily driven into a lawsuit with a rich manufacturer who infringes and will defend for a lifetime?—A. There is that about it. I do not hear much complaint about patent laws. The only complaint is that they are monopolies to an extent that might be restricted, perhaps. For instance, take a Singer sewing machine, which used to cost $100; when the patent expired they were manufactured and sold for less than $50. Now, then, if a man makes 50 or 75 per cent. year after year, and is still asking for a continuation of this privilege, it seems wrong to grant it.

The Chairman. They have, however, recently modified the law so that they now issue a patent for seventeen years, with no right of renewal, and that obviates the evil to some extent, perhaps.

The Witness. Is it not also the fact in a large majority of cases that the inventor is a poor man, and remains a poor man, notwithstanding his invention? He has not got means enough to hold his patent, and goes to somebody else who has, and who is smart enough to see how much there is in it, and he gets half or three-fourths of it assigned to him, and so gets the lion's share.
The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and even before there is any money of any importance in it the inventor loses the share that he owns.

The WITNESS. Yes; we have had mechanics in our mills here who have made valuable inventions in the use of machinery, and the inventors have received scarcely a dollar of it.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been one inventor here to-day who spoke of two inventions, I think he said, which are still in use, and on which he has received nothing, or next to nothing—Mr. Stearns.

The WITNESS. Yes. He is a friend to the poor man, and will make wonderful sacrifices to see justice done. He is an eccentric man, but a friend to the poor.

The CHAIRMAN. He bought a thousand barrels of flour once in order to break down a combination that was holding up the price, and he sold that flour at an advance of ten cents on the barrel.

The WITNESS. Yes; he will do that, and he is always fortunate. He does not lose anything. He is a representative of certain men that we have in our mills.

Q. Can you tell us anything else that will do the farmers good?—A. I guess I have told you all I know.

NEW HAMPSHIRE SCHOOLS.

I am glad you asked Mr. Wason about the schools here. I used to be connected with them for a long time, and had the superintendence of them at one time. At that time I believed our schools were as good as any. At that time we were constantly visited by the Massachusetts people to get teachers. At one time they got all the New Hampshire teachers down there, and they wanted me to speak to them, but I said it was a trick, that they had been taking our teachers down one by one, and now they were going to scoop them all in.

I believe we have too much superintendence. In this city now, I don’t know how many there are, but I think there are about nineteen men superintending our schools. If I have got the idea right, there is too much superintendence, too much machinery, too much of the maxim, “my way must be adopted.” The teachers and the children are too crowded; they cannot express an idea or work out an example in an original way. It must be done according to the books, and I don’t believe in that at all. If we would have teachers that could call out the intellect of the children, I say let them work the problems for themselves; and the more original they are the better. We might have boys and girls by and by who would know something.

Q. You think the system is too much like machine politics?—A. I think so. But we have an excellent superintendent, a most practical man. Our common-school teachers, however, are chosen for their politics, and they are none the better for that.

THE CROPS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Q. How are the crops, generally, in New Hampshire, this year?—A. They are generally compensating; nothing, however, to be a matter of boast. Our hay crop throughout the State, as a whole, is rather in advance of an average crop. The corn crop is deficient largely, but potatoes are of a superior quality, and there is a good, fair yield. Oats are good. Wheat, what little of it is grown—say 100,000 bushels—are pretty good. Fruit is poor; it is an “off-year” in that.
CATTLE, SHEEP, AND HORSES.

Beef-cattle have not "come up to the barn," as the butchers say, very well rounded out. In the early part of the year the feed was good and they grew well, but August and September were very dry months, so that the cattle have not laid on much fat. Beef, therefore, is poor, and mutton is not extra. These are important considerations when you talk about crops. We have a good dairy harvest in this State, and that is important. New Hampshire is improving in her dairy management.

Q. How about our horses?—A. They are improving. We have better horses than we used to have. New Hampshire can show very good horses—I do not know but that I may safely say as good horses as Vermont.

Q. How are sheep?—A. Sheep have depreciated; we are losing sheep every year; we have not as many by ten or twenty thousand as we had ten or twelve years ago. Our farmers are adopting mutton sheep more than they used to, and are endeavoring to furnish something for the early market; that is an improvement. We are improving in hogs, also, and that is essential here. Farmers have come to the conclusion that hogs are not only a mainstay, where they live on fong collareds and bacon, but that the manurial result is worth something to their corn crop. When they gave up growing hogs they had to curtail their corn growing.

PHOSPHATES IN AGRICULTURE.

Q. How is it about the extent and importance of the use of phosphates in this State as a manure?—A. They are using them more and more every year. They may use them foolishly or judiciously; I do not think one-half of our farmers have learned to use them with proper economy. They need to know, before using the phosphates, something about the soil—not that we need them analyzed, for that is humbug—but the practical farmer will tell you what his fields have been producing and to what extent they have been falling off, and if he does not find the phosphates as he buys them accomplish what is desired, he should try another element in combination with them, and the resulting crop will tell him how the thing works and what he needs. If a farmer, then, knows what he needs, he does not require to buy everything that there is in a special fertilizer. He may think he must purchase a good deal of ammonia, because that makes a rank growth; but perhaps he does not need so much as he thinks, and that is an expensive element. He needs, ordinarily, phosphoric acid; he may have it mixed with sulphuric acid, if he pleases, to make it more effective. Very often phosphoric acid can be had in the form of bone, or in the "Charleston rock," which is very largely phosphoric and is sold cheap and will give a largely increased crop without anything else on a rocky hill-side that has been pastured or mowed for many years. If he finds, as undoubtedly he will, on a sandy loam, that potash is wanting, he may get that, or ashes, if he has access to that and can get nothing else. So that, by study, he may be economical in the use of the phosphates and still lose nothing. A farmer who has a stock of cattle may extend the manure that he gets from them over twice the area that some farmers do, and then supplement it by phosphate and get double the crop that he would get without it. Then, by improved machinery, he can double the result of his labors in almost every direction—just as a manufacturer will make more money by taking advantage of every improvement in the machinery of his business. If improved machinery will enable a farmer
to plant now twenty acres with the same labor with which formerly he could plant one, it is his duty to do so. Farmers sometimes think their occupation is too limited, but by keeping intelligently abreast of all improvements and intelligently experimenting until they reach the best results of each improvement, they will find an almost unlimited extension to their occupation, both intellectual and practical.

SILO—ITS USES.

Q. Much has been heard recently about silo; what do you think of that and of its effects?—A. It reminds me of a story I once heard about a parson and his negro servant. The parson said to the negro, "You have heard me preach several times, what do you think of my preaching?" The negro replied, "Well, massa, lis'rin' to your sermons is jes' like snuffin' up the east wind." I don't think cattle will ever get fat on silo; but there is about it, that it will not do as a complete feed, yet, as an accompaniment to other feed, it may be very useful. I have had it analyzed, and that is my conviction as a result of the analysis.

FODDER GENERALLY.

Q. You would feed it along with hay, I suppose?—A. With hay and grain. We can remember the time when hay was not fed to cattle much, but it ought to be.
Q. What kind of grain?—A. Oats are the best when we can get enough of them.
Q. To what extent are vegetables—such as carrots, &c., being used?—A. Not very generally. They are good as a relish—just as a little celery is good for men.
Q. Are apples fed much?—A. Apples are fed considerably, and if fed in reasonable quantity they are valuable. Animals would be apt to hurt themselves with them at first, however, and they ought to be fed to them gradually. Another feed is cotton-seed feed, which is just now getting to be important in connection with corn-fodder and such things. I do not know whether I said awhile ago, but I meant to say, that in the cultivation of hills phosphoric acid would be very useful.
Q. Do you not think that the hills might very well be allowed to grow up into forests?—A. That would undoubtedly be the best use of them.
Q. Do you think the waterflow in the rivers is lessening?—A. Yes, I think it is; it must be.
Q. Is the new growth on the hills going to help the waterflow?—A. It will make some difference, but not very much. In wood lands the earth does not dry up as it does in the open fields; there is not so much evaporation. That is to say, the trees gather back at night what evaporates during the day, I suppose.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

ABEL M. KENISTON examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where were you born?—Answer. In Franklin, N. H.; it was called Salisbury when I was born.
Q. How long have you worked for the corporations here?—A. Ever since I came here, except two years.
Q. What do you work at?—A. I am a machinist.
Q. For what corporation do you work?—A. I worked at Amoskeag first, over on the other side of the river.
Q. The original mills?—A. Yes.
Q. And for how many years did you work for that corporation?—A. I worked over at Amoskeag about two years and a half, and then I came on this side of the river and worked eight or nine months in the Amoskeag Company's mills.
Q. Then where did you work?—A. After that I worked in the shop on the other side of the river part of the time, and then I went to the Stark Mill. I commenced work in the Stark in 1848.
Q. And have been there ever since?—A. Yes, except two years that I spoke of, when I did business on the street.
Q. You have seen the entire growth of this city, then?—A. Yes, very nearly.
Q. How much business was done at the old Amoskeag Mills when you went there?—A. When I went there they had about one hundred and forty looms in all.
Q. They have now some four thousand I believe?—A. I think so. That was on the other side of the river that I was at first.
Q. How many looms had the Stark corporation when you began working with it in 1848?—A. I guess about one thousand.
Q. How many has it now?—A. About thirteen hundred.
Q. What does it manufacture?—A. Well, they manufacture coarse goods altogether—sheetings, drillings, duck, and bags.
Q. The Amory Mills are new, are they not?—A. Yes.
Q. They are probably the latest and the model mills!—A. Yes; the Amoskeag Company have built one mill since the Amory was built—down on their corporation, on the lower level—one of the mills on the Stark is a new mill—they have just got the machinery running.

OPERATIVES' WAGES FORTY YEARS AGO.

Q. What wages did you get when you began in the mill?—A. Forty-five cents a day.
Q. Were you a boy then?—A. I was seventeen years old.
Q. You could do a man's work nearly?—A. Well, I could if I was put to it, very nearly.
Q. What did you get when you quit work on that side of the river two and a half years after?—A. One dollar a day.
Q. You were then competent to do anything?—A. Yes; I was then a "second" hand, and got $1 a day. That is a small mill.
Q. I suppose what you did do was just as hard, however?—A. Yes. I got $1 a day and paid $1.25 a week for my board.
Q. What do you get now?—A. Two dollars and twenty-five cents a day.
Q. You pay your board, I suppose?—A. Well, I keep house.
Q. How would the living of an operative compare then with his living now?—A. Well, a man could live cheaper then than now.
Q. Enough cheaper to make up the difference; could be save as much at the end of a month?—A. Well, no; I hardly think he could; a single man could not, at all events.
The CHAIRMAN. Well, it is hardly fair to compare a man without a family with a man who has a family.
The WITNESS. We get many things now that we did not have then.
Q. You live better now?—A. Well, we have gas to pay for now, and ice, and such things.
Q. Those things make life more comfortable, do they not?—A. Oh, yes. We have some other things to pay for that we were not using then, of course. The manner of living has changed very much in forty years.

OPERATIVES’ WAGES NOW.

Q. Have you considered the help well paid or ill paid?—A. Well, I think, as a general thing, they are paid fair wages. Of course, I have always been an operative. If there was a cutting down I was always opposed to it, but I was there voluntarily, and it was at my option to stay or go. I never could blame the company.

Q. Sometimes they have increased pay, have they not?—A. Yes. Five years ago we were only getting $1.75 per day.

Q. And they increased it to $2.25?—A. Yes.

Q. For the same grade of help?—A. Yes.

Q. What pay did you get in 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, and 1872; did you ever get more than you get now?—A. Oh, yes; I have had $2.75 in times of high prices.

Q. In war times?—A. Yes, sir; in war times.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYÉS.

Q. What has been the relation between the workmen and the employers?—A. Very agreeable, indeed. Mr. Adams, who was agent there for many years, was a very good friend of mine, and always used me first rate.

Q. I suppose you have known, of course, how it has been in the other corporations, whether they have had a great deal of trouble with their help?—A. I do not think there has been much trouble. There has never been much trouble with the help here since they had that strike, and that was not on account of wages, but on account of the hours.

Q. Did they succeed at that?—A. They did.

Q. That seems to have been the only strike that has ever taken place here to any extent?—A. Yes; that was the only one that ever amounted to anything since I have been here. That was a general strike of the operatives in the mill.

Q. Then, the relations of employés and employers have been friendly and agreeable as a rule?—A. Very satisfactory generally. Of course, there will be some that will be dissatisfied; some have gone somewhere else.

OPERATIVES’ SAVINGS.

Q. Do the operatives make some savings generally?—A. Yes; I think a majority of them do. I am more acquainted really with the shop hands as a general thing. Most of the shop hands save money, and I think a majority of the operatives do. I have sometimes felt as though they ought not to have cut me down, but they have done it.

Q. Are you an owner of real estate now?—A. Yes, sir; I own a house in West Manchester, but I don’t occupy it.

Q. How much are the premises worth that you own?—A. Well, I don’t know; I suppose $3,000 or $3,500 perhaps.

Q. Do you rent it?—A. Yes.

Q. What rent do you get?—A. Sixteen dollars a month.

Q. Have you other real estate in the city?—A. No, sir; I have not got any now.

Q. Had you property when you came here?—A. No.
Q. Do you think of any further matter that you might suggest?—A. Nothing in particular. My relations have been most agreeable with the man that has had charge of the work that I have been employed on.

LIQUOR AND TOBACCO.

Q. Is there much loss of wages here by the use of liquor and tobacco?—A. Well, yes; there is considerable. There are some that spend quite a good deal.

Q. Other people use liquor and tobacco besides the operatives, do they not?—A. Certainly they do. I smoke myself.

Q. Is it any worse for those poor people to drink liquor than for others?—A. Well, I don't think it is, and the influence is not so bad.

Q. Do you think it is exactly fair to say that they might live first rate if they would only behave themselves, and that they should not therefore have their pay raised, when as matter of fact those who get much more pay have worse habits?—A. I don't know that it is, but when they say that if they didn't drink they could save money and be in comfortable circumstances, there is a good deal of truth in it.

Q. So that the true course would seem to be for all hands to reform?—A. Certainly, but I don't think the influence on the community is so bad as for a man better known and a "property" man to drink such things. I have talked with a good many of these operatives about drinking at one time or another, and they would point to such a man on the street—some popular man, a "good citizen," as they call him—and say, "He drinks more than I do."

Q. Did you know that it was true?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You did not have much to say then, did you?—A. I have nothing further to say in that direction. I am always on the side of the laborer, of course, but I always took it for granted that the managers of the corporations knew their business better than the operatives, and the operatives are all there voluntarily.

Q. Well, are they there quite voluntarily; do you know any of those operatives who had anything to do with their coming into this world—that came here by their own agency?—A. I understand that, but I am there voluntarily all the same.

Q. That is, in the sense that you could go somewhere else if you wanted to?—A. Yes.

Q. But it is not everybody that can go somewhere else.—A. Well, that is so.

Q. And it would seem that they ought to have some chance to get a living.—A. I know. I have always grumbled when they have reduced prices, but I always felt satisfied to let them manage their own business.

Q. Do you think of any other matter that you would like to mention?—A. No, sir; I do not think I do.

MANCHESTER, N. H., October 15, 1883.

LUTHER B. BLANCHARD examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is your business?—A. I am in the stone business; a stonecutter.
Q. Are you well acquainted with the quarries at Concord?—A. I am.
THE QUARRIES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Q. Won't you give the committee some idea of their extent, and the quality of stone that has been used in the construction of public buildings and public works in this State and otherwise, and some idea of the value of the quarries?—A. Sullivan & Sargent's quarry cost about $75,000, and is considered very nice granite; equalled by none in the country. Then there is the Concord Granite Company which has a very extensive quarry. It can furnish any quantity of granite, very nice granite, too.

Q. Are there any other quarries that have been opened?—A. The Granite Railway Company's is another very large quarry.

Q. A good many others have been opened there from time to time?—A. Yes; there are sixteen or seventeen of them.

INEXHAUSTIBLE SUPPLY OF GRANITE.

Q. What is this formation which furnishes the granite quarry; it is a large hill, is it not, or a range of hills?—A. Yes; it is a large hill, containing an inexhaustible supply of granite.

Q. I suppose it might be quarried for a thousand years?—A. Oh, yes; the longer it is quarried the more there will be of it.

Q. They have merely begun to scratch it then, really?—A. That is all.

Q. What about the quality and color of that granite?—A. It is a silver-gray granite; a lightish granite.

Q. What is its reputation among the other quarries of the country?—A. I think it stands ahead of any in the country. It is considered so by good judges.

Q. What buildings have been constructed from it that you can recall?—A. The Portland custom-house, in Portland, Me.; Booth's Theater in New York, and the Tribune Building, and a big city building in Philadelphia, the Centennial Building, and I think some of the Government work in Washington; I can't exactly say what.

Q. Has it been used for any other purposes than the construction of buildings?—A. There is but very little of it used now for buildings. It is mostly used for monumental works.

Q. For that purpose, how does it compare with any other granite?—A. It stands above any other now. Probably there are a thousand men that work on monumental work at Concord to-day. There are probably ten car-loads of it shipped West every day.

Q. You mean for monuments—statues and the like?—A. Yes.

NUMBER OF MEN EMPLOYED IN THE QUARRIES.

Q. How many men are employed on those quarries when they are in full operation?—A. From two thousand to three thousand.

Q. How many men are employed now?—A. There are now from two thousand to three thousand there.

Q. Are there as many at work there now as at any former time?—A. I think so.

Q. Then the business is really fairly active at present?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I was not aware it had become almost wholly monumental work.
The Witness. Well, they have a great Western trade—they have a great demand from the West for monumental work.

Q. I suppose that class of work requires higher skill and is more valuable and profitable, is it?—A. Yes; and it is nicer work.

STONE-CUTTERS’ WAGES.

Q. What wages are paid to the workingmen?—A. From $2 to $4 a day.
Q. What does the man do who gets $4 a day?—A. He is a good workman.
Q. What is it that he does—what part of the work?—A. Well, it is generally done by piece-work, and the smartest man makes the most money.
Q. Do you mean that it is done by the square foot, or what?—A. Yes; that is the way it is generally done.
Q. All the work then is done pretty much by the piece, is it?—A. Well, it is divided. A good smart man would rather work by the piece because he can make better pay. A slow man would rather work by the day.
Q. What pay does a man working by the day get?—A. From $2.50 to $3.
Q. How often are the men paid?—A. Once in thirty days.
Q. Are stone-cutters, as a rule, permanent or stationary in their habits, or are they somewhat inclined to travel from one part of the country to another for work?—A. Well, there are some “stayers” and some “travelers.”
Q. Are there many who have homes and permanent residences around there in Concord who work in the quarries?—A. Yes, some of the men are well off there.
Q. Men who have made their money by their work there?—A. Yes.
Q. There is something to do there almost always, is there not?—A. Yes; almost always. The great trouble now is to get help; good help is not plenty.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES.

Q. Is there ever any trouble there between the employers and the workmen?—A. Not now, but there has been. Everything is all quiet now. Everything is all right; the shed is open and a man has a right to work where he has a mind to. The society don’t have to be there now.
Q. What do you mean by the “society”?—A. There is a stone-cutters’ society there that has been there for three years, but they are played out.
Q. When they were in existence, what did they try to do; what were they for?—A. Well, for every little difference in the price between the men and the contractor, a few cents, they would take a hand in, and neither party would give in, so they staid out as long as they could.
Q. Are you a contractor or a workman?—A. A contractor.
Q. You do a pretty large business, do you?—A. Not a very large business; I work about twenty men.
Q. How long have you been engaged in the business, or working at it?—A. About eighteen years.
Q. I suppose you learned the trade originally?—A. Yes.
Q. And you have become now a dealer or contractor?—A. Yes.
Q. What wages did you receive when you learned the trade—that is nearly eighteen years ago?—A. When I was an apprentice I got $100 a year and my board.

Q. How many years did you work?—A. I worked one year.

Q. The trade was learned in one year then?—A. Well, I so considered it.

Q. I suppose no man ever fully learns that trade.—A. Well, I don't know; I thought I could do better then than some that served seven years in the old country, and I guess I could. I don't want to “blow,” but I believe I could do better at the end of one year than some of those who come from the old country and have said that they worked seven.

Q. How is it about the American generally?—A. I would rather have one that worked one year here than one that “learned his trade for seven years,” as they say in the old country.

Q. Why; can he do better or quicker work?—A. Well, for one thing we use different tools from theirs, and we are ahead of them. They are away back fifteen or twenty years; they are not up to the times. They have never learned the trade thoroughly. They are not as good workmen as the Americans.

Q. You almost think the Americans a little brighter?—A. Well, yes; I think so. I think we are ahead of them in that line of business. Probably in some others they are ahead of us.

Q. You received then $100 the year that you learned your trade?—A. Yes.

Q. After that, what pay did you get?—A. $3.50 a day.

Q. Wages at that time were about as high as they are now, were they not?—A. Better than they are now rather.

Q. That was back in the war times?—A. Yes.

Q. Was as much work being done at the quarries then as now?—A. Well, there was a different class of work; there was no monumental work then at all. It was all buildings. There were several large building shops there at the time. Work was plenty and pay was good.

STONE-CUTTERS’ SAVINGS.

Q. How much have you known a man who earned his money on those quarries, or at work upon stone taken from those quarries, to accumulate from his earnings and get to be finally worth?—A. Well, I think that we have got men there that are worth from $30,000 to $50,000. Perhaps their money helped them to make more. I don't say that they earned it all, but their earnings started them.

Q. And what they have made upon it is from interest and investment?—A. Yes.

Q. They had no help from anybody else?—A. No.

Q. How old are those men now?—A. Well, I should think about your age.

Q. About fifty or in that neighborhood?—A. Well, I should take you to be a man about fifty or so.

The CHAIRMAN. I shall be if I keep along.

Q. They have averaged, then, an accumulation of over $1,000 a year, some of them?—A. Yes, I should think so. Probably in their last years they made more than they did the first.

Q. Those who stuck to the business and have been industrious and saving, have all accumulated something?—A. Yes. There is no reason
why they could not. But it is like all other businesses. They can spend all they get, or can save a little.

Q. Is there any better business there for workingmen than the stone work?—A. I don't know of any.
Q. What other mechanical or manufacturing pursuits are carried on there in Concord?—A. Well, the carriage business is carried on there quite extensively.

THE CONCORD CARRIAGE TRADE.

Q. Do you know how many men are engaged in carriage making there—about how many?—A. I should judge three hundred or four hundred; I don't know exactly.
Q. Abbott & Downing's place is there?—A. Yes.
Q. Is there any other firm there?—A. There are three or four.
Q. Won't you mention the firms?—A. The Concord Carriage Company and three or four others that I have no acquaintance with.
Q. Do you judge that they are doing as large a business there in the carriage line as ever?—A. Yes. I think so.
Q. I suppose the old Concord stage coach is not made any longer?—A. Yes; I think they make quite a good number of them still.
Q. I suppose you cannot give the rates of wages among the workmen in the carriage making business?—A. No; I cannot exactly. But I guess they get $2.50 a day about on an average. I think they are well paid.
Q. Do you know of any complaint among the workingmen there in the carriage-building business?—A. I have never heard of any.
Q. They have no trouble with strikes?—A. I haven't heard of any.

THE HARNESS TRADE.

Q. The harness business is carried on there too, is it not?—A. Yes.
Q. Mr. James R. Hill is in that business, I believe.—A. Yes.
Q. Do you know how many men he employs?—A. I think three hundred.
Q. What is the reputation of those Concord harnesses and Concord carriages?—A. I don't know much about them, but from what I have heard, they stand a little ahead of any other in the country. That is what they say.
Q. You understand that they are exported to foreign countries too?—A. Yes.
Q. Both the carriages and the harnesses?—A. Yes.
Q. They go everywhere in the world where such things are used?—A. Yes.
Q. Do you know of any difficulty among the workmen in the harness-making trade?—A. I have never heard of any.
Q. Do you know anything of the wages paid in the harness-making business?—A. Well, I should think $2.50 or $3.
Q. Full as high as in the carriage-making business for first-class workmen?—A. I should think so.
Q. What other business is carried on up there of a manufacturing character?—A. Railroad business; that is considerable.
Q. Machine shops?—A. Yes; and the tannery business.
Q. Who has that?—A. The Page Belting Company.
Q. Where is that situated?—A. Between East Concord and the city.
Q. Do you know how much help they employ?—A. I should think one hundred hands.

18—c 3—(c Law)
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES.

Q. Among the working people in Concord, then, there is a general condition of contentment and good pay?—A. Yes; they are well paid.
Q. Do you think of any other manufacturing work there that has not been mentioned?—A. No.
Q. Is there a pretty extensive business done there in the way of manufacturing or repairing locomotives or other machinery?—A. Yes; they do a good deal of such business there.
Q. Is there any matter or thing that the working people appear to desire to have done to improve their condition that you hear being discussed among them, or that it has occurred to you it would be well to have done?—A. Yes; I think there are some things.

INTEMPERANCE.

Q. What are they?—A. I think something ought to be done for the temperance cause. I think that would be a good idea. That is the best, I know, that could be done for them.

The CHAIRMAN. Several witnesses who have been here to-day have said something of the same kind.

The WITNESS. I guess that is the worst trouble the working people have.
Q. How serious an evil is that among them?—A. Some think it doesn’t hurt much; others think it has hurt a good deal. There is a man that has worked for me this summer—as nice a fellow as you would meet—and he is never paid without loafing a week or ten days after pay-day, until his last dollar is gone, and then he returns to work. He is a good fellow and a good workman, and when he comes back he says he is very sorry and will never do so again.
Q. And no doubt he is sorry?—A. Yes.
Q. And thinks he won’t do so again?—A. Yes.
Q. Then you take him back, I suppose?—A. Well, yes; he is a fellow I like, and he is a good workman. I talk to him a good deal about it. There is nothing bad about him when he is drunk, but he just goes on a drunk “to have a good time,” as he calls it. Then he is sick a week afterwards, and gets around to work after awhile.
Q. I suppose a good many men are just so?—A. Well, not a great lot, no. Perhaps there may be half a dozen or a dozen around.
Q. That includes all?—A. All.
Q. In all kinds of business?—A. I mean that there are not many men like that. Many more drink, but they can’t stand it; have not got the constitutions to carry it on to such an extent.
Q. They can’t do so big a business?—A. No.
Q. How would you stop it?—A. Well, I don’t know, unless you pass a big license law and make the license about $1,500 for every one that sells liquor. I guess that is the best way. That would shut up a great many of these “slop shops,” because those who pay the license would look out.
Q. And would do all the “slopping” themselves?—A. Yes, and if they sell liquor enough to get a man drunk, then their license should be revoked.
Q. Do you think you could manage a big liquor seller easier than you could manage a smaller one?—A. Well, I think the big one would manage the small ones, if he had to pay $1,500 license.
Q. Aaron’s rod would swallow up all the rest of the rods; that is your
idea!—A. Well, I think that is about the best way to do for the temperance cause.
Q. Is there any serious effort made to enforce the law they have got?—A. About the same as usual. Once in a while they come down on the fellows for a few dollars, but it does not amount to much.
Q. Do you think the law would be enforced against a man who had paid a large amount of money to the community for a license any better than the law now is enforced?—A. Well, I don't know that it would, but it would shut up a certain class of the worst.
Q. Is there any other suggestion that occurs to you?—A. No; I don't think of anything else.
Q. You think more money is wasted that way than in any other?—A. Yes.
Q. Do these people make many deposits in the savings banks—the working men there?—A. I think so.
Q. You do not know so much in regard to them, perhaps?—A. Not so much.

HOURS OF LABOR.
Q. About how many hours a day do they work?—A. Ten.
Q. That is the understanding, is it?—A. Yes.
Q. Ten hours form a day's work there?—A. Yes.
Q. Do you think that number of hours is too long to work in that business?—A. Well, I think that is about a fair thing.
Q. You do not hear much complaint about its being too many hours?—A. No; but they only work nine hours on Saturdays.

FREIGHT RATES.
Q. How about your freight rates for the transportation of your work?—A. Well, I like cheap rates, but I don't know that we can get them any cheaper than we have them now.
Q. In shipping to the West, over what road do you ship your freight generally?—A. From Nashua.
Q. Down to the Merrimac River?—A. Yes; we can send them to Chicago as cheap as we could to Boston.
Q. Do you bill direct from Concord?—A. Yes; we didn't use to; we had to bill to Nashua, but now, I think, we can bill direct through.
Q. How far is it from Concord to Chicago?—A. I have heard, but I couldn't tell you now.
Q. It would be about 1,000 miles, would it not?—A. About that.
Q. And how far is it to Boston?—A. Seventy-seven miles.
Q. And you say you can send goods as cheaply from Concord to Chicago as from Concord to Boston?—A. There is very little difference. I believe they want about 20 cents on 100 pounds to Chicago, and they won't carry it for less than 18 cents per 100 pounds to Boston.
Q. How much do they permit you to carry on a car?—A. Ten tons.
Q. I suppose they overload a little?—A. Oh, yes.
Q. And underload a little?—A. Yes.
Q. But without weighing, do they estimate the car always at just 10 tons?—A. No. They weigh every car load.
Q. So that overloading does not do anybody any good except the railroad?—A. That is all; but you can accommodate yourself by putting on a little more or taking a little out if you want to.
Q. But you have to pay for it just the same?—A. Just the same.
Q. As a business man, you have some idea whether they charge you too much for carrying your freight to Boston or too little for carrying it
to Chicago. Which way do you think it is?—A. Well, I don't know. I had some stone that I wanted to get up from Cape Ann, a small lot, and I rather grumbled at my freight bill a little mite; I thought they were charging me too much. There were three pieces of stone on one car, and they charged me $17 to fetch it up from Boston to Concord. I grumbled a little about it, and they told me that there were no competing lines, and that it was "all right." That settled it.

Q. And that looked reasonable, did it not?—A. Yes, that looked reasonable.

Q. And in the other case, they had some competing lines and so it did not cost so much?—A. No.

Q. And that looked reasonable too, did it not?—A. Yes.

Q. The railroad problem upon the whole is rather a simple problem, solved in that way, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. That same difference exists in regard to all kinds of freight, I suppose, or corresponding freight, between those cities?—A. Yes.

Q. You do not fancy that they would draw the freight from Concord to Chicago at less than cost, do you?—A. Well, I should not want to work at less than I could afford to do it. I don't know how others would do.

Q. They would hardly carry the Concord quarries out West unless they got their pay back, would they?—A. No, I hardly think they would. I guess they make it up or else they would not do it.

Q. Is there any other matter that occurs to you in which there might be some change bearing on the manufacturing interests of Concord?—A. I don't know that there is.

Q. Of course I understand from what you say that you think, in the matter of temperance, much might be done, and in the matter of freights something might be done for the business interests of the city, and of other cities throughout the country?—A. I think so.

Q. Stone-cutting is hard and heavy work—is it unhealthy work?—A. Oh, no.

RELATIONS OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES.

Q. There is one question that we put a good deal to witnesses; there seems to be considerable stress laid upon it: Whether the relations of personal feeling between the employers and the employed are good, or whether there is a sort of aristocracy on the one hand and "common folks" on the other, with considerable feeling of aversion and hostility between the two. How is that? Are they on good terms and friendly, or otherwise?—A. All are friendly.

Q. Socially they intermingle?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. With no assumption of superiority on the part of the employers?—A. No.

Q. They treat their laborers as men?—A. Yes.

Q. And the laborers treat them as men?—A. Yes.

CO-OPERATION.

VIEWS OF J. T. LANGLEY.

MANCHESTER, N. H., November 24, 1883.

To the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor:

GENTLEMEN: As you invite voluntary communications on the subject of the relations between capital and labor and other conditions of the laboring class in the United States, I wish to make a suggestion.
As business is now conducted in this country I cannot see how we can prevent a man’s hiring the labor of others for the lowest rate possible; and, on the other hand, what is there to prevent the laboring man from obtaining the highest price possible for his services? Now, if every man was temperate, intelligent, honest, and industrious, this would do very well, but as all are not so, I think it would be well to introduce a new system. What we want is that labor shall be equalized; that one man shall be required to work no longer than another; and every man receive an equal share of the product of such labor.

I wish to ask if it would be wise for our Government to encourage a system of co-operative labor!

I think societies should be formed from the most moral and intelligent of our laboring classes, that each individual should own an equal share in the concern, and have an equal voice in the management of its affairs, that the president or agent and all other directors should render their services for the same price as he who is engaged in the most common labor, for it is as necessary to have the one as the other and it should be as honorable to labor with the hands as with the brain.

The number of hours for daily labor should be determined by the members, as well as what per cent. of the products should go to the institution to maintain and improve its condition and provide for its helpless members, rendered so by old age, sickness, or accident. They should also provide that no member should wear clothing or jewelry of more value than any other could obtain if he wished it, and these and all other articles required by the members should be furnished through the institution.

If all labor should be well directed and every man would strive to assist his fellow man they might all live in peace and plenty, and have ample time to cultivate their moral, social, and intellectual natures, so that in time ignorance, intemperance, and crime of every sort might be banished from the land.

Yours, respectfully,

J. T. Langley.

Boston, Mass., October 17, 1883.

Carroll D. Wright examined.

By the Chairman:


Q. State to the committee, if you please, what relation you occupy to the labor organizations of the country, or what appointment you hold under the State of Massachusetts which has to do with the labor interests of the State and of the country?


A. I am chief of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor—a bureau which has been in existence since 1869. I have been at the head of the bureau since June, 1873.

Q. Will you state to the committee the scope of your duties, and, what in a practical way, you do in the discharge of those duties?—A. The organic law of the bureau empowers it to make investigations relating to all sanitary, industrial, and educational interests of the working people as these matters relate to the permanent welfare of the State, and we
are obliged to incorporate the results of our investigations in annual reports, which are submitted to the legislature. This law gives us a very wide field, and we can, without special legislation, make investigations in almost every direction wheresoever the interest of the State may be involved.

Besides the scope given our work by the organic law, the legislature is in the habit nearly every year of assigning special investigations to us, as for instance, upon questions of license and prohibition, gathering all the statistics relating thereto, and investigating the question of employers’ liabilities, the question of half-time schools, and various other matters upon which the legislature wishes to secure special information.

CONDUCTED AS A SCIENTIFIC OFFICE.

The bureau is conducted, of course, as a scientific office, not as a bureau of agitation or propaganda, but I always take the opportunity to make such recommendations and draw such conclusions from our investigations as the facts warrant. I do this more to bring the results of investigations to a focus than with any hope of the adoption of the recommendations. In the fourteen years of the existence of the bureau, we have covered a very wide range of investigations.

Besides the duties devolved upon the bureau as a bureau of statistics of labor, the law of the State makes the bureau the census office of the commonwealth, as, by constitutional provisions, the State takes the census every ten years.

Q. You arrange that census so that it comes semi-decennially—every five years—between the United States census periods?—A. Our decennial State census gives us, with the United States census, a census every five years. Our next State census will be taken in 1885, and it has been the custom since 1837 to carry along with the census of population and the voters of the State, a census of the industries; so that our State census now is a very complete one, involving all statistics of population and of industry.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE BUREAU.

Q. Will you give the committee some account of the things you do in the prosecution of your work. My object in asking you to be somewhat particular in answering this question is to enable advantage to be taken of such information as you may give, so that it may aid in the establishment of similar bureaus in other parts of the country where well organized bureaus of this description are unknown, and, in fact, bureaus of precisely this kind are hardly known at all. Just explain your method of procedure.—A. Our bureau is organized with a “chief” and a chief clerk. The legislature annually makes an appropriation of $5,000 for such clerical services and contingent expenses as the chief may deem expedient. Our information is usually gathered by special agents, who are experts. We long ago demonstrated the uselessness of attempting to gather statistics by circular inquiries, although circular inquiries are of great assistance. We usually in any investigation, construct a blank for the purposes of systematic tabulation. These blanks are then put into the hands of special agents, and they are sent to the local authorities through which we expect to gather our information. By this method the officers of the bureau are brought into direct contact with the people from whom information is sought. If we are collecting statistics of wages, the officers of the bureau go directly to the counting-
rooms of the manufactories, and with rare exceptions the books and pay-rolls of the concerns are open to our inspection, so that whenever we report wages, we report them directly from the pay-rolls of establishments and not from the statements of individuals.

Q. You have legal authority to require this of them, and they so understand it?

LEGAL STATUS OF THE BUREAU.

A. The law allows us to summon witnesses, the same as a court of law, although we have no power to commit for contempt; but we are not embarrassed in any direction by want of willingness to give us all the information we want. So that if we had all the legal power which could be given by the legislature we should not need to use it. This state of affairs, of course, has not always existed since the creation of the bureau, but during the last six or seven years there has been no difficulty whatever in getting information from the counting-rooms of our manufacturers. If we desire information from the wage receivers, we send men directly to their homes.

METHODS OF OBTAINING INFORMATION.

We have found it difficult to secure the attendance of workingmen at hearings, or to get their testimony in writing, but by sending a gentleman directly to them, so that they can have explained to them the objects of the information sought, and the purposes of the bureau in seeking it, we have but little difficulty in getting their testimony. Of course, all information which comes through official sources, as from the boards of assessors of the towns and from the offices of the town clerks, we gather by circular inquiry, and usually with very full results.

If we could have an authorized agent in every town and city properly selected, the efficiency of the bureau would be vastly increased, but as our bureau has the decennial census among its duties, we are enabled by that to gather by a house-to-house canvass a vast amount of information which is really applicable to our general work as a bureau of statistics of labor. For instance, in our census we find out the exact number of children at work and at school, which we could not seek by any agency whatever except through the agency of enumerators.

We have been content to take up a few topics each year, and prosecute the work connected with them thoroughly, rather than to try to cover many topics at once.

SOCIAL, SANITARY, AND ECONOMIC INVESTIGATIONS.

The investigations on which we are now engaged are, first, into the condition socially, sanitary, and economically of the working girls of the city of Boston; and, second, we are making very thorough investigations in regard to the wages paid in all the principal branches and trades of Massachusetts, as compared with the wages of the same trades in Great Britain, and all the work of the two investigations is carried on by special agents and experts, supplemented by correspondence.

Q. How large a number of special agents and experts are in your employ?—A. We have only three now. We increase or diminish the number according to the work of the office. Sometimes we have fifteen or twenty agents and clerks at work at once, and again the personnel of the office is reduced to the chief and his chief clerk. This is the only method we can adopt to secure the greatest results from the small amount of money at our disposal.
ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.

It would be a great benefit to all bureaus of statistics, as they have been established in the different States, if two or three clerks could be kept constantly in the employment of the bureau, that we might always have expert and efficient assistance; and if they could not be constantly employed on the work of the office their time could be well spent in studying statistical methods.

Q. Have you stated substantially the machinery that you employ and the method in which you work?—A. I have.

ANNUAL EXPENSES.

Q. And this you do with an annual expenditure of how much?—A. The appropriation for clerical work and contingent expenses is $5,000, in addition to the salaries of the chief and chief clerk, which amount to $4,000 more, making an annual expenditure for the personnel of the office of $9,000. In addition to this the reports of the bureau are printed as public documents under the “public document” appropriations, of which we have no control.

Q. I suppose that there is a further allowance for other and miscellaneous expenditures—that is, you print these circulars, &c.?—A. That has all to be paid out of the $5,000.

Q. Do you have anything in securing the attendance of witnesses?—A. We never have had. We find it cheaper and better to send men to witnesses rather than bring witnesses to us.

Q. In such cases you pay nothing for their time or any detention that they might be subjected to in taking their statements, which, I suppose are under oath usually?—A. Sometimes under oath and sometimes otherwise. If we should subject them to any loss we should pay for it.

Q. You would feel authorized to do so?—A. Perfectly so; sometimes we ask gentlemen to come to the office, and in those cases we pay their expenses.

Q. What places in the State do you visit; what kinds of business do you make a matter of special investigation?—A. Most of our investigations have related to textile industries.

THE OBJECT OF THE BUREAU.

Q. The object of the bureau, I suppose, is the improvement, so far as can be done by these methods primarily of the condition of the wage-working population?—A. That is the prime object of the bureau; by giving information of real conditions, the hope has been that, through public sentiment or legislation, conditions that are not favorable may be improved.

Q. Please state again how long you have been connected with the bureau?—A. I have been connected with the bureau since 1873.

Q. I would like you to state to the committee with some particularity the condition in which you found the wage-working population of the State when you began the discharge of your official duties and its present condition; and, if there has been any change, to what extent you think you may probably attribute the result to the influence and workings of your bureau; in other words, what good has it done?

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS—1873–1881.

A. In the year 1873, and from that time up to 1878, the economic conditions in this country were very bad; those five years constituted
a period when no fair or just estimate of the conditions of the working forces of this country could be made. The reverses of 1873, the results of the inflation of the time, the consequent depression in trade, resulted, of course, in conditions which neither manufacturers or operatives cared to have continued. Many industrial establishments were forced to work on short time. Wages decreased from 1873 to 1878 very largely and very rapidly. The exact decrease in all branches in this State is clearly shown in my report for 1879. Since that period of hard times, from 1873 to 1878, and up to 1880 and 1881, there was an increase in trade and production and in wages, and relatively a great progress in the condition of the working people of our commonwealth. Since 1880 there has been a very large decrease in the margin of profits to the manufacturer, while there has been but little increase since then in the rates of wages.

SOME RESULTS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS LABOR BUREAU.

The action of the bureau during these ten years of varied experience industrially has been to present the exact condition at the time, so far as it could be done, so that comparisons over a larger period might properly be made, and so that conditions which had brought unhappiness or discontent might be clearly seen. One of the results of these investigations has been the factory inspection laws of the State, by which the safety of the operatives in case of fire has been vastly increased.

COMPULSORY FIRE-ESCAPE LAW.

Through these investigations we have a law now which provides for the proper construction of fire-escapes, the organization of operatives into fire parties, and these provisions have been extended from industrial establishments to the halls and churches and school-houses of the Commonwealth.

Q. Taking the idea apparently from the application of the fire-escape to factories and places of labor?

HALL AND FACTORY DOORS OPENING OUTWARDLY.

A. Yes. So that now every hall in the Commonwealth must have two means of egress, and all doors must open outwardly, as they must in factories. Churches come under the same rule, and the crowding of people in the aisles and halls of churches is at the same time prohibited by law.

Q. Do you attribute these laws to the action of the bureau of statistics?—A. Those laws are due directly to the investigations of the bureau.

Q. What was the condition of the Commonwealth prior to these investigations in the respect that you have mentioned—with regard to factories as well as public places?

IMPROVEMENT UPON OLD CONDITIONS.

A. The fire-escapes in factories were very insufficient, except in rare cases, where the proprietors had seen the necessity on their own part. All doors, or nearly all doors, opened inwardly in the old time. There was hardly a hall in the Commonwealth where the doors did not open inwardly. Now, there is hardly a hall in the Commonwealth where they
do not open outwardly, so that in case of a rush no catastrophe like a recent one in England could occur.

Q. What catastrophe do you refer to?—A. A catastrophe where there were a large number of children destroyed in England. I forget the name of the town, but it was in the result of a door closing against the rush. That could not occur in any of the halls or factories of our State.

POWERS OF INSPECTORS.

Nor could the "Granite Mills" disaster be repeated unless in some factory that has escaped the vigilance of the inspectors. These inspectors also have the power to enforce the school laws relating to the education of the operative children and to the enforcement of the ten-hour law.

Q. What connection have the operations of your bureau with the school laws you refer to?—A. Nothing except in reporting information which we gather. Our bureau has no executive duties at all, and should executive duties be assigned it, as has often been suggested, it would destroy its statistical efficiency. The execution of laws should be kept entirely separate from the gathering of information.

INFORMATION THE PRIMARY OBJECT.

Q. You look then, I suppose, upon this power to gather information and its exercise as one of primary importance!—A. One of primary importance, and the execution comes as a secondary matter. If the people of the State thought that we could gather information as statisticians and could then use the information in an executive way, we would very soon destroy the statistical efficiency of it.

Q. It would be supposed that you obtained your knowledge with reference to some purpose of your own which you would then carry out?—A. Yes, and that would destroy our work at once. As it is, I feel that all parties in the State are not only willing to furnish information, but glad to see any results which can be shown to benefit the working classes of the State.

WHAT GOOD DO INVESTIGATIONS OR "LABOR BUREAUS" DO?

Q. We sometimes, in the progress of this work that we have been commissioned to do, find men of intelligence inclined to ask "What good will it do suppose you get all the information in the world?" The General Government has no direct connection with this, that, or the other topic in regard to which you obtain information." I would like to just ask you to put on record your opinion as to the propriety and the usefulness of the General Government exercising these powers of obtaining and disseminating information on these subjects, even if no legislative results by the General Government follow.

INDUSTRIAL LAWS THE EMBODIMENT OF PUBLIC SENTIMENT.

A. Your inquiry is one that I constantly meet in this State—that is, what good does the information which we gather and disseminate do? My own opinion is that legislation is the least thing that comes from the information which these offices secure by their investigations. In fact, if I look at legislation in industrial matters correctly, it is simply the reflection of a public sentiment that has preceded it. That public sentiment is nearly all the power that is necessary in reforming indus-
trial evils. For instance, the ten-hour laws in this and other countries have been the result more of public sentiment and of economic conditions than of positive legislative enactments. The enactments have come at the time when the law could become a fact, and not before.

PUBLIC SENTIMENT THE RESULT OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION.

You might as well inquire what good our school system does or what good any educational force does as to inquire what good information may do when brought before the public. I am thoroughly convinced that the results of investigation in any direction by which the people are clearly and fully informed of all the conditions which surround the members of society can have but one result, and that is for good.

THE EDUCATIONAL INFLUENCE OF STATISTICS.

Of course, being somewhat of an enthusiast in statistical work, I feel more strongly in favor of prosecuting such inquiries, it may be, than others who have not seen the educational influence of statistics, but when statistics are put before the people with proper analysis, so that they are robbed of the bare tabular appearance, I have found thus far that there is no species of information which is more readily caught up by the public. In fact, as General Walker happily expressed it a few years ago, the desire to secure statistical information has become almost pathetic.

IMPORTANCE OF CORRECT BASIS.

The difficulty and the danger in all such work is in establishing a proper basis for statistical information. If the basis is not correctly founded statistical information constitutes the most dangerous information that can be given to the public. But when established on a correct and sure foundation there is nothing more effectual in establishing a point than statistical information.

THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT HITHERTO NEGLECTED.

I have felt that the National Government has been negligent in the past in just such work, and if they will in the future make investigations into all conditions which affect the people, whether in a moral, sanitary, educational, or economic sense, or in all together, they will do a great work and add to the educational forces of the country a sure and efficient auxiliary. The two must travel together. In fact, the statistical progress of a nation or of a State indicates its great progress in all other matters. It is the "account of stock" in various directions.

RESULTS OF STATISTICS AS TO TENEMENTS.

To illustrate that, I need only refer to an investigation which my honored predecessor, General Henry K. Oliver, carried through in relation to the tenement houses of Boston. The immediate result of their investigation was not only found in legislation, which attempted to correct bad conditions, but in a public sentiment which did more toward removing some of the evils of our tenement-house system than any work which had ever before been done. And yet the bad conditions of tenement houses is one which exercises our philanthropists and our manufacturers to the fullest extent.

(The examination of this witness was here suspended until to-morrow.)
CHARLES L. HARDING examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:


Q. What is your business?—A. My business has principally been manufacturing woolen goods. We manufacture now and also sell our goods, and sell goods for others.

Q. With what corporation or corporations, if any, are you connected?—A. The Merchants' Woolen Company, of Dedham, Mass.

Q. And what is your relation with them?—A. Well, we own pretty largely the stock. We own most of it, and also a portion of the stock of the Washington Mill.

Q. Have you any official connection with either of these corporations?—A. I am president of the Merchants'. I have no official position with the Washington at present. I was ten years there, but at present I am not.

Q. How long have you been connected with the manufacturing interests?

The WITNESS. In this State!

The CHAIRMAN. In any State.

A. About forty odd years, I think.

CONDITION OF MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Q. What is the existing condition of the manufacturing industries of Massachusetts; is it prosperous or otherwise?—A. Not particularly prosperous. As a general thing, it is at rather a low average. Some kinds of manufacturing are paying tolerably well, but some kinds are exceedingly dull.

Q. To what causes do you attribute that condition of the manufacturing industries of the State?—A. At present there is rather an oversupply, an overstock of goods.

OVERPRODUCTION.

Q. How does that come about?—A. They are not consumed quite as fast as we make them. Some kinds are not over supplied; some kinds are.

Q. What are oversupplied?—A. As a general thing, I should say the manufacture was a little ahead of consumption.

Q. In what goods is there an oversupply?—A. In both woolens and cottons.

Q. When you say that there is an oversupply, do you mean that there are more goods than people could consume, or would be glad to consume?—A. More than they do consume.

Q. Why do they not consume them?—A. I can't tell you that.

Q. Do you think that if the people could get all the goods now manufactured, they would fail to do so? That is, do you not think that the disposition exists to consume all the goods that can be made?—A. I think we can make all the goods that are needed for consumption here, together with what goods will naturally be imported under the present state of things. There will be more or less imported anyway, and we could supply the rest of the demand, and I think we can more than supply what is actually needed. For the last two or three years we have had warm winters and cool springs, and the seasons have been a little
out of the usual course, so that we have got sometimes a little too many
spring goods made, and have to carry them over, and sometimes sell
them at a great sacrifice, and other times we would have winter goods
too many, if we have a very warm winter, and that overstocks us with
those. If we have a very warm winter people do not consume so much
as in the cold weather. But for the last two years I think production
has exceeded consumption. Goods have been low, and people have all
been generally employed to good advantage, but they have not seemed
to need the amount of goods that has been made.
Q. You seem now to refer to the consumption of goods in the State!—
A. No, I mean in the country, for consumption means in the country at
large. We cannot separate the consumption of the country from the
consumption of the State.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND.

Q. This power of consumption depends, I suppose, on the power to
buy does it not!—A. Well, I don’t think it is altogether that; I don’t
think a man wears any more clothes than he needs, even if he has
money. He will probably spend it for something else.
Q. But does he not sometimes buy more and sometimes less, accord-
ing to the amount of money or purchasing power that he has!—A. Some
do, but some would not buy any more than so much, no matter how
much money they had.
Q. Up to a certain limit!—A. Yes.
Q. You think that the overproduction you speak of, which has led
to the low prices and small profits, is an overproduction that remains
beyond the point of reasonable production, do you!—A. I think it is.
Q. You do not think, in other words, that the people have lacked
means to purchase all that they needed to consume!—A. No, I do not
think that there is any lack of that as a general thing, on an average,
or any more than there generally is. There are always poor people
who have not got enough to buy what they want, but the class that
consume goods generally have, I think, been prosperous in this country
for the last three or four years.
Q. And are so up to this time, when you say there is this overpro-
duction, or glut, of goods in the market!—A. Yes.
Q. Then it comes to this, does it not, that the power of capital and
labor to produce, by machinery combined with the labor, in this State
and in this country, is greater than the reasonable consumption of the
country at the present time!—A. It seems to be, with what are im-
ported.

FOREIGN MARKETS.

Q. This depressed condition of the markets would be relieved if you
could find other markets, creating a greater demand in this country or
anywhere else, would it not!—A. Yes, but that is impossible, except
with certain kinds of goods. There are some cotton goods that perhaps
can be exported, but with woolens it is out of the question to export
them to any other country.
Q. Why!—A. Because we could not compete with any other country
and furnish them woolen goods generally, even with free trade.
Q. Is the business with which you are connected the woolen busi-
ness mainly!—A. Yes.
Q. You say we could not find markets in other countries in the woolen
trade, even if there were free trade which, would reduce labor, I sup-
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Q. Would free trade put our capital on a par with the capital of Europe?—A. I should think it would; it is almost that now.

RELATIVE INCOME OF CAPITAL IN EUROPE AND AMERICA.

Q. Have you information of reasonable precision as to the relative income of capital in Europe and of capital in this country?—A. Nothing more than we generally see from the reports daily, weekly, and monthly. Capital in Europe was a few years ago, as a general thing, so that you might obtain money there at about half what it usually was here, but latterly money has been low here; there has not been so much difference as that. Still, the business of this country is so large—there is so much business going on—that it absorbs capital pretty generally at pretty good rates of interest—better than in Europe. But with free trade, with a large portion of our business checked, of course there would be a surplus of capital that would want to find investment, and would have to find investment at much lower rates.

Q. There is nothing to prevent the free immigration of capital as well as of laborers from the continent of Europe now, is there?—A. I suppose not.

FOREIGN CAPITAL INVESTED IN AMERICA.

Q. Does foreign capital find its way here to any extent, at present, for investment in our regular industries?—A. I should think that there is a good deal of capital invested here.

Q. I mean is it coming now. It depends, does it not, on the question of whether capital is cheaper or dearer here than in the old country—just as the other question does on the wages of labor?—A. I am not sufficiently acquainted with that to express an opinion. We know that many of our stocks are sold in Europe, which shows that capital comes this way to be invested.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FACTORIES IN AMERICA BY FOREIGNERS TO AVOID DUTIES.

Q. Do you know how anybody can find out with any reasonable definiteness as to whether the tendency is still strong for continental and British capital to come to this country for investment in the ordinary regular industries of America?—A. I have no statistical or definite knowledge of that, but we know that there are several very large concerns built up here by foreigners who had a popular kind of goods that they sold here, and the duties being pretty high they have established branches and started a business in this country to a very great extent.

Q. But that capital comes under exceptional conditions, and that is hardly a fair comparison from which to draw any just inference as to the general truth whether capital in this country is so much higher than capital in other countries, in its returns, that it is now tending to the United States.—A. I could not give you a satisfactory or intelligent answer to that. I simply know no more about it than every one that observes the amount of stocks that are invested in Europe—in the foreign market. There is a large amount of interest going out for Government and railroad stocks constantly. Every year the European trade is large.
RELATION BETWEEN RETURNS TO CAPITAL AND TO LABOR.

Q. As a general truth, do you find that where labor is high capital is also high, and where one is low the other is low, and that there is a relation between the returns to capital and to labor? Would you expect, in other words, where wages were very low, as a rule, that the returns to capital would be very high?—A. No; I should think not. I think capital does not get any more than its share usually—a small share at that. I don't think capital gets a very large portion of the profits arising from labor.

Q. You have reference to capital invested in legitimate and honest industry and not in speculative enterprises?—A. Oh, yes; the speculative use of capital, of course, I know nothing about, but I mean in manufacturing industries. I think capital does not get so well paid as it did formerly, and I do not think it gets so largely paid either. To reduce it much more would be likely to check capitalists from doing business.

Q. You think the returns would be such that rather than take the risks of investments, capitalists would keep their capital in their pockets or invest it in other pursuits or in other countries?—A. They would invest it in something that would pay a small per cent. and be satisfied with that, and not run the risks of business.

THE TARIFF.

Q. We will not spend too much time in that direction for we want to get at practical conditions as far as we can. I understand you to say that in the woolen trade, with which you are more particularly connected and acquainted, you think that free trade would put an end to it substantially?—A. It would for a time.

TARIFF AGITATIONS INJURIOUS TO BUSINESS.

Q. Were the modifications in the tariff of last winter likely to prove hurtful or helpful to the woolen trade?—A. Well, it is a disturbance. It disarranges things for awhile, but probably won't make any especial difference in the long run; when they come to sit down quietly, they can adjust themselves to it. There are some kinds of goods that you cannot import so well as you could before; others can be imported, but as a general thing we would switch off from one to another, and when we find one protected a little more and another not so much, we leave the kind of goods we cannot so well make as we can import, and go for others, and get business adjusted to what will pay. This last tariff has disturbed the state of things in some respects, but still, if they let it alone, we will get adjusted to it in time, so that I don't think it will be worse for manufacturers than it was before.

EFFECTS OF TARIFF REDUCTION ON LABOR.

Q. It is the change and uncertainty that troubles you?—A. Yes. It takes some time to adjust our business to any considerable reduction. For instance, if they reduce the tariff very materially on manufactured goods and not equally on raw materials, of course the entire change or the reduction in cost of goods to meet foreign goods has got to come out of labor.

Q. That is just what I do not understand, why it has got to come out
of labor any more than it has got to come out of capital.—A. Well, I have told you. You have got all out of capital that you can. That is what I mean. The manufacturer is not going to run a factory and hire help unless he can make money on it, and as long as we can't make more than about 6 or 7 or 8 per cent. by running a mill and employing four hundred or five hundred hands, and taking the risk of the business, we are not going to run it; that is to say, the mill stands still, and we won't work, we will let it lie idle.

LABOR MUST ACCEPT WHAT CAPITAL CAN AFFORD.

Q. You will get all you can out of capital; that is, you will go where you can get most; but is it not so with labor also?—A. Labor has got to live anyhow. If a man has got $100,000, he can live on 2 or 3 per cent. of that, but a man that has nothing must work for what he can get, to get enough to eat and wear.

Q. Why cannot the laborer—as well as the capitalist—go into some other employment?—A. He can if he can find it.

Q. Can he find anything else to do?—A. I don't see how he can. He may go back to farming, but everybody can't go to farming.

ALL MEN CANNOT BE FARMERS.

Q. Can a man go back to farming and get started in life, and live a year without some help, some capital?—The WITNESS. In Massachusetts?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

A. He can buy a farm here cheaper than in Iowa.

Q. Yes; but he must have something to get there with and something to get farming tools and stock with, and it is a question of time before he can get returns, is it not?—A. Yes; it is the same everywhere.

Q. So that the condition is such that the laborer is obliged to depend on the employment he is now in?

INJURY TO ONE INDUSTRY AFFECTS MANY.

A. Yes; but the moment you check one kind of employment you check everything that goes to support it. If you check manufacturing, for example, if you check woolens and cottons, you check machinists and every element that enters into the support of that business.

Q. You mean that they are all interconnected?—A. One man makes one thing and another another thing, and we use each other's products. We call it manufacturing, but that means a very great variety of industries to produce the things that the manufacturer uses. A man comes in and runs a machine; now, when you stop the machine you stop the product of the machine, and you stop a thousand things. That at once throws labor out of employment, and there is no way for the laborers to find anything to do. They can't go back on anything else. So things have got to wait until the laborers become satisfied that they can't get any work to do.

STARRATION BRINGS LABOR TO TERMS.

When they get starved down to it, then they will go to work at just what you can afford to pay. I remember going through 1840, 1841, and 1842. We had very hard times all through that period, and the man-
ufacturers were losing money. In the fall of 1842 the thing culminated, and almost all the woolen manufacturers of Massachusetts failed, or came so near it that it was not much better than failure. Then we were down as near free trade, probably, as we have ever been in this country, to amount to anything. At that time labor, of course, was not getting anything like the pay that it is getting now. It had not got it previous to 1842.

POSITION OF LABOR IN 1842.

But in 1842 the mills had to stop. Mine was a small mill, but it will perhaps illustrate what others had to do as well as any illustration that I can give. I found that I could not run the mill and hold my own. I had not capital enough to run through and afford to lose anything. I sent to my help and asked them whether, if I could manage to run the mill through the winter they would be willing to work for less wages, and they said no. One man said he had a family of five or six children, and he said he would take his family to the poor-house before he would work for less. I said very well, I would not run the mill. I shut it up and went home, myself and my wife, and staid there through the winter with my father.

In the spring I went back and found that these people had been idle through the winter. I went into the mill building and lit a fire and the smoke began to curl up and go off through the chimney, and it was seen throughout the neighborhood, and they all came flocking to the mill to inquire if I were going to start. Among the others who came to make that inquiry was the man who said he wouldn't work for less than his own price. When he said, "Are you going to start?" I said, "I don't know." "For God's sake," he says, "start this mill, and give us just what you can afford to pay for our work." Said he, "I have had no work through the winter, except occasionally a job at chopping wood at 50 cents a cord, and I couldn't do more than one cord a day, and with that 50 cents I have got Indian meal to feed my family on." I said to him, "I told you last fall it would be hard for you, and you said you would rather go to the poor-house." "Well," said he, "I was mistaken, and I am willing to go to work now." When help find that they cannot do any better, and learn that they have to go to work for a certain price or get nothing, they will go to work.

EFFECTS OF FREE TRADE.

You have asked me why capital would not bear a portion of this loss if we should have free trade and goods came in here at less than they are coming now. The moment you have free trade, so that goods are coming in here on that principle, they are coming in at very much less price than we can make them at present. Then we have to get ourselves to the same basis as the labor of Europe as quickly as possible. The capitalist has his plant, capital, &c. That he at once reckons at 50 cents on the dollar, or puts it at a basis as low as the European mills. Suppose he can buy woolens just as low as they can be bought, that is as far as he can go. His capital he has already reduced one-half, and now if he has enough left he can run this mill. If he can't make anything by hiring one hundred hands and working them, he does not want to do it. There is nothing to give way but labor, and the laborer has to feel that fact and do what he can. Now the manufacturers have got to go to work and produce these goods as cheaply as they can be produced abroad, or they will not find a market.
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COUNTRIES WITH CHEAPEST LABOR SECURE THE MARKETS.

If we allow the foreigners to take the market, our people have nothing to do but to wait until they starve or until something turns up which enables them to work cheaply enough. If we give them the market on an equal footing with ourselves, where are we! They are going to take one-half of our market in such case. The thing is perfectly ruinous. We may grow into it in time when we become as thickly inhabited as China or countries of that kind, and have to take less, but for the present we shall have work to do for all our people and a good many more to come. It will expand gradually.

UNDER PROTECTION HOME COMPETITION REGULATES PROFITS.

We will have little times of surplus, and that little surplus will regulate itself. We will stop some of our mills and some of the capital in the others will go into some other kinds of business until very soon the surplus will regulate itself. Our home competition drives us sometimes into a season or two where we make more money, or perhaps lose money, and some have not the means to keep up, and so they fail. They cannot prevent home competition, and cannot always keep the thing just equalized so that consumption will keep up production. Sometimes they want the goods faster than you can make them.

FASHION IN ITS EFFECTS ON PRODUCTION.

There are some kinds of goods to-day that the demand runs on more than usual, because they have become fashionable—certain things that are wanted a great deal, more and more of them wanted than in other years. Those articles become scarce, and all rush to making them as fast as they can, but by the close of the next month the fashion will change, the demand will be over, and perhaps they won’t want that article at all. It is especially so with ladies’ goods. They get running on a thing and sometimes the demand stops before all the manufacturers get ready to make it. That fashion runs awhile, and the moment that there is a chance to sell the goods, it drops sometimes as quickly as it was taken up, leaving us with a lot of goods on hand that are not wanted at all—at all events, perhaps for a good while, and which may have to be sold for another purpose. It is impossible to keep supply and demand even, or uniform. There will be times when there will be a glut and when there will be a scarcity.

THE ADVANTAGES OF PROTECTION.

Now, of course, we can do that between ourselves in this country very much better than we can do it by having manufacturers come in from abroad. Therefore if we can keep our own market, and do our own work here as much as possible, labor and everything else is so much better off. Of course there will always be more or less woolens and cottons imported here, because many people want to try foreign goods and styles, something a little different from what we are wearing; but the main supply for the millions we regulate ourselves. People that are carrying on the business will sometimes get overloaded and lose money, and then they turn around and stop a portion of their work, and the thing soon regulates itself, and on the average, if they make out a decent living, and get through life with enough to bury themselves with, that is about as
well as the average do, and it is better than they do in some countries. But at any rate, this country has so far got along pretty well with that policy. For the last twenty years you all know we have all got along pretty fast here, and we have had a high tariff. Whether the high tariff is the cause of it or not, people must judge for themselves.

EFFECTS OF OVERPRODUCTION OF RAILROADS.

There was a time in 1873 and 1874 that there was a general overstock of all kinds of products of the mill, but it was then largely owing to the stagnation of business in the Western country, they were overdoing the railroad business a little, and that set back upon us. Then the stagnation in building railroads, &c., has become generally felt pretty well throughout the country, but although felt it was got over, and people got to building railroads as fast as ever again. Now, for a year or two, however, there has been a little check. Probably in a year or two more it will be all right, and we will be moving on. I don’t think there is any great suffering yet; at least it is not sufficient to be felt; as a general thing, the change in wages is not much felt; thus far the change has all come out of the manufacturers; they have lost money.

FINANCIAL DEPRESSION FIRST AFFECTS CAPITALISTS.

They generally go on losing money for awhile, as they do not like to make much disturbance in the mills, but when it comes to be too hard upon them, and they can’t afford to lose any more, then they stop and sometimes have to reduce wages.

Q. I would like to ask you as to the practice among business men engaged in manufactures. When they find the market falling do they visit that declination in the prices realized for goods—the reduction in profits—first upon the operative and wages, or do they suffer in their own returns?—A. Generally they suffer in their own returns for some time before they make any attempt to disarrange their mill.

Q. I am asking for the fact now, the practice.—A. I should say that that was the practice as a general thing, to make no change in regard to their help until depression has gone on so long as to become so serious that they find they can’t stand it.

THE LABORER SECONDARILY THE LOSER.

Q. When they see this gradual tendency downward, and see that either the operatives or themselves must lose, why do they not begin by taking it out of the working people? What reasons of policy or reasons of any kind are there to induce this apparently unselfish practice?—A. It is not an easy matter to reduce your help in a mill. It always creates dissatisfaction and unpleasant feeling, and oftentimes they do not earn you as much money at low as at fair wages. It is always desirable to let the help remain at steady pay as much as possible. We find that so in practice, and we try to get our raw material a little lower and try to get our supplies lower and oftentimes stop a month or two perhaps to do some repairs and let the product run down a little.

LABORERS PREFER TEMPORARY STOPPAGE TO REDUCED WAGES.

Help had rather stop and lie idle and lose than to have their wages cut down. They would prefer to have a little play day. They can get
along with that for a month or so, but don't like the idea of all having their wages cut down. If we can get over it in some such way as that we prefer to do it.

Q. So that this statement of yours is based upon a sound economic reason; it is not necessary to appeal wholly to the sentiment of benevolence; it is really better for both parties!—A. Oh, certainly. We do not claim any sentiment of benevolence at all. Everybody managing business has to manage it on business and economical principles, and tries to save himself and his business if he can, but in some seasons we lose money. Once in four or five years we have had a dull year come when we could make no money. Some years we lose money even in the best regulated mills, but we never want to make a change in the general management of the help any more than we can avoid.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. You say that in 1842 your woolen mills were stopped!—A. Yes, sir.

NEAREST APPROXIMATION TO FREE TRADE IN 1842.

Q. And that at that time there was a nearer approach to free trade than there has been since?—A. I think there was; yes.

Q. When did you resume operations—how long after stopping?—A. In the spring of 1843. In the winter of 1842-43, I think, there was a tariff bill passed and business revived immediately the season following—after about June or July—and it went on then very satisfactorily for some three or four years, perhaps.

LOWER WAGES IN 1842.

Q. At that time you say that wages were lower than they are now?—A. Very much lower.

Q. How was the price of woolen goods at that time as compared with the present time?

WOOL IN 1837 TO 1842.

A. Woolen goods at that time were higher than they are now, in one sense. We had then hardly commenced making fancy cassimeres. It was mostly broadcloth, cassimeres, and satinets. In 1838-40 and along there satinets were worth, I think, 90 cents, and from that perhaps down to 75 cents. In 1842 the same goods ran down as low as 37½ cents or 40 cents. That price would not pay for the wool that was in them. But wool went down in the winter of 1842. Wool that in 1838 we paid 60 cents for went down to 20 cents. In 1837 wool and woolen goods went down very low, but gradually came up a little and spasmodically revived somewhat in 1838-39, but only to fall back again; the price did not stay up at all. In 1837 the mills were stopped so much and so long that the country got rather bare of cheap goods, so that it rallied for a season and woolen goods came up for awhile, but they immediately went down again and culminated in 1842.

Q. With lower wages then than now, and higher prices for the fabric then than now, what was the cause of your inability to run?—A. We could not make goods so cheap then, nor the same kind of goods.

IMPROVEMENTS IN MACHINERY.

Q. Was it altogether the price of the raw material that made the difference?—A. Not altogether; the improvements in the manufacture
of this country have now increased; machinery has improved very much. Fancy goods were made only by hand then, whether in this country or abroad.

Q. Your mills did not stop any more, did they; they continued to run on, or did you ever suspend work after that?—A. Yes; we have suspended at other times. We suspended a little while in 1848, I think; we had a pretty hard time that year. And we suspended in 1857.

THE TARIFF OF 1846.

Q. What was the cause of the suspension in 1848?—A. The business went down again in consequence of the change in the tariff in 1846.

Q. A depression in trade?—A. Yes; the tariff was so changed in 1846 that it hurt the woolen manufactures very much; it suffered a great deal. Many concerns failed, and many went out of business. Then it gradually revived a little, and along in 1857 we had a hard time again. There was some change then.

SPECIFIC DUTIES IN 1842.

Q. Do you remember the difference in the rate of duty between the tariff of 1846 and the tariff of the present time?—A. I could not tell you, but it was entirely different. The tariff in 1842 was arranged largely, on broadcloths and cloths of that kind, on square yards.

Q. By specific duties?—A. Yes; very much so.

AD VALOREM DUTIES OF 1846.

Q. The tariff of 1846 was mostly by ad valorem duties?—A. Yes; I think the main difference was between specific and ad valorem duties. At any rate it let a great many foreign goods in here immediately after that. It was a very common thing for many goods to be sold at auction here then.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Brought in by under-valuations?—A. I don’t know; but I think not. They could bring them in I guess, under the duty, at fair valuations at that time, and compete with us.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Have you suspended work since 1865?—A. For a short time only. In 1873 we stopped about three months.

Q. Have you ever had strikes in your factories since 1865?—A. Yes.

Q. How many?—A. We had one, I think, in about 1873 or 1874. I never had but one strike in our mill.

A STRIKE.

Q. That was on account of a reduction of wages?—A. Yes. It was about the time that they tried to strike for ten hours. The law was not then in existence to force us to go to ten hours. They struck for that, and for a little higher wages; but at the time business was very poor. We had been running at a loss for the six months previous, and had lost $50,000 in that time; but some of the advisers of our help advised them to turn out and strike for various things of that kind. I think the ten-hour rule was one thing they demanded; and another was
more pay to certain proportions of them—weavers and spinners, I think. Then we let the mills stand as long as they wanted to, and when they got ready to go work again on our terms we started up. I think that we stopped them about six weeks. The hands stood it until they could not get trusted any more at the stores, and some had been off to some other places to see if they could not do better, and had spent their money, and they wanted to go to work. Meanwhile, others had come in from abroad and wanted to go to work, so that there was no difficulty when we concluded to start again; we had plenty of help. We made no change.

**PRESENT WAGES.**

Q. What wages do you pay now?—A. That is a broad question, because we pay all kinds.

Mr. Pugh. You can make a broad answer.

The Witness. Well, we pay all the way from 50 cents a day up to $6.

Q. How do you classify your labor, how do you grade it, what is the lowest grade and what is the highest?—A. The lowest are children about fourteen years old, who do some light work like spooling yarns and such work. Such hands as that get about $3 to $3.50 a week.

Q. What do the weavers get?—A. Weavers work by the yard, and vary all the way from $5 to $10 a week.

Q. And spinners?—A. There are a variety of spinners. There are some of what we call self-operating machines that young folks tend; they make $1 a day, while on others that require men the men make about $1.75—from $1.60, say, to $2. I should think $1.75 to $1.80 would be about the average of that class of help.

**TENEMENTS.**

Q. What sort of houses do your operatives live in—their own or rented houses?—A. A good many of them have their own houses. We have quite a number of tenements that we rent them.

Q. Owned by the corporation?—A. Yes.

**RENTS.**

Q. What rents do you generally charge?—A. Well, I declare I don't know that I could tell you. I should say from $40 to $75 a year, depending somewhat on the size of the tenement.

Q. About what percentage is that on the cost of the houses they live in?—A. Well, it is a pretty small percentage. We do not count on getting much profit on the houses that we let to operatives.

**VENTILATION AND SANITARY CONDITIONS.**

Q. What is the character of those houses for ventilation and general sanitary condition?—A. They are as good as are built around the country here in Massachusetts. Perhaps not with scientific ventilating improvements, such as may be theoretically gotten up and are passing around in cities considerably now, but there is no necessity for it. They are isolated, single houses in the country, and the people are not crowded into thick tenements at all. Sometimes we have a row of three or four tenements on a block, but it is all open on both sides. The ventilation is generally by opening windows or doors.
OPERATIVES HEALTHY AND CONTENTED.

Q. Are your operatives generally healthy?—A. Very; there is very little sickness.
Q. They seem to be contented and satisfied generally, as a class?—A. There is no trouble; they are perfectly quiet and satisfied, unless some of these smart young men, that think they know more about it than the help do, undertake to come in sometimes and tell them they do not know what they are about; that they are a kind of slavish set working for employers, and ought to set up for independence, and start strikes, &c. However, our folks never tried that but once on us. I think they learned that it did not pay then.

DIVIDENDS.

Q. What dividends have you declared on your capital invested in this woolen business?—A. Well, our mill has declared, I should think, about 8 per cent.
Q. Semi-annually?—A. No; annually. It will average that. Some years we do not divide anything; some years we have a loss; but the average for the last twelve years perhaps—
Q. (Interposing.) You declared and distributed 8 per cent. ?—A. I should think 8 per cent.
Q. Do you have any surplus left for use?—A. No; not any more than the ordinary capital. That includes all the profits that have been made.
Q. You have distributed all the profits?—A. Yes.
Q. Have you enlarged your mills?—A. No.
Q. Or your manufacturing power?—A. No.

PRESENT OVERPRODUCTION.

Q. You say that at this time the organized and operating capacity to manufacture exceeds the reasonable ability to consume?—A. Well, I say it happens to be a year of that kind—this year and last year. For the last two years there has been, on an average, rather more goods than were called for by the consumption. It does not take more than a very few goods to make an apparent surplus or scarcity.
Q. Is not the capacity to consume in about as healthy a condition as it ever can be in this country with the same means of consumption?—A. I should think it was.
Q. What is your opinion, founded on your experience and judgment as a business man, and with a knowledge of the resources of this country, as to whether our ability to consume has kept up with our ability to produce?

TOO MANY MIDDLE MEN.

A. Well, that is a very difficult question to answer. There is a tendency by many people to go into something besides farming, and a great many try to get a living without even working for it at manufacture or mechanical business. It takes a great many people to collect and distribute the products of the labor of this country, and you can see that cities, some how or other, collect a great portion of the earnings of the labor of this country, which is probably the cause of the property that exists in this country. The property that is in the country is of course the result of labor or muscle.
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.

Q. Germany, France, and England are full of art industrial schools, and the young people that are growing up are being educated in these schools to stock the country with skilled labor. We have no schools of that sort or comparatively none; our young people are not directing their attention to this sort of skilled labor. In that condition is it reasonable that the laborer in Europe anywhere can expect as much wages as he gets here? It is overstocked there and understocked here with that sort of labor, and we have to import what we get of it. The Americans are going out of these industrial art employments, and the European states are getting full of that sort of labor and skill. Is there any reason in men expecting to get such wages over there as we give here for that sort of labor?

The WITNESS. Do you mean to ask whether that kind of labor, since our folks won't learn it, will not be called for, and if we will not pay the European laborers who come here more than they can get at home?

Mr. PUGH. Yes.

The WITNESS. Of course.

Q. And is not the prime source of the difference in labor between Europe and America to be found in the fact that there is an absence of skilled labor here, and a considerable demand for it, while there is a less demand for it there in proportion to the people? Does not that account for the difference naturally, on the principles of supply and demand?—A. Well, I should hardly think that you could take that view of it. Our people, of course, go for that kind of business that they think they can do best in. We have industrial schools, and scientific schools, and have many young men that are disposed to learn or are learning what they can in those schools; but it is a lamentable fact that our Americans are in some way working out of labor institutions—out of manufacturing.

SKILLED LABOR.

A large portion of the help that we have in our mills now is foreign, but it is not particularly because they are skilled any more than any other people are skilled. The skilled get the high prices. They cannot earn one-half of the money at home that they can here, and so they come here and make perhaps $10 a week, when at home they could get only $5. It is not because they are unusually skilled or scientifically educated, or anything of that kind. Our people used to be just as good when they worked in the mill as the others are. It does not require scientific knowledge to work these branches of business that they get those wages for.

COMPARISON BETWEEN LABOR HERE AND ABROAD.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understand you to say that there is as much competition between our unskilled and their unskilled labor as between our skilled and their skilled labor when brought together in the American market?—A. Certainly.

Q. So that, generally, their labor, skilled and unskilled, is cheaper than American?—A. Yes; it is cheaper abroad.

Q. And coming here, of course, it is brought into competition with our labor?—A. Our labor of all classes, skilled or unskilled, earn more
here than the laborers abroad. We have got a higher scale of prices for labor. We are paying higher for it, and our laborers are living better—have more of the comforts, and even more of the luxuries of life than laborers have abroad. The question is, whether we shall deprive them of those luxuries and attempt to get them down to the prices that labor is getting abroad, or keep our market to ourselves and furnish all the labor we can to them at the best price we could afford to pay, and keep that state of things on as long as we can? Our laborers generally are doing as well in this country as they can.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. England cannot add a man to her agricultural laborers?—A. No; I suppose not.

GREATER DIVERSITY OF EMPLOYMENTS HERE.

Q. Well, there is nothing else to do in those countries but to go into the art industries. They go into manufacturing there. But in this country the field is open in a thousand directions besides manufacture?—A. Yes; I know that.

Q. And labor can find employment here, though it may not be able to get it in a particular place or city, or of a particular kind; there is a demand in every direction, and means of employment in every direction—inexhaustibly!—A. Yes; but they cannot earn high wages long without competition from others who learn the business. One class cannot earn high pay a long time without somebody else finding it out and going for that class of labor, and that equalizes things. Labor is pretty well equalized all over the country.

WHY PROTECT WOOL?

We put a high duty on wool. Why? Because we want to induce somebody to go to raising sheep in Texas, California, and all through the Territories, which they have not been in the habit of doing. They have never raised sheep at all on the flock system, and having shepherds to keep them. A few farmers, or "fancy men," have simply kept them for stock. But that was not sufficient. We now have a large territory open, and must have shepherds to tend sheep. We must make it an object for men to do that. One way to do that is to make wool and mutton worth so much as to induce it. If they cannot make money at it they won't go into it. If they cannot make money at raising wool the same as they can at lard, beef, mutton, or things of that kind, they won't raise it. The only thing is to give people an idea that they will make money by it, and then they will work like tigers. That is the only inducement you can give people here to invest in business. If you want to have money invested in railroads, you must show people that when the railroad is built it will pay, no matter whether it runs into a wilderness or on the edge of a precipice.

CHEAPER FARMS IN MASSACHUSETTS THAN IN IOWA.

Q. I understand you to say you can buy a farm cheaper in Massachusetts than in Iowa?—A. You can, taking the buildings and fences into consideration. The land itself is cheaper. The farm is not worth so much when you get it.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You have a market for whatever is raised on it better than theirs?—A. Yes.

Mr. PUGH. It is strange that with that good market land is not worth more. That is a surprise to me.

The WITNESS. If you will go on the farms you will ascertain why it is.

Mr. PUGH. If a man raises a little cart-load of vegetable truck to sell, it does not amount to much unless he has a market for it.

WHY FARMING IS ABANDONED IN NEW ENGLAND.

The WITNESS. Yes; but there are plenty of little villages around that buy the products of the farm now. The products of the farm in Massachusetts to-day would bring as much as they ever would. It is not because they could not get as much for their pork or grain, or anything else, that they will not raise it, as they could forty years ago, but the fact is that there are very few people that want to farm in Massachusetts. Very few farmers now are successful.

Q. Do you think that is wholly because they can make less money, or because there is a growing tendency and taste to go into some other pursuit of more life and animation; to get into the city store and into the whirl of the world?—A. No doubt that is a part of it; but I do not think they can make much money in Massachusetts. Very few farmers make much money for the amount of labor they expend. There are very few farms that you can produce anything on. There is very much rough land. In old times we used to live pretty cheaply, and we had to do it, because we could not do any better. I was brought up on a farm, and know what it was to try to get a living on a farm forty or fifty years ago.

Q. Where were you born?—A. Up here at Franklin.

Q. Have you lived most of your time in that part of the State?—A. Yes.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Mr. Carroll D. Wright stated—I suppose you have heard him make the statement here—that the manufacturers had been reducing their profits since 1880, and the price of labor had gone down in proportion to the reduction of the profits on capital, and that these industries in which capital had reduced its dividends, but had not reduced the price of wages materially, were still prospering, still running?—A. Still running; yes.

Q. And you say your average dividends have been 8 per cent, clear?—A. That is, for fifteen years past; not a cent for the last year; not a cent in fact for the last eighteen months. We have not held our own for the last eighteen months, and we are not so well off now as we were eighteen months ago.

LACK OF DIVIDENDS DUE TO OVERPRODUCTION.

Q. The fault I understood you to charge to overproduction?—A. That is what it appears to be. We can't sell our goods at a profit.

Q. And that overproduction you yourself are to blame for, are you not?—A. Well, we do not consider ourselves to blame for it.

Q. I mean you cannot account for the laws of supply and demand
that are coming in ahead of you?—A. No; we cannot tell about that. We cannot tell what it will be until things come in.

Q. These natural laws would operate under any conditions, would they not?—A. Yes.

NEITHER HIGH PROTECTION NOR FREE TRADE A REMEDY FOR OVERPRODUCTION.

Q. And cannot be avoided under free trade, high protection, or anything else?—A. No, sir; I do not think it will make our case any better, because we overdo our business for some years here. I do not see how it is going to reduce overproduction at all by throwing our markets open to other folks to send their goods in here. The papers, I see, frequently lay all this overproduction to competition at home, and ascribe the cause of it to the tariff; that we have encouraged this building up of manufactories to a greater extent than they will bear, and that if we had no tariff, and let foreign goods come in, we would not build so many mills.

Q. You mean that they say this would happen if you reduced the tariff?—A. Yes; that that would prevent our building so many mills, and ruining, by competition, the mills already built.

Q. You say that at this time you are suffering somewhat, you think, from the operation of the change in the rate of duty on raw wool made by the last Congress?—A. No, sir; not on raw wool.

TARIFF CHANGES DEPRESS WOOLEN MANUFACTURES.


Mr. PUGH. The tariff was reduced 3 cents a pound on wool, and it was not reduced in the same proportion upon woollen goods.

The WITNESS. I beg your pardon; it was reduced more.

Mr. PUGH. They utterly deny that everywhere where they have woollen goods to consume.

The WITNESS. They do not deny it where they make them.

Mr. PUGH. The rate of duty itself will show whether the reduction in the raw material is equal to the reduction in the fabric.

THE TARIFF ON WOOL.

The WITNESS. I can figure that up and show you in a minute. The reduction in raw wool was 3 cents a pound, you say. It is 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) cents on the average. It was calculated that it would take 4 pounds of that wool to make a pound of cloth. That would be 12 cents to the pound of cloth, or nearly that, if it were 3 cents a pound on the wool, or it would be 10 cents to the pound of cloth, if it were 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) cents a pound on the wool. The tariff reduction on cloth was from 50 cents a pound of specific duty to 30 or 35 cents—say 30 cents on most of the goods. There, you see, is a difference, made by the tariff, of 20 cents on a pound of cloth, while the difference made by the tariff in the wool that goes into that pound of cloth is only 12 cents. Therefore the last tariff cut down the duty 8 cents a pound more on the cloth than on the wool.

Q. That is, on the goods that American wool enters into?—A. No.

Q. The reduction was on the kind of goods you manufacture of American wool, but there was no reduction of duty on the wools you have to import to make the finer woollens?—A. There was 50 to 35 cents.

Mr. PUGH. I do not agree with you in my recollection.

The WITNESS. You will find that to be the case.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

LABOR'S SHARE OF THE JOINT PRODUCT.

Q. What per cent. of the value of the product made by your capital and the labor you employ goes to your operatives?—A. On the class of goods we make, about 20 to 22 per cent.

Q. About 20 to 22 per cent. of the value of the joint product of labor and capital goes to labor?—A. Well, let me see—it is a little more than that. It is about 30 per cent. of the value of the entire product of the goods—it would be about 40 per cent. of the entire cost of the goods.

Q. Do you mean the entire actual cost, or the market value?—A. The entire actual cost; but it varies very much. For instance, a certain kind of goods we are making to-day will cost 80 cents for the wool.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. That is per pound of cloth?—A. Per yard. Those goods will cost 37 cents for labor and perhaps 38 cents for other items—rent, insurance, taxes, dye stuffs, oil, fuel, and various other things. In that particular thing it would be just about a quarter. If we take a finer article—made of finer wool—the wool would cost $1 in some cases, and the cost of labor in that would be 40 cents, while in other goods it would be 37½. It varies a little, according to how you work it. If it is a fine article it costs a little more to make it per pound or yard than another article, so that really it does not vary much from a quarter—from 25 per cent.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. You pay a larger per cent. on the value of the joint product in your business than they do in cotton manufacturing?—A. Well, I could not answer that question. There are cotton manufacturers coming in here, and they can tell you what they pay.

Mr. PUGH. I know what they say. They say 30 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. I think their answers are variable.

Mr. PUGH. I never heard one say over 30. Mr. Livermore, of the Amoskeag Mills, said that his company paid 30 per cent. out of the value and cost of the goods in labor.

The WITNESS. Very likely. My impression is that the labor on cotton is a little larger percentage of the cost than on woolens.

Mr. PUGH. That was my opinion, or at least my idea.

The WITNESS. But it must vary very much, because the price of cotton varies two or three cents a pound. The help do not vary at all in that case.

Q. Where do you buy your wool?—A. Some in California, some in England, some in Australia—anywhere we can get it.

WOOL IMPORTATIONS.

Q. What proportion do you import of the amount used in your business?—A. Last year we imported, I think, one-half. This year we are importing but very little.

Q. This year American wool is quite as low as foreign? Is not American wool improving in quality? Are we not making the finer wools now more than at any time heretofore?

AMERICAN WOOL.

A. Well, our wools are generally pretty fine, but there are better qualities of fine wool from abroad than we get here. We get some very
good wools, but our California and Texas wools and wools from those new parts are fine enough. They shear twice a year, however, and it is short wool. It is not suitable for combing. That makes it necessary to import wool to get the year’s growth. Ohio and Pennsylvania make very good wools, and their year’s growth wools are bought up very readily where long wools are wanted, but there is not enough to supply the demand, and therefore they import this class of wools considerably.

COMPARISON OF WOOLS.

Q. Are not our coarse wools better than the coarse wools made in other countries; are they not stronger?—A. Well, some of our coarse wool is. Ohio and West Virginia wools—the medium qualities—are generally strong, healthy wools; in some seasons they are not so, however. If we have a dry spell in the fall of the year, or if feed is scarce, it checks the growth, while if the rains come on fairly well it will be different. That is the case with foreign wools oftentimes to some extent.

COMPETITION BETWEEN AMERICAN AND ENGLISH MANUFACTURERS.

Q. Is there any reason, except in the cost of labor, why American manufacturers of woolens are unable to compete with the manufacturers of England and other places?—A. Well, labor being higher, everything else that we use is higher, of course; our machinery costs more.

Q. Where do you buy your machinery?—A. Well, our machinery varies. There are a great many kinds. We get a good deal of it at Davis & Thurber’s down here.

Q. Is it all American?—A. Yes.

Q. None of your machinery for manufacturing woolens is imported?—A. No, none that I have, but sometimes woven machinery is imported. That is imported especially for worsteds.

Q. Are your fabrics sold entirely in American markets?—A. Yes.

Q. You are not able to export anywhere?—A. Oh, no.

EXPORTATION OF WOOLEN GOODS.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What general reduction in cost of production would be necessary in the woolen trade, in order to bring about exportation?—A. That is a harder question than I can answer.

Q. Then can you state in regard to a few specific articles which are produced in the woolen manufactures, what percentage of reduction in cost of production would be necessary in order that you might sell them in competition with foreign goods in foreign markets?—A. The only way that I could do that—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Mention some particular classes of goods, I mean.

The WITNESS. I could not give you any criterion to judge by, except the class of goods that come in here and pay high duties. There are goods that come here paying high duties, and I suppose they are made at a profit by the foreigners. There is or has been nearly 100 per cent. charged on many of those goods brought in here and sold right along, and apparently they must make money on them, or they would
not do it. They come over here taking orders. The last tariff we have had on now for a few years charges perhaps 100 per cent. on woolens.

Q. How large a proportion in value, not in quantity, do you think of the woolen consumption in this country (in our own market, I mean) is supplied from abroad—that is, knowing the whole woolen consumption of this country, how much of it, in money, comes from abroad, and how much is furnished by our home manufactures, in relative proportions?

The WITNESS. You mean what amount of goods are imported?

The CHAIRMAN. No. Here is a total consumption of woolen goods in this country, of American and foreign manufacture. Now, what proportion of that total consumption is of foreign manufacture and what proportion of American manufacture?—A. I could not answer that question. I have read the statistics, but I have not got them sufficiently in my mind to give a correct answer. I would have to refer you to Mr. Wright for statistics, or to some one that has kept the run of them. The custom-house statistics give us the amount of goods imported; but in those cases the valuations are the foreign valuations, and I do not know exactly how to get at that.

Q. The only real criterion would be the cost to the consumer?—A. Yes.

Q. And it is for that reason I ask the question, because our statistics, as we get them from the census, do not throw much light on it, because, after all, what a man eats and drinks and wears is the real thing.—A. It is impossible for me to give you any idea of that.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not know but what among wool manufacturers there would be some idea of it.

The WITNESS. No; we have none. If we could see the account of foreign importations, and had the figures of duty, and the profits to the merchant, we might be able to tell what it results in to the consumer, but I could not say now.

Q. But whether the proportion that comes from abroad is one-half or one-third or one-fourth you do not know?—A. No; I could not tell. I should not think it was more than one-fourth, certainly; but I should not like to state any sum.

The CHAIRMAN. If that question could be answered it would show to what extent the tariff is a burden upon any and all classes of woolen consumers.

The WITNESS. Well, it is very considerable now under the present tariff. It amounts to a great many million dollars; but I have never attempted to work it out.

Q. And you do not know whether it would be better for the country as a whole to kill off the producers of woolen goods or to permit the consumers to continue to bear the cost of the tariff—in its immediate effect?—A. Well, people can judge for themselves about that. You kill a large class when you kill the woolen manufacturers.

Q. And in killing them you kill every one who is connected with them in other departments?—A. Yes.

Mr. PUGH. If they are ever killed it will be by protection. Nobody wants to disturb them. I am in favor of letting them live and having them prosper, and I never saw any man anywhere in my travels that was not a friend, and a real friend, of our industries of all kinds.

The WITNESS. I think that is so.

Mr. PUGH. The only question is one of remedy—what is the medicine, or what is wanted to keep them in health; and the doctors differ upon that point. Some think they need a large amount of something, and others think they can get along with a smaller amount.
PROTECTION, NOT PROHIBITION, WANTED.

The WITNESS. It is a pretty plain fact to most of us that the more foreign goods we can keep out and supply ourselves by our own labor, the better.

Mr. PUGH. Then prohibition would be the best way to do that.

The WITNESS. It is well enough to have foreign goods come in here to have examples for us.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. You think that all importation is an injury to our manufacturer?—A. No; I do not say that I think all is; but I say the more we can keep out, the more work we can make for our own citizens. I do not think we want to prohibit entirely. That would cut off all connection with foreigners, in a measure.

Q. Do you think a higher rate of duty would be more beneficial to manufacturers than the one we now have?—A. No; I think the duties are high enough.

REDUCED DUTIES ON RAW MATERIALS.

Q. Could you not stand a little more reduction without hurt?—A. If you reduce it on raw material, we could. So long as we pay a high duty on raw material we must keep it on the manufactured article. The manufacturers are not strenuous for high duty, if they could have cheaply the articles they work with; but if you have to pay duties on all the articles you work with, you have to add your duties on to the price in order to make any profit to the manufacturer. This duty on wool averages about 12½ cents a pound for the last five or ten years, and on greasy wool at that. It prohibits the purchase of wool in Buenos Ayres, the only wool imported at the time the duty was put on; but that is equal to about 50 cents on wool enough to make a pound of cloth, and now if we have to import that, and we have to, that regulates the price of our home wool, pretty much. Then of course our duty, in order to protect the manufacturer, has got to be put on top of that; and if he pays a duty on his indigo, oils, dye-stuffs, and everything of that kind, that must be considered, and the duty put on to the price.

RELATIVE COST OF RAW MATERIALS.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I would like to know something of the relative cost of the raw material that enters into the woolen production—on the one hand, the wool itself, and on the other, the indigo, the dye-stuffs, the oils, and other miscellaneous things. We usually think only of the wool. Now, what proportion of the cost do those other elements constitute?—A. That all depends on the quality and weight of the goods.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I understand that; but we cannot expect to make it so minute as to cover everything.

The WITNESS. The gentleman whose name I gave you last night can give you the figures, I guess.

Q. What was that name?—A. Henry F. Coe. He is treasurer of the Washington Mills, and is very particular to keep the cost of all his different departments. I think he has the figures right before him, and can show you the cost of all his different departments, and the cost of wool for all the goods he makes. I have the figures at home, and could
give them. In fact, I do not know but what I have figures in my pocket which would give very near that on certain goods that I am making.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us have them.

The WITNESS. Here is one concern that makes heavy, low-priced beavers—a mill running in Stamford, Conn. The wool costs 69.82 cents per yard; labor 39.82 cents per yard.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. What wool is that?—A. Good, fine wool.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Imported wool?—A. Some California wool; some is imported—sometimes from South America, sometimes from Australia—but it is fine wool. The cost of supplies would be .02.43 cents per yard.

Q. That item “supplies” is not wool?—A. No. Then dye-stuffs .04.73 cents per yard; oil .1.45 cents per yard; gas .64 of a cent per yard; soap .01.59 cents per yard; teasels .01.49 cents per yard; fuel .07.28 cents per yard; insurance .67 of a cent per yard; and interest .06.43 cents per yard.

INTEREST IN ADDITION TO DIVIDENDS.

Q. What does “interest” mean in that connection?—A. That is interest on his stock.

Q. What they call quick capital?—A. Well, it might be capital, yes; it will take all the capital; for the way he manages his capital it is all credited with and is paid interest at 6 per cent.

Q. And includes what he pays for labor and everything?—A. That includes 6 per cent. interest on the money until the goods get into the market.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. That is apart from the dividends?—A. It is the cost of the goods.

Q. But the dividends are declared on the profits which are left after charging cost, and that item of 6 per cent. is included in the cost?—A. Yes.

METHOD OF KEEPING ACCOUNTS.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. On the money he hires or uses?—A. Yes; they own the mill, and this is the way they keep the accounts. This is the interest they pay on the money. If he gets a lot of wool to-day and pays for it at sixty days, he is charged interest on it at sixty days. The proportion of expense charged upon a yard of cloth for rent on the mill is .09.69 cents per yard; for repairs, .02.93 cents per yard; freight, .01.86 cents per yard; general little expenses—I could not tell exactly what—.67 of a cent per yard; then for the boarding-house, .01.16 cents per yard. He kept a boarding-house and kept his help in it, and lost on that an amount equal to .01.16 cents, that makes $1.52, I think. That is one account.

Q. And making a denominator of that $1.52, these others represent the numerators?—A. Yes. Another mill kept by a brother of mine in Vermont, shows these figures; per yard: wool, .66.59 cents; labor, .38.87 cents; dye-stuffs, .05.50 cents; freight, .01.88 cents; insurance, .91 of a cent.; fuel .04.50 cents; oil .01.41 cents; soap .01.8 cents; teasels .62 of a cent.; taxes .80 of a cent.; rent .11.44 cents; interest account, .09.79 cents; making $1.43.85. I could give you an account like that for the last sixteen years, if you should want it—made up in a similar
way, for our mill; but I have not got the figures with me. It is two
or three years ago since those figures that I have given you were made
up, and I happened to put them in my pocket at the time and they have
become somewhat obliterated, so that they may possibly be a little out
of the way as I have given them; but I guess they are substantially
correct.

Q. Have you anything else of the kind to give us?—A. I have
plenty of it in our books at the mill, but I do not carry many things of
that kind around in my pocket. These figures happened to be figures
that my brother gave me.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Could you not have a statement of that sort made up by your
book-keeper, and sent to us?—A. Yes; we can make up a statement
of that kind.

Mr. Pugh. An itemized statement in a general way, giving just a
good average.

The Witness. Yes. Those are for a certain class of heavy goods.

“SHODDY” IN WOOLEN GOODS.

By the Chairman:

Q. You mean both these statements are?—A. Yes. There is some
shoddy put in those goods for “back-filling;” they are heavy goods;
and we have to use that to some extent, as they do in Europe, though we
have not got to a state of perfection in working it. They work it in
better than we do.

Q. That is one reason why their goods are cheaper, I suppose?—A.
Yes.

Q. Do they wear just as well?—A. Well, they wear pretty well.
They do not wear better; but are heavier goods. They wear just as
well because shoddy is put in on the back. The wool is thick enough
to wear well; but the back portion is made of shoddy.

ENGLISH SKILL IN UTILIZING SHODDY.

Q. Is it or not one reason for the cheaper production of the old coun-
tries that they have greater skill in working up that material into new
forms?—A. It is one of the reasons.

Q. It is one of importance?—A. It is one of considerable importance.
We are trying to learn it as fast as we can here, since the last high
tariff was put on. We are learning fast.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. You are apt scholars?—A. Yes. The amount of material that has
been worked up here is immense.

By the Chairman:

Q. They were sent to Europe to be worked up formerly?—A. Yes.
When our tariff was very low they used to bring these goods in here
and work them against us; we could not do anything with them; be-
sides, we had not really attempted to learn to make that kind of goods
as cheaply as they could.

THE “MERCHANTS” AND “WASHINGTON” MILLS.

Q. How heavy are those companies that you are connected with;
what is the amount of their capital?—A. The capital of the “Mer-
chants” is $700,000, and of the “Washington” $1,550,000, or so.
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Q. How much help do you employ; how many operatives or working people are there in the "Washington" Mills?—A. Usually about two thousand three hundred to two thousand five hundred.

Q. And in the "Merchants"?—A. About five hundred.

The Chairman. If anything further occurs to you to state, you can either come and state it to us orally, or send it to us in writing. Of course, we want to get as fair a representation of the manufacturing interests as we can. We do not like a partial statement.

CORRECTION OF NEWSPAPER REPORTS.

The following letter from Mr. Harding relating to the above testimony is here inserted:

[Harding, Colby & Co., dry goods commission merchants.]

Hon. H. W. Blair:

Dear Sir: I notice that the papers quote me as saying before your committee yesterday that the cost of labor in the manufacture of woolens was about 40 per cent. of the entire cost. If they understood me to say so, it was a mistake, either in my statement or their understanding of what I did say. In stating the cost of a yard of similar goods to those I was making, the labor cost about 40 cents, or 38 and a fraction per yard; but the entire cost was about $1.52, which is about 25 per cent. At another time I stated the proportion of the cost of woolens generally was about 25 per cent., or from 25 to 30 per cent.; there would be exceptions, both above and below those prices. The variation in the price of wool would sometimes make the percentage greater and sometimes less, but at present prices of wool and labor, I should say from 25 to 30 per cent. would be a fair proportion of cost for medium to good qualities of goods.

Respectfully yours,

C. L. Harding.

Boston, Mass., October 17, 1883.

GEORGE C. RICHARDSON examined.

By the Chairman:

Question. Do you reside in Boston?—Answer. Yes.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Selling agent for mills in Lowell, Lawrence, Saco, and Lewiston.

Q. Cotton manufactures?—A. Cotton and wool; and we are agents of the Lowell Carpet Company.

Q. Are you the exclusive selling agents?—A. We are the exclusive selling agents for all the mills we represent. We sell every yard of goods they make.

Q. There are different corporations in the several cities you have mentioned—under different names?—A. Yes.

Q. You speak of a company in Lowell.—A. That is the Lowell Carpet Company.

Q. Do you sell for the Lowell cotton manufacturers?—A. Yes. We sell for the "Massachusetts," which is a large mill.

AMOUNT OF COTTON MANUFACTURE IN NEW ENGLAND.

The Chairman. We would like to get an idea as to the amount of the cotton manufacture of New England, the sale of which you represent.

The Witness. The "Massachusetts" has a capital of $2,000,000. It makes more yards of goods than any other mill in New England.
Q. That is where?—A. In Lowell. The Lawrence Manufacturing Company has a capital of $1,500,000. It is a very large concern. They have a large surplus which is all invested in their mills. The concerns are very extensive. The “Booth” Cotton Company is the second largest.

Q. That is located at Lowell?—A. Yes. These establishments—our mills in Lowell—are very extensive. For instance, the “Booth” has seven, and the “Lawrence” seven or eight mills, but they are contiguous to each other.

Q. The “Lawrence” Mills are situated at Lowell?—A. Yes.

ECONOMY OF COMBINATION IN MILLS.

Q. Not in the city of Lawrence?—A. No. The Tremont and Suffolk Mills are a combination of two mills that were in existence for a long time, that were small, having $600,000 capital, and they have combined their capital. These mills have absorbed others. For instance, they have absorbed the Prescott, that used to be a $600,000 mill, but is now included in the “Massachusetts.” There is a greater economy in combination; the same stockholders own the two mills. It was so with the Tremont and Suffolk also. By combining the capital they can produce goods cheaper.

Q. And these organizations comprise the cotton manufacture of the city of Lowell, substantially?—A. Largely so. There are one or two other mills. The Hamilton Mill is a print mill, and the Appleton is a small mill of $600,000 capital.

Q. Do you represent that?—A. No, sir; but I represent altogether the majority, the larger portion of the cotton, and in the city of Lawrence we only represent the Everett Mills—making colored goods.

Q. What is the capital of that mill?—A. The capital of the Everett is $800,000.

Q. You mentioned two or three other mills in Massachusetts; what are they?—A. There is the York Mills, at Saco, Me. Their recorded capital is $750,000. They had a very large surplus.

APPLICATION OF SURPLUS EARNINGS.

Their capital is $1,000,000, and they paid 25 per cent. back to the stockholders, so that the recorded capital now is only $750,000.

Q. How long since they did that?—A. That is about five or six years ago.

Q. They reduced their capital stock accordingly?—A. They reduced it. They had a large surplus.

Q. It was the surplus that they divided?—A. Yes.

Q. Leaving the nominal capital just about as it was before, I suppose?—A. Yes.

Q. Those were the accumulations of the prosperous years we read of?—A. A long period—over forty years. The York Mills were incorporated in 1822.

LARGE DIVIDENDS FOR FORTY YEARS.

Q. What rates of dividends had they usually paid while this surplus was accumulating?—A. The dividends were pretty large; it is a record we don’t like very much to make; but at the same time their dividends were quite large; sometimes they earned quite large, and sometimes not so largely, but the average dividends were large.
Q. This all has reference to a period before the distribution of the surplus?—A. Yes.

Q. And the profit showed the surplus accumulating through that period from 1822; how much did you say that they divided?—A. I did not say. They divided of this capital 25 per cent.; but their earnings for forty years had averaged quite large. They averaged over 12 per cent. for forty-seven years.

Q. And the surplus had accumulated besides?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. What mills were those?—A. The York Manufacturing Company, at Saco.

By the Chairman:

Q. Were those cotton goods?—A. Yes, pretty much; but they are making only irregular dividends now.

Q. And sometimes don’t pay at all?—A. Don’t pay at all.

Q. But they have kept in operation?

MILL CAPACITY DOUBLED—DEPRESSION RESULTING.

A. Yes; and their mills have been increased in power, in fact doubled within seven or eight years. That was one of the causes of this great depression. They made too many goods. It is so also with the Everett Mills; they have doubled their machinery, but they have got more machinery than the market would warrant for a time. But Lowell and Lawrence and all our large manufacturing concerns take a pretty broad view in regard to that. We see the population of this country growing very largely. We think that if we go ahead the population will overtake us by and by, but it is very depressing at times.

Q. At such times of depression you still continue your mills in operation, of course?—A. Our mills never stop.

LABOR PAID FROM SURPLUS EARNINGS IN TIMES OF DEPRESSION.

Q. Wages are drawn from those accumulations really, then, at times when you are not making anything?—A. Oh, certainly; yes. In the period that those mills have existed there have been many years that they did not make anything; but so far as paying the labor is concerned, they never change it.

Q. Nor the rates?—A. Nor the rates.

Q. Then these large accumulations are in their nature an assurance of continuity of labor to the operatives?—A. Yes; a very great assurance of that, and of regularity in the payment of wages.

Q. Now, with regard to the other mills you represent, what of them? You spoke of Lewiston.

THE MANUFACTURE OF COLORED GOODS.

A. Yes; those are colored goods.

Q. And you are the selling agents for those?—A. Yes.

Q. There are other manufactures besides that of colored goods at Lewiston, I take it?—A. Oh, yes; quite a number of mills. We do not have much to do with Lewiston—only this one mill.

Q. Allow me to ask this question while we are upon it: Whether the profits upon the manufacture of colored goods like the Everett, Saco,
and Lewiston mills that you represent, have as a rule been larger than in the manufacture of other kinds—of the more common kinds of cotton goods!

HIGH PROFITS ON COLORED GOODS CAUSES COMPETITION AND OVER-
PRODUCTION.

A. Decidedly larger up to the last year. But this last year there has been an unusual depression all through, from the fact that the accumulation has been so great on colored goods; and it is not only that, but the large dividends and earnings of the York Mill, perhaps, and of the Amoskeag Mill (which has been a very prosperous mill), their large earnings for a long period has invited other machinery in other parts of the country to go onto their goods, and now there is actually too much machinery on colored goods, and it will take some time to bring the true relations about between production and consumption.

Q. Of colored goods?—A. Of colored goods.

Q. How long have you been engaged as selling agent for the manufacturers of New England?—A. Eighteen years.

Q. What was your occupation and pursuit before that?—A. I have been always connected with the dry-goods business in various ways. I was a retailer fifty years ago. I was in every branch of the business; I was in the jobbing business seventeen years.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not begin with the idea of examining you on the general subject, and was only going to call out who you were, and then ask Senator Pugh if he would examine you.

Mr. PUGH. Go on. I can ask him additional questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Mr. Richardson, you have heard the examination of Mr. Harding, and of course you understand the general subject of our inquiry. We are not inquiring merely as to one specific industry. It is rather a broad matter.

The WITNESS. Have you the resolution under which you are acting?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. [The resolution is read]. Of course that is an exceedingly broad authority.

The WITNESS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Any observations that it seems proper for you to make on the subjects mentioned, or any collateral subject, we should be glad to hear from you. You can take up one or all of the subjects that may be in your mind—the condition of the people; the hours of labor; the labor of women and children; the wages question; the sanitary conditions of the places where labor is performed; and of the homes of the people; the education of the people, and industrial questions generally; anything that would operate in a remedial way or promote the general prosperity of the country.

MONEY VALUE OF INTELLIGENCE AMONG WAGE-EARNERS.

The WITNESS. I think the matter of education has a very important bearing upon the manufacturers of New England. Intelligence pays. There is nothing like intelligence in manufacturing. I recollect some years ago Horace Mann instituted a series of questions for the Lowell people, and the questions dealt largely with the character of opportunities that the operatives had, and how they used them. For instance, in one mill, there was about one third of the employees that could not read and write; then another one-third that were very ignorant, but could write their names, and in looking into the earnings of these different
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

It was shown that their earnings had an exact proportion to the way that they had spent their time in the development of their minds. It showed that mind told in manufacturing, and there is nothing more visible to-day in Lowell than that fact. Intelligence produces at a very much lower rate because it produces more. It reduces the cost.

IMPORTED IGNORANT HELP RATED LOW ON THE PAY-ROLLS.

The labor of the ignorant help that we import is at a lower rate on the pay-roll; they do not earn nearly as much, and really the price that is paid for labor does not fully indicate the cost of that labor, because the intelligent, higher priced labor produces very much more. I mean the cost of manufacturing, which is at the bottom of the whole thing. If a manufacturer can produce goods cheaply he can get a good profit, otherwise he will get none, or perhaps only a very small profit.

Q. Do you think that if labor generally—the lowest grade and all the grades above—were increased in intelligence, not one more than another, but if labor universally were increased in intelligence, production would be cheapened notwithstanding?—A. That is a pretty broad question.

Q. Or would wages be increased, and cost of production increased in a corresponding degree with the universal increase of intelligence among producers?

INTELLIGENT LABOR PRODUCES AND CONSUMES MORE.

A. I think the natural law would be that the intelligent help would command more, and demand a higher price, and get it.

Q. But I was only speaking as to the amount of production.—A. The production would be increased by intelligent labor.

Q. And do you think that there would be a corresponding benefit derived by labor itself?—A. I think so.

Q. The wants of labor would increase with intelligence, and the means of gratifying their wants would increase, you think, in a still larger proportion!—A. Yes.

Q. So that the balance would be maintained, and beneficial results follow the increase of intelligence generally?—A. One of the greatest benefits of our American manufactures, as compared with other countries, is that the average intelligence of help is of a higher grade; but it would apply perhaps to Lowell and Lawrence, and some of the older manufacturing towns. In Mr. Harding's mill he makes a kind of goods that he can make with a low foreign labor, and that would probably pay better with him than a more intelligent and higher-priced labor; but when you produce fine cotton goods it requires skilled labor, and a different class of labor from what is required in his mill.

Q. Skill is always intelligent!—A. As a rule, always.

Q. Assuming that anything is to be done to improve the general condition of the working people in this country, what would you do?

RAW MATERIAL SHOULD BE FREE.

A. The first thing I would do would be to equalize raw material as compared with other countries, and with the general tariff. We have labored under great disadvantages here. We should improve the condition of our people if we had raw material, so that we could use it freely.
with a great many kinds of goods that we do not make now. But if you have raw materials standing at too high a cost, it is an impediment and reflects upon the laborers, because they do not have the field to operate in; yet if our manufactured raw materials were free—

Q. Industry would become more diversified?—A. More diversified, and the result would be exceedingly favorable.

Q. What would you do to equalize the cost of raw material to our people, then?—A. I should make it free of duty.

WHAT ARE RAW MATERIALS?

Q. What would you be understood to include as raw material?—A. Well, we have no duty on cotton; but I should include wool and all materials that we call dye-stuffs—chemicals of all kinds.

Q. How important an item are chemicals or dye-stuffs, oils, and whatever enters into the manufacture aside from the cotton or the wool that we import?—A. By dissecting Mr. Harding’s evidence you will see that it would depend entirely on the kind of goods you make. In the Lowell Carpet Company, besides the wool, there is a great variety of items that go to make up the cost. In the first place our designing department in the Lowell Company costs us $40,000 a year.

Q. Is that an importation?—A. No, sir.

BENEFITS OF THE SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY.

Q. What I meant to ask is this: Is the man who designs a foreigner, usually?—A. It has been the case heretofore; but our school of technology here in Boston is turning out some designers. We have two or three of them in our business.

Q. So that in that department we are going to have a supply?—A. There is progress in that department, and it is a very important department, too.

Q. Pecuniarily important?—A. Yes; and it balances up the manufacturing interests better. It enables a certain class of the young people to be educated in the right line. We have something to fall back upon if we are short of designers. Sometimes we are obliged to go to Europe to get them, which is very inconvenient, and it is a great deal better for our manufacturing interests to produce them at home if possible.

CHEMICALS IN MANUFACTURES.

Q. We were speaking of the equalization of the cost of raw material. You have mentioned the designer’s department. Anything else?—A. And all kinds of chemicals. There was a large advance in the last tariff in that way. Chemicals were relieved of the burden very much, but not fully. It was a long step and a valuable one, however.

Q. In regard to chemicals, are we producing them to any great extent, so far as they enter into manufacture in this country?—A. Yes; we are gaining that way all the time.

The CHAIRMAN. I know that those interested in chemical industries found some fault with the reductions which seemed to please the other manufacturers.

The WITNESS. Yes; there was in Baltimore and Philadelphia quite an opposition to making chemicals free, because their industries were just being developed.
Q. In equalizing the cost of raw material and reckoning your chemicals as raw materials (for they are so to the manufacturers), would you be in much haste in that process of equalization?

**DAMAGE RESULTING FROM TARIFF AGITATION.**

A. Well, any change in the tariff is very damaging.

*The Chairman.* Taking the country as a whole, I mean?

*The Witness.* The country as a whole would be very much better off—more prosperous for the next five years by letting the tariff remain as it is, although the tariff is not what we wanted. The reduction on wool is very slight, and we use such an enormous quantity in our carpet mill—15,000 pounds a day—that it means something.

**THE TARIFF ON WOOL.**

Q. And yet much greater reduction would mean something to the wool-producer, would it not?—A. Yes; but the wool-producer has had all the advantages so far. The wool-grower of the West has controlled the tariff—the last tariffs that we have made—they have really controlled the duties that have been decided upon.

Q. Has there been a corresponding development of the wool producing industry in the West?—A. I want to explain a moment. People are not agreed upon that exactly. There are two interests to-day; some think that the wool interest has yielded and been liberal; but the cotton interests feel that the wool interests have been pretty severe, and think that the duty on wool is higher than it ought to be.

**COMPETITION BETWEEN COTTON AND WOOLEN TRADES.**

Q. There is then developed, of course, two classes of competition—one between the various establishments engaged in a particular manufacture—those who, for instance, abroad, manufacture woolen goods, and at home manufacture woolen goods, and then those at home as between themselves; so that these two great trades come in competition—the cotton and woolen trades—for the clothing market?—A. To a certain extent, yes—not necessarily to a damaging competition; it is a healthy competition.

Q. But the principle of competition is involved when the cotton interests say that the woolen interests have been too highly protected with regard to raw material?—A. Yes; but I am on both sides. I am a woolen manufacturer and a cotton manufacturer, although the cotton dominates with us. We have four mills that manufacture 30,000 bales of cotton each a year.

**UNFAIR DISCRIMINATION OF THE PRESENT TARIFF.**

Q. Do you mean that, from your stand-point as a representative of the cotton interest, you state this as to the protection of the wool grower of the West, or do you mean to say that in your judgment as a citizen of the country, without regard to the interests you represent, you think that the wool has had a high protection in the past?—A. As things have been in the past I should not say that, because in the tariff before this last one there were compensating advantages for cotton and for woolen manufacturers in the variety of goods that were made, but the last tariff discriminated unfavorably on a great many things.
Q. You mean by the last tariff the last winter's tariff?—A. Yes; they retained the duty on wool, and took it off on woollen goods, as Mr. Harding said, which is nothing that the general public sees, but a manufacturer feels it very quickly in running his machinery.

**COTTON MANUFACTURER AND FREE TRADE.**

But we have no fault to find in the cotton trade. We can get along. I do not know but what we could get along with free trade in the cotton business of this country if they would give us free material to work with.

Q. What material would be needed to be made free?—A. There are not many materials that work into cotton manufacture or pay a duty that is burdensome—very few; and if it were not that cotton is combined with wool largely, it would not be very much affected.

**COTTON AND WOOLEN INTERESTS CORRELATED.**

Q. Not very much affected, you mean, by a tariff one way or the other?—A. By a tariff one way or the other; but cotton and wool work together in many departments of business. In dress goods, for instance, it is cotton and wool, or worsted and cotton. So it is throughout. They are not entirely independent of each other. Take all our numbers of cotton from below 14 (we export those very largely) and there is no duty; but when you come to get on to our finer goods there is a duty. We do not feel it very much in our business. A gentleman whom you will call here, Mr. Lyman, is treasurer of the Lowell Carpet Mill, and is treasurer of a small mill up in Holyoke which makes spool cotton; his mill feels severely the want of a low tariff, yet it is very high on spool cotton now. As things are to-day I do not think it would make any difference.

**COTTON FACTORIES ESTABLISHED HERE BY ENGLISH FIRMS TO AVOID DUTIES.**

The machinery of England is all here to-day. For instance, Coates, the great cotton manufacturer, moved his machinery to Philadelphia, so with Clark, and several manufacturers of Europe—they could not manufacture spool cotton in Scotland and Manchester to compete with the "Willimantic," which is a remarkable establishment near Hartford, and this Holyoke mill that Mr. Lyman represents; it has really brought those people here to manufacture goods on this side of the water. And that is the true way. It is to the interest of this country. We ought to make our own goods here, and when you bring manufacturers into a condition that they can come here with their machinery and be one of us then they are all right. Their competition we are ready to meet. And that is the case now with the spool-cotton interest. We are competing with them here on our own ground.

Q. And all competing for the foreign market?—A. Yes.

Q. That is the spool-cotton interest?—A. Yes; though we are now exporting all the lower grades of goods. I recollect three years ago we exported about 64,000 bales of goods.

**CLASSIFICATION OF COTTON MANUFACTURES.**

Q. You said that all numbers below 14 of cotton goods you were able to export. What does No. 14 mean?—A. It is No. 14 yarn.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

The Chairman. I did not know but that it had a classification with reference to quality.

The Witness. No; it is the number of the yarn spun. Our mills make but very few goods that are made of more than 9 or 10.

Q. What are the coarsest ever made?—A. There are ducks, such as No. 8, and they come down to Nos. 2 and 3.

Q. What are Nos. 2 and 3 made for?—A. Ducks.

Q. That is the size of the thread?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. What class of goods is made up of No. 14?—A. Heavy sheetings; such as you are beginning to make in the South very largely.

Q. And drillings?—A. Yes; 13 and 14 drillings; and those we are exporting all over the world, more or less. I was going to say that three or four years ago, I think it was, 64,000 packages were exported, and the mills we represent export 23,000 to-day.

FOREIGN MARKETS CUT OFF BY THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT.

But the export trade has fallen off during the last year or two. The last legislation of Congress regarding China has damaged it.

Q. That is, the legislation excluding Chinamen?—A. Yes.

Q. The Chinese people won't buy our goods now, do you mean?—A. That had a decided effect on the business.

Q. Owing to the unfavorable impression created on the Chinese national mind?—A. Yes; they felt very sore about it, and have not got over it. For the last year or two they won't buy our goods. Others, perhaps, will give some other reason for it; but we, as merchants, think that is a very strong reason for it.

THE TARIFF OF SLIGHT IMPORTANCE NOW TO COTTON INTERESTS.

Q. I understand you that the tariff is of little importance comparatively to the cotton manufacturing interests, aside from its intermixture with the woolen interest at the present time. — A. All below Nos. 30 and 40 yarns are of very little consequence. We can make them, although Mr. Atkinson is coming here to testify before the committee, and he will say that we could not make them and compete on 30s and 40s; but we have done it, and the tendency is that way.

Q. Give us an idea of the proportion of the cotton manufacturing interests of the country upon yarns below about No. 30. — A. It is only a small item, because if you look at all the Fall River mills, you will find them making No. 30 goods.

Q. They cannot export No. 30!—A. They cannot export No. 30 to any extent.

Q. How far do these numbers run?—A. To 40.

Q. The most of the manufacture is about 30!—A. Well, I ought not to say the most. Such a mill as the Ameskeag makes 23 or 22.

Q. And they export, do they?—A. They export; but a large number of their goods are colored goods.

VALUE OF PROTECTION IN THE PAST TO COTTON INTERESTS.

Q. Has the tariff at any former period been of consequence to the cotton goods?—A. Oh, yes; very largely. Within my own experience and recollection we have seen cottons which were made in India on sale here in Boston.
Q. To what do you attribute this condition now existing, when we can compete with foreign markets to the extent that we do?—A. Education and intelligence in labor and in the use and application of machinery to labor. That is a very good point.

Q. You spoke of the tariff having had some relation to the development of the cotton industry and of its having been more important hitherto, in what way?—A. Because we could not make the goods as cheaply as England or France could, and the tariff enabled us to produce the goods and place them in the market.

Q. And on that protection our laborers became educated?—A. Yes.

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

Q. They have acquired now this mental qualification and skill of fingers?—A. We are better educated as manufacturers than we were thirty years ago, and the South is going to compete with us just in proportion to that development in education.

Q. Then I understand your statement to be, substantially, that this process of education in industry is one of slow growth, and requires a great length of time before the people acquire it?—A. Yes; it is in a measure undefined; but at the same time it is absolutely an element that qualifies the result very much.

Q. Do you think that what has resulted in the cotton manufacture may result in the woolen trade, with reference to our being able at some time to export?—A. There are a great many more difficulties in the woolen business than in the cotton. There is wonderful skill in woolen manufacture, so far as our foreign competitors are concerned, in using low grades of stock—making handsome goods without wool in them.

ENGLISH WOOLENS WITHOUT WOOL.

Q. What is in it?—A. Everything but wool, pretty much. It is wonderful how, in Yorkshire, they will manage to work in jute, and all the ordinary materials that are ever used in manufacturing, and give the appearance really of good stock. As Mr. Harding said, we are gaining on them very much in that respect, but we shall not be able to compete with them until we can make good-looking goods out of poor stock.

Q. Is not that attended with the necessary loss of quality—usefulness?—A. Measurably so; but they work up an article that has really very good wearing qualities. It is astonishing how much skill there is in that way. It is a small thing, but a very important one. If they can produce goods that cost them 25 to 50 cents because of this skill, and we produce an article at more than double, say at 75 cents to $1, but which does not appear any better than theirs, and yet we contend that our goods are worth a great deal more, that is one of the battles we have to fight. Our goods are better, but the appearance is on the side of the English goods—in woollens, I mean; not in cottons.

Q. Can they work other material into cotton?—A. No. We are all up with them in cotton. There is no difficulty there. They cannot cover up the raw material and put it out of sight, as they can in woollens.

EFFECT ON AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS OF FOREIGN BOGUS WOOLENS.

Q. In other words, cheating is easier in woolen than in the cotton product?—A. Decidedly so. It has really killed off the small manu
facturers in this country. These bogus goods, as we call them, have killed off the honest American manufacturers who did not have large capital. People like to buy a good-looking article if it is not worth a quarter as much as a better one.

Q. You think there is a strong reason, then, for this tendency of business to the management of corporate bodies in manufacture—to large establishments and to the extinguishment of the small manufacturer?—A. I do not think there is the same tendency now as formerly; it has been a necessity, because we have had to compete with improved machinery in Europe and their skilled labor in a way that cannot be done by small capitalists or individuals. The large corporations could avail themselves of all the advantages that Europe had, whereas the small ones could not.

SUPERIORITY OF AMERICAN WOOLEN MACHINERY.

But now, at this period, the power of the English manufacturer has been really wiped out largely by the use of improved machinery.

Q. Of our own!—A. Of our own.

Q. Woolen machinery!—A. We have gone ahead in machinery faster than they have gone in Europe. The labor in England will not allow beyond a certain portion of machinery to be used in their mills; they are very tenacious on that point; the laborers of England dictate the improved machinery that shall go into the mill.

Q. It manages the manufacturer in that respect?—A. It manages the manufacturer in that respect.

Q. When we get so as to produce more cheaply than they, then the labor of England will keep out our productions, will it not?

AN ENGLISH TARIFF TO PROTECT ENGLISH LABOR FROM AMERICAN COMPETITION.

A. It will be very apt to. They have always used the tariff to protect their own labor in England; always.

Q. Presently the laborer will establish a tariff there to protect himself, will he not!—A. It has a good deal of that look for the future.

Q. Then, there is growing up in a large way, you think, an apprehension on the part of the labor in Europe, that it may yet have to compete with the labor of America?—A. There is a strong feeling of that character in Manchester, England, and in all the manufacturing districts of Europe. In fact, it seems to be the only thing they fear. It disturbs them very much indeed.

Q. And it is the labor element that has this apprehension?—A. It is the labor, not the capital; capital can take care of itself.

Q. It can come here, as in the cases you mentioned?—A. Yes; I do not think one man in five hundred in the United States knows that this Coates spool cotton is made in this country now.

Q. And they do not understand the secret of it all—that it is the effort of capital to protect itself in advance. That, however, has instructed labor in England, and it creates the existing tendency that you speak of there.

ENGLISH LABOR CONTROLS ENGLISH MANUFACTURERS.

A. Labor is thoroughly organized in England, and has great control over the manufacturers, and the manufacturers submit, rather than quarrel.
Q. What is your view of the effect upon the interests of labor itself of the establishment of labor organizations—trades unions, and the like?—A. Yes; yet there is a certain injury which that produces.

Q. Capital is driven to protect itself by emigrating to other countries?—A. Yes.

Q. And there is where the injury to labor comes in?—A. Yes.

Q. But if capital combines to protect itself against labor, what resource has labor got, but to do the same thing?—A. Capital never has in this country, and I should say not in Europe, to any great extent, combined as against labor. We are all friends of labor.

NATIONAL PROSPERITY DEPENDENT UPON THE CONDITION OF LABOR.

The prosperity of this country has depended for the last fifty years almost entirely on the condition of labor. When labor is depressed and poorly paid, the business industries of this country suffer directly and very materially all through. You cannot have low and depressed labor and a prosperous business or a prosperous country.

Q. Not prosperous for the capitalist, even!—A. No; if capital prospers it is used in the development of the various interests of the country, and that everybody has its share of.

Q. You do not consider that there is any division or line of demarkation between the capitalist and laborer in this country, do you?—A. No; I have never seen it.

Q. Do you understand that the capitalists in this country—I mean those who are engaged in great enterprises and manage them in a large way—look upon it as a fundamental proposition to their own success that labor must also do well?—A. Yes.

THE POLICY OF CAPITAL TOWARDS LABOR.

Q. And they act upon that as an economic fact or law?—A. Yes; their experience teaches them that. It does not always come at once; but that is the result. If you look at all our depressed times, going to 1836 or 1837, you will find that that has been the result. At the time that Mr. Harding mentioned to-day, when he resumed business in 1837, there was no compensation you may say for labor. Labor did not have a market value.

Q. I am asking now, Mr. Richardson, for the fact upon which manufacturers act in shaping their business policy, and not what may be your individual opinion, or what would be right or best.—A. I think that capital understands that the security of labor, and the ultimate results in any of the departments of business require that labor should be well paid. I think that is a fundamental fact in this country.

Q. And that it is acted upon!—A. And that it is acted upon.

Q. Capital takes it into consideration, just as much as it takes into consideration the price of raw material!—A. Yes.

Q. We have got to pay this labor well, or it hurts us!—A. Well, it does not hurt us to pay labor well.

Q. But the capitalist, you mean, says, "I must pay this labor well or it will injure me"?—A. That is the feeling. All our large mills, especially, and some small manufacturers may feel that they cannot afford to
meet these questions, but the large ones do it; it is one of the fundamental elements of their management.

Q. And you understand that they are driven by their experience to this conclusion, and that they act upon it?—A. Yes.

Q. And they study the interests of labor as their own?—A. As their own. It has always been so, especially in Lowell. I am more acquainted there than elsewhere.

THE PROFIT OF CAPITAL THE INTEREST OF LABOR.

Q. They study the interest of labor for their own profit?—A. Yes; and their own protection, because the good-will of the laborer is very essential to the manufacturer. It is absolutely important to prosperity in conducting business. You have got to have your laborer stand upon a ground that is, in his mind, equitable and right, in order to obtain the greatest advantages from his labor. He will do his duty better, and in every way be a better producing power, if he is well paid. Do I state it clearly?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I do not ask it (and you do not state, I presume), as an opinion of your own as to what would be best; but, as a matter of fact, what the practice and the rule are.

The WITNESS. Yes.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Are there any importers in this city?—A. None that are strictly so. The importers have been driven from the field almost entirely. I mean the importing business as a specialty has been driven from the field. All our dry-goods merchants import more or less of their goods. Take Jordan, Marsh & Co., they import largely, but they buy more American goods and sell more of them than they do of foreign; but formerly—up to the time that the tariff before this last was passed—we had a large number of houses here that did a foreign business.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Exclusively?—A. Yes; I was going to say that there were not more than ten importing houses in New York altogether, most of them have gone into the commission business.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Do you sell many goods for foreign export?—A. Yes.

RUFUS S. FROST examined.

By Mr. PUGH:

Question. Your residence is where?—Answer. At Chelsea, in this State.

Q. What relation do you occupy to this question of labor and capital—in what position are you?

WOOLEN MANUFACTURES.

A. I am interested in the woolen manufacture, and selling woolen goods on commission.

Q. Do you hold any office of trust connected with that business?—A.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

I am a director in some of the mills that we sell for, but most of our mills are not incorporated.

Q. Do you belong to, or represent, any association of capital employed in the business? — A. I am holding the position at present of president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

Q. How long have you been connected with these industries? — A. Over twenty years.

Q. In this State? — A. In this and other States.

Q. What amount of capital and labor do the corporations or companies you are connected with control or employ? — A. Over $2,000,000.

Q. And what number of laborers do you employ, in round numbers? — The WITNESS. These different factories we sell for?

Mr. PUGH. Yes.

A. Somewhat over one thousand employees.


Q. How long have those industries been operating under your control or to your knowledge? — A. The different mills vary from eight years to thirty years.

RATES OF WAGES PAID TO WOOLEN OPERATIVES.

Q. Are you familiar with the rate of pay of the laborers employed in these industries—the general average pay to the different grades of labor? — A. Yes.

Q. Please state them. — A. I should say that overseers in the different rooms in a woolen factory would average about $3 per day. I don’t suppose you care about going up to the superintendents.

Mr. PUGH. No, sir; those that are not in immediate contact with the operatives we do not care so much about.

The WITNESS. The overseers in the different rooms receive, I should say, $3; I think that would be a fair estimate. If the reporters do not take down all I say, I can explain it to the committee. For instance, in some of our own factories we are paying $5 a day for some of our overseers, and yet in other factories, where not so much skill or experience is required, we only pay $2.50. But I think $3 a day is a fair estimate of the wages of overseers in the factories of New England and throughout the country. In the larger factories they pay more, but in the smaller, where not so much skill is required, they pay perhaps $2.25, making the average probably $3 a day for the overseers. Then I should say that men working in the card-room would average $1.75 per day. Spinners, about $1.75 per day; weavers, male and female together, would average $1.33 per day—those who attend the looms. Let me explain what I mean by that. We have weavers in one of these mills with which I have been connected for a quarter of a century who will earn $2 a day, and others of less skill, and perhaps less strength, will earn 90 cents a day until they get educated to the business. For that reason, I place the average at $1.33 for the skilled and unskilled labor of weavers in woolen factories. When you are ready to compare these prices with those abroad, I have with me a document issued by the State Department at Washington, entitled “Commercial Relations of the United States; Cotton and Woollen Mills in Europe,” dated September, 1882, which gives the prices as reported by our consul in the different countries of Europe. I would like to compare those prices with the different prices as given to you here.

Mr. PUGH. Do so.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

RELATIVE WAGES OF WOOLEN AND COTTON OPERATIVES IN EUROPE
AND AMERICA.

The Witness. Perhaps I ought to state about the prices paid for
core common labor in the mills, that is, the lowest class of labor. I
think that that would average about $1.20 per day in the mill. I have
before me the report of the United States consul at Rheims, in France,
in which he states that the hours of labor in all the manufacturing
establishments at Rheims are seventy-two hours per week.

Q. Twelve hours per day?—A. Yes; all the labor is established at
twelve hours. He gives the prices of overseers at from $6.36 to $7.50
per week; weavers, $4.62 to $6.36 per week; and he gives the prices of
the different articles of food. But perhaps you don't care to have that
enumerated in your report; it can be referred to.

COST OF FOOD IN EUROPE.

They are much higher prices than the prices here. For instance, beef
of the best quality three is 40 to 50 cents per pound, which we know is
much above the price here; beef of the second quality is 24 to 30 cents
per pound. Butter there is at 33 to 60 cents per pound.

Q. He does not give the pay of any other class of laborers?—A. Those
are the principal ones which I see here.

Q. The overseers?—A. The overseers. There seem to be about the
same prices paid for combing and carding. Mechanics receive $6.36 to
$7.50 per week.

WAGES OF MILL OPERATIVES IN GERMANY.

Then I find that the United States consul at Leipsic, in Germany, re-
ports from a worsted mill in that place, and says, as an evidence of the
high character of the goods of that mill, “I might add that medals of
the first class have been received by the firm from the exposition of
Vienna, 1873, Santiago, 1875, Philadelphia, 1876, and Leipsic, 1880,”
showing the character of the goods. The average rate of wages is as
follows: For males, $3.60 to $4.25 per week; for females, from $1.90 to
$2.87 per week. This factory consumes 500,000 pounds of wool per year,
which I suppose would make it a representative factory.

WAGES OF MILL OPERATIVES IN ITALY.

As to Italy, I find that the United States consul at Venice gives
the average wages for men working by the piece, at 67 cents per day; men
working by the day, 48 cents per day; women working by the piece,
29 cents per day, and women working by the day, 17 cents per day;
children working by the piece, 29 cents per day, and children working
by the day, 15 cents per day. I have also reports from Genoa, in Italy,
but they are so nearly like the others that it is hardly worth while, per-
haps, to take up the time of the committee with them. You will see
that there is a marked contrast between the prices paid for labor abroad
and here.

I notice by the resolution that this committee is authorized and di-
rected to take into consideration the subject of the relations between
labor in this country and the labor of similar classes abroad, and whether
the laborer receives a fair proportion of the joint product of labor and
capital in the United States, and also the subject of labor strikes.
WAGES OF LABOR ADEQUATE IN AMERICA.

Now, it seems to me, gentlemen of the committee, that the reason we have had so few labor strikes in this country is because the wages paid for labor are adequate for the support of the laborers and the education of their children, and whenever the prices for labor fall below a mark which will enable them to live comfortably and educate their children we may expect strikes; we may expect socialism with all its evils. It seems to me that that question turns upon the price which is paid for American labor. We do not want to reduce the prices of labor; we want to keep them up to a point at which the present generation of laborers can properly educate their children, so that they, in turn, can open the factories which their fathers are now working.

THE PROPORTION OF PROFIT RECEIVED BY LABOR.

Q. What percent. or what share of the gross product of capital and labor do the laborers get in the business you represent—generally, I mean; I do not mean to go into particulars, but to get at the round rate percent. as compared with what the employer gets?—A. I should be unable to give a definite answer to that, if you mean the joint product of the factory, without studying the subject a good deal more thoroughly than I have done in that line; but if you mean what proportion of the profits the laborers get, I should answer that this year they get more than the employers, but other years they are apt to get a good deal less than the employers; it depends upon the state of the business.

Q. You estimate the cost of labor in your expense account, do you not?—A. Certainly.

DIVIDENDS—UPON WHAT THEY ARE DECLARED.

Q. And after you make up your expense account, it is upon what is left that you declare your dividend or ascertain your profits, is it not?—A. It is upon whatever is left to the credit of profit and loss account after having paid the expenses of running the mill.

Q. After your expense account is itemized, aggregated, and made up; it is upon that amount that you ascertain your profits, is it not?—A. No, it is upon the capital. The capital is, for instance, a specified amount. Then the purchases are made of raw materials, and money paid out for running the mill. Whatever is left at the end of the season, or of the year, if there is anything left, for profits, a dividend is declared upon the capital of the corporation.

THE DEDUCTIONS FROM EARNINGS BEFORE DECLARING DIVIDENDS.

Q. Well, in making up the expense account, you embrace labor as one of the items?—A. Yes.

Q. You embrace wear and tear of machinery—waste?—A. No, sir; not generally.

Q. Not generally?—A. No, except in particular cases where machinery is worn out and has to be replaced, then it is carried in for that year.

Q. Is there any interest account in that for the use of the plant?—A. Whatever actual capital is employed and whatever the plant has cost, of course they are entitled to interest on that.

Q. And that is one of the items in the aggregate?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, of that aggregate, what per cent. of it goes to labor; can you 21—c 3—-(5 LAW)
make any estimate of that!—A. I have not any information on that subject. I would have to look over the books to get at it. I have not considered it in that light.

Mr. PUGH. That is the very question we are directed to examine into. That seems to be the ground of the complaint, if there is any, on the part of the laborers or those who speak for them—the press and their representatives in Congress and out. They say that their complaint is well founded; that they do not get a just and equal share of the values produced by their labor when working in co-operation with capital. If you have any estimate that you could furnish us with, or that you could make out and furnish hereafter, we would be glad if you would do so.

The WITNESS. I will be very glad, indeed, if you will let me have a copy of that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The stenographer will give you a copy of it.

The WITNESS. Very well, I will try to answer it.

**WHAT ARE NET PROCEEDS.**

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. In making up your account of profit and loss, to explain the process, you first sell your goods and get so much; that is what you have earned!—A. Yes.

Q. Then you deduct from that all these various items you have specified, and the remainder is the net proceeds or profit which you distribute in the form of a dividend upon the capital stock, so much to each share!—A. Yes.

**INTEREST ON CAPITAL A PART OF EXPENSE ACCOUNT.**

Q. In making up the expense account do you include interest upon the money invested in the plant and interest upon the quick capital employed!—A. Yes; but not always the full cost of the plant.

Q. You mean what the plant ought to sell for at the time?—A. What the plant is worth at the time.

Q. Then in this account you first deduct interest, or what is tantamount to interest, upon the capital, both the fixed and fluctuating (or "quick") capital that is employed in the business!—A. Whatever is actual capital, yes.

Q. Then it stands substantially as though you had received interest on all the money employed in the business before you have declared any dividend!—A. Yes.

Q. Whatever is declared in the form of dividend then is so much beyond ordinary interest which the capitalist receives for his money beyond mere income, is it not?

**DIVIDENDS AN EXCESS OVER INTEREST ON CAPITAL.**

A. It is if dividends are declared in that way.

Q. Well, as a rule among manufacturers, how is that!—A. Some of the largest corporations could answer that better than I. I represent small corporations, and those doing business on their own private account; but it is not often the case that we get much more than 6 per cent on the capital invested in quick capital and in the plant. This year we shall run under as a rule. I think it will be safe to say that the woolen manufacturers will not make 6 per cent. this year.
Q. You mean, it is seldom that you get more than 6 per cent., including what you allow as interest, and the dividend also as declared on the capital stock?—A. I don’t think the dividends would average much over 6 per cent.

Q. But I understand you that the dividend is an excess over the 6 per cent. on the capital really in the business?—A. Not in incorporated concerns. In incorporated concerns they pay on the capital, and in private concerns they divide whatever they choose, or they keep it as a guarantee capital to provide for such a year as this, when it will fall under, calling it “guarantee account.”

Q. But generally in making up the expense account, am I or am I not to understand that interest at 6 per cent. is included among the items on quick and fixed capital?—A. Yes, and should be; it is worth that.

Q. Then, if there is any dividend which is distributed upon the shares of the capital stock, it is so much in addition—so much beyond?

Mr. PUGH. The dividend is on the profits.

The CHAIRMAN. But as he states it, the dividend is the profit.

The WITNESS. It amounts to the same thing precisely. The money has earned its interest, and it is not that we get a dividend in addition to the 6 per cent. of the active capital employed. The money goes into the general account, and we charge interest. For instance, if you leave $10,000 with the corporation, and are glad to loan it to them, they pay you interest on it. It is just exactly so if they owe it to their stockholders.

The CHAIRMAN. Precisely; I do not say that it is not just, but I am asking for the fact. I have heard it stated differently.

Mr. LYMAN, of the Lowell Manufacturing Company. I think that statement was made this morning, but I think the gentleman who made the statement was confused. That is to say, in Mr. Frost’s case, or in any case, it would take a large amount of money over the capital which the individual or corporation has, to conduct the business. On that money interest is charged, but after paying the interest so charged and paying for the raw materials and making an allowance for depreciation, or for new machines in place of the depreciated machinery, and after making payment of wages, &c., if all that exceeds the amount of his sales and interest combined, he would then make a profit; but he does not make a profit and an interest account, too. If he has $1,000,000 and borrows another $1,000,000 of you, and pays 6 per cent. on that, he pays $60,000 interest. He will pay another amount for wages and another amount for raw material, and if he makes enough to pay for all those and no more, he gets nothing for himself—he does not get even interest on his capital. Mr. Frost can’t mean to include—it certainly is not usual—interest on that million of capital before it is considered that any profit is made from which a dividend is to be declared.

The CHAIRMAN. It would all be distributed whatever there was in the form of dividend before interest was charged in the form of dividend?

Mr. LYMAN. Yes; there is no interest charged before making the dividend. Of course you may, as matter of account, if you please, charge interest against a factory at 6 per cent., and then, if you only make 5 per cent. profit, you may consider that you have made a loss of 1 per cent., but that interest charged against the factory in such a case as I specify is mere matter of account. The interest paid out is what is charged into the expense account, not interest on the remaining capital.

The CHAIRMAN. If it were so and there were an interest of 6 per cent.
allowed upon the capital invested, and there were a dividend of 5 per cent., there would be an annual income of 11 per cent.—that would be so, would it not?

Mr. Lyman. If interest were charged at 6 per cent. and then, without making any loss, 5 per cent. additional were declared as dividend, that would be 11 per cent. profit, as ordinarily regarded; but if you charge 6 per cent. and only make 5 per cent. profit, that 6 has got to include the 5.

The Chairman. So that if a concern owns its property and it is valued, and justly valued, at $1,000,000, and if, before you figure out the profits, you compute 6 per cent. on that capital, and distribute it as interest to the owners, and then declare a dividend beyond that of 5 per cent., it would be a profit of 11 per cent., would it not?

Mr. Lyman. Yes, of course.

The Chairman. And that is not the way the account is made?

Mr. Lyman. No, sir; that interest is not paid to the owners unless they receive it as a dividend. For instance, the account of not a single mill in Lowell or Lawrence is made up in the way you suggest, of charging interest on the capital.

The Chairman. There is no such case, you say?

Mr. Lyman. No such case. Of course an individual may charge his capital with 6 per cent. to see whether he would have done better by putting his money out at interest or not. Some gentlemen, for instance, who have stock in the Merrimac Company, charge that stock each year with 6 per cent., and credit the account with the dividend. Sometimes they make it, sometimes not; but the method which Mr. Frost spoke of is not a method pursued by any corporations in Massachusetts that I know of.

The Witness. I did not mean to be understood that they were to have interest and dividends beside, but the dividends include the interest.

Q. And where you spoke of there being no profit on the business you mean that there is nothing in the nature of interest made on the money invested in the plant. You say, for instance, that this year you declare no dividend; labor gets its wages right along, but there is nothing left for capital. You mean by that that there is nothing whatever left to distribute after deducting the expenses of the year from the whole amount realized from the sale of goods?—A. Instead of that, in many cases, a decided loss.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. I should like to know if you have declared any dividends on your business; and, if so, when, and what amount.

The Witness. For the past year!

Mr. Pugh. No, within five years, say.

A. There have been dividends in many of the mills in past years, but not any this year.

Q. What dividends have been declared within, say, the last five years?—A. I do not recollect them now, but they have run along from 6 to 10 per cent.

Q. From 6 to 10 per cent. annually?—A. Yes.

Q. When was the last dividend declared?—A. I think about a year and a half ago; I should say about a year ago last January.
FRANCIS A. WALKER examined.

By Mr. PUGH:

Question. Have you read the resolution under which we are acting here?—Answer. I have.

Mr. PUGH. Then you understand what sort of information we are seeking on this question of the relations of labor and capital—the condition of the laborer, the share he gets of the product of his work; the subject of labor strikes, and their causes, and all subjects in any way relating to labor. Just in your own way proceed, if you please, to give us such information and opinions as you may have on those subjects.

The WITNESS. I have stated to the chairman of the committee that I have not prepared any remarks, but I shall be glad to answer any questions that may be asked. The ground which the committee seeks to cover is so large that I thought I could be more useful, if useful at all, by making answers to specific points than by preparing a general address upon the full scope of the committee's inquiry.

GOVERNMENTAL ACTION REGARDING LABOR SHOULD BE LIMITED TO FACTORY ACTS AND SANITARY REGULATIONS.

I will say in general, that I shall have little of a positive nature to offer, because I believe that all the governmental action which it is desirable to take in the interest of labor is comprised within two heads: Factory acts and sanitary regulations; and governmental action in both those directions, in my judgment, can, under our form of government in the United States, be better done by the legislature or government of each State for itself than by the Government of the United States acting one for all.

I say all the governmental action, for I heartily believe in the Government of the United States obtaining and diffusing information in regard to the condition of labor, and in regard, generally, to the industries and the trade of the country to the very largest possible degree. I believe in that, rather, because I think the diffusion of information is the best means of reducing to a minimum governmental action. I believe in general that that government is best which governs least, and that interference with trade or manufactures is very undesirable. Yet I recognize the fact that evils may and do exist which require correction by the force of law. I think government will reduce its function to the desired minimum best by diffusing information and spreading light, rather than by interfering positively by commands and prohibitions. Therefore I believe in governmental collection and diffusion of information in the highest degree, mainly because in that way I believe Government may reduce to the lowest terms its own active interference with trade and industry.

THIS ACTION BEST LEFT TO STATE GOVERNMENTS.

I believe, as I have said, that the action necessary to be taken in regard to the interests of labor, namely, factory acts, in the usual acceptance of that term, and sanitary regulations in the usual interpretation of that term, and perhaps more than the term has heretofore been generally understood to cover—for I believe in the extension of the system of sanitary inspection and control—I believe, I say, that Government action in these directions can be best taken by the governments of the several States, each for itself.
REASONS WHY.

My reasons for holding that opinion are two. The first reason is common to a large class of governmental measures, which base, or should base themselves upon sociological principles, in which class I should include the pauper system of any community, the educational system, treatment of the insane, of the deaf, dumb, and blind, and of prisoners, as well as the factory acts and sanitary regulations of which I speak. All those have this in common, that they should be based upon the results of experience or direct experiment bearing upon the best system to be adopted in one or the other class of public exigencies.

SOCIOCY IN A PRIMITIVE CONDITION.

The ground of my belief in thinking that in those cases it is better that each State for itself should determine its policy is, that social science, or sociology, is at present in a very primitive condition. It has made very little progress, and much of the progress which we seem to have made at times we find has not been made. We are not yet advanced in the science of society, especially as concerns the matters I have mentioned—the care of paupers, the deaf, the dumb, the blind, the insane, the idiots, and the criminals, and although we have made some progress in regard to elementary or popular education, we have yet much to learn.

ADVANTAGES OF STATE-RIGHTS FROM A SOCIOLOGICAL STAND-POINT.

In this matter of factory acts and sanitary regulations, we have still very much to do, and for that purpose our State-rights system is admirably disposed to the development of sociological principles. We have here a great number of States, many of them having populations closely like each other in their character and experience, others very widely unlike. We have these States, each for itself, trying experiments now. That has been so in regard to public elementary education; that is, the system of one State differs more or less from that of every other. Each State is trying a system of poor relief for itself; each is dealing with convicted criminals on a more or less individual system. Those experiments are going on side by side, and as the result of those experiments we shall in time undoubtedly reach a rather positive conclusion that one system is better than others, or than all.

If, therefore, I were asked what was the greatest advantage of our system of government, I should say that it was not the political advantage commonly attributed to the State-rights system, in which I heartily agree, but that it is the sociological advantage—that in a hundred different ways we are trying different experiments in large communities in these various respects. Perhaps twenty years ago publicists and men interested in social science, would have said that we had pretty nearly reached a conclusion in regard to many of the matters I have indicated. To-day we are very much more in doubt and uncertainty than we were then.

To take an illustration from another field: For example, twenty years ago, I suppose there were very few writers on law or governmental policy in this section, at least, of the country, or in New England, who would not have said that it was a settled principle that two legislative houses were better than one; indeed, that you could not have successful popular representative government without an upper and a lower house,
To-day the experience of the British colonies in Australia and elsewhere has thrown that matter into doubt. No man would to-day presume to say that it was a certain thing. The experience of representative governments under very widely differing conditions with a single house is such as to destroy all the confidence which, twenty years ago, the advocate of the bicameral or bifurcated system of legislature would have had; and we now recognize the fact that it is in doubt whether representative government cannot be successfully maintained at least for long periods of time with a legislature which is a unit and not bifurcated.

In the same way, with regard to the elective or appointive system for the selection of judges, the opinion, the status of publicists, of men interested in political science and law, has changed not a little in twenty years, where there was formerly, at least here in the East, but one opinion—that they should be appointed.

I mention these matters simply to illustrate the fact that changes are constantly going on. So it is in regard to poor-law administration; in regard to the treatment of convicted criminals and of the afflicted classes—the deaf, dumb, blind, and insane. We are rapidly unlearning much that we had learned. Therefore I think it exceedingly desirable that the system of experiments under the sanction and authority of the States should go on; and I believe that that argument applies with quite as much force to the system of factory acts and sanitary legislation in the interests of labor as to the other classes of legislative measures I have spoken of.

FACTORY ACTS NOT NEEDED IN THE EARLY STAGES OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

My second reason for holding the opinion that this sort of governmental action in the direction indicated—factory acts and sanitary regulations—would, with more advantage to the laboring classes and with less danger of injury, or less loss to the community, be taken by the governments of the several States than the Government of the United States, is found in this consideration (to take one of those classes by itself), Factory acts are only needful and not positively harmful in societies which have reached a certain stage of development. For example, in regard to the employment of women and children and the operations of machinery, if such a body of legislation were to be imposed upon a community where manufacturing industry was just making its beginning it not only would do very much less good but infinitely more harm than by being imposed upon a community like Massachusetts or Rhode Island. As to the lack of reason for such regulations being uniform over a country like the United States, if a factory were being set up in a county in Iowa containing a population almost exclusively agricultural of, say, 20,000 people, a factory population of 200 would not require protection by law to anything like the extent that a factory population here in the East would require it, because there there could be recourse to the land; and if the conditions became unfavorable the farming population could absorb the others, who could go on the land. If the factory operatives were ground down by their employers they would resort to the land.

STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS OF HIGHLY SPECIALIZING EMPLOYMENTS.

Again, the want of factory legislation comes, in the main, more from the numbers of the factory class at a given time than from the fact that
they are a factory population by inheritance or tradition. If you have a factory population in one place for several generations, as they have in the older cities of Europe (and some of our older manufacturing points have industries which are now in the second and even the third generation), they acquire aptitudes that are highly specialized and very minute, which give them great power in production. They acquire certain habits of labor and mental attention which contribute greatly to their success, but also, on the other hand, render them weaker in the general competition for labor than a community of more primitive agricultural condition. A New England farmer can do almost anything. Every one of that class of men is a mechanic; he can turn his hand to almost anything. He has self-assertion, and is accustomed to a great variety of duties. He is a man who can get upon his legs from almost any position. He is a man of a thousand duties. The factory operative, however, especially in the second and third generation, is an artificial creature. What he can do he can do very much better than the farmer or the farmer's son, but he is not a man of varied experience or acquirements as the farmer, or country carpenter, or country blacksmith. Hence a factory population in the second and third generation, particularly, has occasion for protection, in the fact that that population, in becoming highly specialized and adapted in a high degree to certain operations, has also become, in a degree, incapable of turning itself readily to other occupations—of seeking even change of place when that becomes necessary.

That is the reason why, in all the enlightened nations of the world having large manufacturing interests, there are factory acts, or a body of factory legislation. I do not remember how it is in Austria or Russia, but I think that, with those two exceptions, there is no country in Europe without its body of factory acts. They are very often very minute, and that legislation is approved, with scarcely an exception, by the best political and economic writers of those countries.

WHERE FACTORY ACTS ARE UNNECESSARY AND WHEN UNNECESSARY.

But, on the other hand, it would not do to apply such a body of legislation to a country where manufacturing industry was beginning to spring up, there not being the same occasion for it—perhaps little or no occasion for it in the character of the population, they not having yet lost their general adaptiveness—their power of turning themselves from one thing to another. Such legislation would be unsuitable there, from the fact that there would be a large agricultural population that could absorb them, if that were necessary, and that they could have resort to the land, if that were necessary, which they would not have in the neighborhood of Lowell or Manchester. Not only is there no such occasion for such legislation, but the positive mischief would be very much greater. Factory legislation is more suitable here. Because here capital is large and powerful; the conditions of manufacture are well understood; we have passed the experimental stage; we have achieved success; have founded great manufacturing establishments, and great manufacturing cities. I do not say that no factory legislation that could be passed by the Massachusetts legislature could be so foolish as not to hurt these old communities, or do any damage. It could. But even if it were not extreme or excessive in any direction, that legislation, applied to a community in which the manufacturers hardly knew what to do, and were trying to start a mill, as in some town of Georgia, Iowa, or some other place where manufacturing
had not existed; where they had not trained labor; had not superintendents and overseers thoroughly understanding their business; had very little capital, and with the whole thing in a very tentative, tremulous condition, might put a factory under regulations which would very seriously cripple the enterprise. The old manufacturing communities would not, perhaps, be oppressed or embarrassed at all; they would adapt themselves to it; but where it is difficult to get your manufacturing population anyhow, or your capital anyhow, or to get men fit to conduct such enterprises anyhow—where it is a question whether you have got it or not—these first efforts at manufacturing enterprise over a large space of country, factory legislation prescribed by Congress might totally prohibit.

Therefore while I thoroughly believe in factory acts and in sanitary regulations, I think the action in those directions should be taken by the Government of each State by itself, in view of its own necessities first, as I said, because in the first place we get in that way the very best experience upon the widest possible scale as to different methods and systems of dealing with these social questions; and secondly, because many communities in the United States do not need any such legislation, and it would be positively prejudicial and a hindrance to the development of manufactures if it were undertaken. That is in general the view I take in regard to legislation with reference to labor by the General Government.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Have you given any thought to the subject of the power or agency of the Federal or State Governments over the question of wages for skilled labor employed in those manufacturing industries over the mere question of the amount, more or less, of pay? What power or agency can be exercised by the Federal Government or by the State Governments upon that subject? If there is any, what is it—taxational, educational or otherwise?—A. I believe the wages of the laboring class should always be increased with the increase of their intelligence—their general intelligence and their special intelligence. Therefore I believe very heartily in promoting elementary education to secure the general intelligence of the laboring class, and technical and trade education superimposed upon it, to fit them for the industries which they may desire to fill, or which may be especially pursued in the sections where these children are born or brought up.

NATIONAL AID TO EDUCATION.

With reference to the functions of the State or National Government, I should be very sorry to see the Government of the United States interfere in the common-school system of Massachusetts. I believe it is a better system than it would have been if the United States Government had undertaken to direct or establish it in the first instance. As regards communities that find themselves with a vast number of illiterate children—say with millions of illiterates upon their hands, with means more or less crippled, resources destroyed by war or violence—I think it would be perfectly legitimate for the United States Government to intervene, as by the illiteracy act of the last session, in the way of subsidies to the States which are dealing with a mass of illiteracy which makes their cases fairly exceptional and extraordinary. But I think that the scope of such an act should be restricted by a minimum percentage of illiteracy, which would not make it apply to any State that
is not in an exceptional or crippled condition. If it were made to apply to 10 or 15 per cent. of illiteracy, then the educational systems of the Northern and Western States, that have already a good school system founded, and which are abundantly able to maintain their school-teachers and house their children well in ample schools—will not be interfered with; and I think the exceptional emergency created by the war in the respect of illiteracy in the Southern States might fairly be met by the intervention of the Federal Government. That state of things was one of the consequences of war, and I see no objection to the Federal Government aiding to remove illiteracy there under the circumstances. At the same time, my opinion is not worthy to be put against the opinions of those who are called to legislate for the people of the United States in such a matter. But I should be very sorry if a system of subsidies in favor of State instruction were to be established which did not have a minimum that would cut out all the communities that are abundantly able to maintain themselves, and which make no such special plea for assistance. I think it would be very unfortunate if the State of Massachusetts were to receive a quarter of a million of dollars for its schools by a contribution from the Federal Treasury. And I think Massachusetts would very much rather let the whole of any sum that may be needed go to communities that are in a condition to need it than to take its share of such money. Because I think the people of this State want to maintain the absolute independence of their own school system, and I do not believe that any good effect, in the long run, could be secured by contribution from the United States Treasury to the schools of Massachusetts. The people of this State are abundantly able to maintain their own schools and they spend every dollar that is needed for the purpose; they only want to know how much is needed for their schools and they supply the money themselves. Educationally and politically it would be setting a bad example to give any such aid to our public schools.

ACTS IN RESTRAINT OF TRUCK.

Q. Is there any other governmental power that could be properly and beneficially exercised for the benefit of labor or the improvement of its condition?—A. I think the principle of the English "Truck" acts, as they are called, is perfectly sound, the acts in restraint of "truck," and requiring that the laborers shall be paid "in the coin of the realm," prohibiting, except in agriculture and certain specified forms, the payment of wages at "truck" stores of any kind. That is an instance in which the legislature of Great Britain has intervened by, I think, as many as fifty acts. I do not remember the entire number. Finally, by the act of 1850, I think it altogether prohibited payments in "truck," and I think that that exercise of governmental power is perfectly proper. There is no doubt, I think, in the minds of any who have investigated that subject, that the passage of these "truck" acts prevented the laboring classes from being ground down by various extortions from a greed by which pauperism and crime would be increased. These acts are very numerous and I had those in mind when I spoke of factory acts. "Truck" acts might be made much wider in scope than the ordinary factory acts are.

The State must enforce all contracts for labor as well as other things, therefore it is proper for the State to require that the contract shall be such as to be capable of enforcement. A contract for the payment of wages in kind is not capable of enforcement, as for the payment of
wages “in flour,” for one kind of flour is worth one sum and another kind of flour another sum. It is perfectly right, therefore, that the State should prescribe that labor shall be paid for in money. “Truck” has not been practiced in this country to a very large extent; it has been to some degree, but is not much resorted to in New England at present. Even the English acts, however, permit “truck” at certain times and places, as where a railroad is building and there may be no shops along its lines, or where mining is going on at any considerable distance from shops, there the master is allowed to furnish supplies to his workmen, but in the majority of cases it is prohibited.

IMPORTANCE OF A SOUND CURRENCY.

Q. Is there anything else that you think would be of value to suggest upon those questions?—A. I think the Government of the United States may do a great deal of good, as, in my judgment, it has in the past done a great deal of harm, to the working classes of the country, by maintaining a sound currency. There is no evil against which it is so hopeless for the workmen to fight as bad money. As to what is good or bad money: I do not suppose the committee wish me to enter into that much disputed question, as they have doubtless studied it as much as I have, but I think there is nothing that the Government can do for its laboring men that will go so far to protect them against economic evils, and protect them in their work, than to help them by a good, sound currency, in which the wages of labor are to be received and expended.

THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE.

I believe also in education, as I have said, both technical and general; and I believe that with a mass of illiteracy existing as a result of war, the General Government might properly intervene and apply a remedy. I believe the Government of the United States did well—though I cannot say that it seemed to me the exigency was very great—when it passed the act of 1863, by which the College of Agriculture and the Mechanical Arts was formed, an institution with which I am connected. I think that institutions of that kind have well repaid the effort made for them. It would certainly be ungracious in me to intimate that the bounty was not well bestowed, or that the funds have not been made use of for the general good of the country. I think they have been; but I did not regard the exigency that existed as a very grave one. If there was any constitutional or political objection to it, I do not think the economical or industrial exigency was sufficient to overcome it. But I think the bounty of the Government was well placed and the country benefited by it.

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Won’t you give the committee your ideas as to the necessity or advantage of technical or trade education to the American people generally—the degree of necessity in which the call for such education now exists, and what, if anything, is being done to supply it.—A. I think the term “Industrial education,” as it is commonly used in discussions on this subject, is susceptible of two very different interpretations. Industrial education may mean elementary high-school education di-
rected to the general accomplishments, equipment, and training of the person as an industrial agent, without regard to special trades; or, it may mean trade schools. We have very few trade schools in this country. I am not certain that we have yet reached the point where it is desirable to have them. At any rate, the most important need which the laboring classes of this country now have, in my judgment, is for giving direction to elementary education—common-school education, as we call it in this section of the country—giving it a direction which will better qualify those who leave our schools at the age of fourteen or sixteen to become industrial agents—machi-nists or mechanics—without regard to special trades. That is the branch of industrial education to which my mind has been specially turned, and in regard to which I feel altogether the deeper interest.

In Germany, Holland, Switzerland, and other countries of Europe there are trade schools where young children are taken and trained thoroughly to learn such occupations as they are expected to follow in after life.

A PLAN OF INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION FOR COMMON SCHOOLS.

Sweden, on the other hand, which has a population very like our own, and systems (except the form of government) not unlike ours, has a system of education which is not intended to breed artisans, but to make the children of the ordinary people more apt and intelligent—to give them better eyes and better hands and minds, trained to work with eye and hand for the general purposes of an industrial career, without specialization. And that system of instruction I should be very glad to see introduced into the schools of the United States, little by little, tentatively, going down from the high schools to the lower schools, and from the cities out into the country, as its success would justify. That is, I believe the children of the common schools should be trained in the elements of physics and mechanics, and that they should have a certain degree of manual training, at the carpenter's bench and at the lathe, not to make them carpenters or machinists at all, but to develop, in the first place, the executive faculty which is likely to be lost in long-continued courses of study; the disposition to take right hold and do a thing; to apply one's powers promptly, courageously, and effectively. Then for the development of the perceptive faculties—the training of the eye and the habit of mind that comes from observing distinctions, as of color, of distance, of faces, of moisture, of temperature, &c. I believe the perceptive faculties are almost wholly neglected in our schools, excepting in the kindergarten. The reflective faculties and the memory are developed at the expense of the executive faculty on the one hand and perceptive power on the other. And I believe that if the elements of physics and mechanics should be introduced into the public schools, not for the purpose of training carpenters or blacksmiths, or training young children to do any one thing for its own sake, but for the purpose of developing them as better men and better women, developing them more harmoniously and more fully; developing their constructive powers, instead of developing merely the powers of ratiocination and memory by an education that seems to me at the present time wholly one-sided.

The CHAIRMAN. Describe a little more minutely, if you please, just the process that you think might, without much difficulty, be introduced into the schools as they now exist, gradually modifying their methods of instruction, so that there might come to be ingrained upon our pres-
ent school system just the methods you speak of for developing the exec-
utive and perceptive power. I ask you to do this for this reason: There are but very few people in this country who know just what to
do in this direction, and if you should give us a little talk on the sub-
ject it would be distributed all over the country; and thousands of
teachers, who might be glad to avail themselves of an opportunity
for conveying this instruction, would get useful hints; and, even if the
system were not very minutely detailed by you here, it would set them
to thinking, and to the pursuit of the information where they might be
able to obtain it.

The WITNESS. I shall be happy to do so. My judgment is that such
a system of education would have to go downward from the higher
schools to the lower, and outward from the cities and centers of popu-
lation and wealth to the rural districts. I do not think it could be im-
posed at once, peremptorily, upon even this community of the State of
Massachusetts, wealthy as it is, with any degree of success. Do I un-
derstand that you desire me to give an illustration of how I think this
system might be carried out?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

HIGH SCHOOL OF THE MECHANIC ARTS.

The WITNESS. I shall be glad to do that. I think there is no city of
ten thousand inhabitants in this State which could not within a year
set on foot a high school of the mechanical arts, which should be either
immediately connected with its high school or located at some short
distance from it, according to the expense or other considerations in-
volved. That is a matter of detail, but I think every city of ten thou-
sand inhabitants should have a high school of the mechanical arts,
either as a department of the existing high school or as a separate in-
stitution; I should very much prefer the former if there be no reason
to the contrary.

In those schools I think the high-school children from fourteen to eight-
een should be trained in carpentry and joinery, and in work at the
forge and at the lathe; trained in the mechanic arts; taught to make
things; taught to impose their ideas upon matter, and compel it to take
the form which they have chosen for it. I think the equipment of such
a school would bear no undue proportion to the expenditure which all
our cities have shown themselves willing to make in behalf of educa-
tion. For example, the high school in this city cost hundreds of thou-
sands of dollars. It would have been a matter of ten or fifteen thousand
dollars to equip it in it, or in connection with it, shops in which a number
of persons connected with that high school might get a thorough train-
ing in the mechanic arts and have their mechanical aptitudes developed
by practice.

THE DWIGHT SCHOOL.

Q. Is there anywhere in the State, connected with the schools of the
State proper, any such department as you speak of?—A. There has been
in the city of Boston. There was a year ago an experiment of this kind
in carpentry only, which was very successful, tried in the Dwight school,
under the mastership of Mr. Page. The boys were taken as volunteers,
but they were all desirous of going. It came to be considered a sort of
prize by the best scholars. They understood, of course, that they must
not allow other studies or educational work to be diminished. Two
classes were formed, eighteen scholars at a time, making thirty-six in all, from the upper rooms. They were taken from that school and given a course of carpentry and joinery. The results of that experiment will be found in the school report of Boston, and in the last school report of Massachusetts.

Q. Were the results understood to be highly favorable to the experiment?—A. Wholly so; and only last Saturday, Mr. Page, the master in charge of the experiments, expressed himself as greatly pleased with the experiments and declared that the work improved the boys in their general studies, that it took nothing from the zeal or energy with which they applied themselves to the ordinary scholastic exercise, while at the same time they got this training in the development of their powers of observation and the executive faculty.

Q. At what time of the day was this instruction given, and was it every day?—A. I think it was one day in the week. Every grammar school being required to bring its pupils up to a certain point at a certain time, this had to be all extra, and the pupils had to do this in addition to their regular studies—and they were glad to do it. Perhaps a more striking instance is the normal institution at Salem, of which I am a visitor. It was there applied last year to a class of volunteers from the young ladies. The school is a young ladies' normal school. There are no young men connected with it. The senior class were offered an opportunity to take this course, but as the board of education made certain requirements of the normal schools, this work had to be done out of school, and in addition to the regular amount of school studies. There are very few pupils who would volunteer for any more of the ordinary scholastic work, but the whole class to whom this privilege was offered volunteered for the work. Tools were furnished by a lady of the State who has been interested in this cause for some years, and the carpenters' benches were set up in the basement of the State normal school.

Q. This is a ladies' school?—A. It is a ladies' school entirely. The principal of the school is a man—Professor Hagar—and perhaps there are one or two other gentlemen.

Q. It leads to the conclusion that women can become professors of this art?—A. That is the point.

Q. So that it would not be necessary to dispense with female teachers all over the country in order to give instruction in arts pertaining to male education?—A. It would be impossible to change the current of forces by which our school-teachers have become women. They are certain to remain so, and perhaps become so in an increasing degree. The branches can be taught in the rural districts, or they can be taught in cities and towns. For instance, in this city a grammar school will have twelve rooms. With twelve teachers, it would be a very simple matter to have a supplemental or thirteenth teacher who would come in and teach these arts, but in the ordinary village school where there is but one teacher, and that a woman, the practicability of this school depends entirely upon whether women can be taught to practice these arts and train themselves to teach them to others. Professor Hagar reports that his young ladies took hold with enthusiasm—that they learned to drive a nail sharp and straight, and learned to make a straight edge and bring edges together—for instance, to make a box or make a platform for a work-box to stand upon. They became able to repair the apparatus used in the chemical room so far as all ordinary repairs were concerned, and, generally, the young ladies took the greatest interest in the practice of those arts. The experiments are declared to be an entire success.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

BRIDGEWATER LADIES' NORMAL SCHOOL.

Mr. Boynton, principal of the Ladies' State Normal School at Bridge-
water reports that his young ladies have shown great interest in work-
ing with the plane, the saw, the chisel, and the hammer, and that they
like it, and are willing to do that work in addition to their ordinary
school work, and to take the time out of their rest and holiday time for
the privilege of doing so. Those are the instances I speak of which
serve as an example of the success that I think would attend a ming-
ing of such work with the public school system under the sanction of
law.

WORCESTER FREE INSTITUTE.

There are institutions like the very admirable Worcester Free Insti-
tute where the mechanical arts are very extensively carried on in con-
nection with scientific instruction, as chemistry, mathematics, engineer-
ing, &c., but that is what is called a private institution. It has received
funds from the State, but is not controlled by the State, and does not
regularly receive funds from the State.

Q. Has there been any movement made in education in this State
that would promote the introduction of this school system?—A. That
has been very actively canvassed in the legislature, and the superin-
tendent of schools in Boston has made the most urgent recommenda-
tions for the introduction of this system into the public schools of
Boston. I think he would give you a very clear view of the advan-
tages of this system.

Q. Who instructed these young ladies at the normal school that you
have mentioned?—A. There was a young carpenter who was called in
who had been in a manual training school there, supported by some
charitable ladies, and this carpenter gave very excellent instruction.

Q. Is there anything that embraces work in iron or metals applicable
in that respect, do you think?—A. Altogether so, I think, in connec-
tion with the educational system of any large city. It is a question of
expense equal, perhaps, to one-tenth part of the money that is now
thrown away on fashionable locks for our public schools and construct-
ing highly decorated and ornate buildings, to equip shops in which
wood and iron could be worked. It is a matter of comparatively a few
thousand dollars to get up such a machine-shop as would be necessary
for purposes of instruction.

Q. Do you see any reason why this same system might not be made
a part of any academic institution, so that young men pursuing even
an academic course in college might, as recreation—perhaps as a means
of exercise during some portions of the day—become instructed in
these practical things that would be useful to them in after life?—A. I
do not. I believe that the example of this system of education in some
of our institutions is going to compel other institutions to follow. Last
summer I told President Porter, formerly of Yale College, that in ten
years I believed he would have to have machine-shops and chemical la-
bratories in his institution. I believe that the demand for this kind
of training is part of the general education of a man; that the work of
developing and harmonizing his powers and faculties is to be laid upon
the colleges as well as the technical schools.

THE MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.

In the institution with which I am connected it is the most popular
part. We have students who are going to college, and some who have
gone through college. There are this year two or three gentlemen who entered Harvard College who are staying out a year and taking this course of instruction with us.

Q. Before going on with the regular course?—A. Yes. We have, also, this year gentlemen who have graduated at Harvard who are taking our course after their college course. Professor Ordway, who went to Sweden and studied the system there, reports—his report is to be found in the last State report of the Massachusetts Board of Education—that the establishment of this system in connection with the public schools in Sweden had laid the same necessities upon private schools, and that the circulars and prospectuses of the private schools in the cities of Sweden, some of which he showed me in the daily papers as they were advertised, called attention to the fact that they had connection with schools of boys and girls where these opportunities for practical study of the mechanical arts were afforded.

Q. If your own institutions were at Cambridge it might easily be made a part of, or made to work harmoniously with, Harvard itself, as one department of a great university, might it not?—A. Of course, I cannot speak for the Harvard people; I do not wish to speak for them. I purposely spoke of Yale on that account. If they were satisfied that this was a desirable feature it would be a very easy matter for them to establish it. Mechanical education—I call it mechanical rather than manual—is a desirable element of general training.

THE FUTURE OF MECHANICAL EDUCATION.

Q. And that it may well be introduced, if feasible to introduce it, as a part of the common-school system?—A. Yes; from the normal and high schools downward through the lower grades, and outward to the rural districts. It would take a long time, of course, to find teachers fit to do that work, and a long time to set the system in operation throughout even so wealthy a community as Massachusetts.

Q. That would not, of course, obviate the stern necessity of learning a trade?—A. No.

Q. It would simply facilitate the education of the powers at that early period when a boy can hardly be well set to work in a shop?—A. Yes. The general intelligence of our American people, as a mass, has been a subject of admiration on the part of all who have visited the United States, who study carefully its manufactures. It is more a question of general intelligence than of technical skill, perhaps, as yet, with us. If the strong native mechanical genius of our people were developed by elementary courses of physics and mechanics, and by courses of manipulation in primary schools, I think, the working classes would be more profited than even by technical education; they would be apt to adapt themselves more readily. If a boy goes into school at fourteen to learn a trade, that implies that he is going to practice that trade, and perhaps he could not practice any other. Two years later, with the Israelitish habits of our people in traveling about, he may have an opportunity to practice another trade, and be in another State where that trade is followed. I think that the time under sixteen will be better devoted to giving him a general training in manipulation, and in the practice of mechanical principles, and developing his powers of perception, and I think that would be more useful to the mass of the people than a more highly specialized direction.

Q. Do you think that this sort of application would be attended with a disciplinary effect upon the mind itself, as well as by the pursuit of
the ordinary studies!—A. Of the very highest advantage. The training, as I said, of the executive faculty is a most important thing. It does not matter so much when you are dealing with boys, going back to the farm or shop at fifteen or sixteen, but the great bane of our education to-day is that the will suffers a kind of impotence after a certain duration of studies in dialectics, mnemonics, and rhetoric.

Q. I mean further than that. You speak very cogently upon its effect upon the perceptive and executive powers as, in fact, almost equivalent to their creation; at all events, preventing their loss by the undue proportion of educational attention given to the reasoning powers and the memory. Now, in these same manipulatory processes, would there not be an absolute direct effect of a disciplinary character and executive character as well as of a respective character? A boy must think as well as make a box, and must institute comparisons in doing just the same things that you speak of, almost as much, perhaps, as the study of his lessons in arithmetic, geography, or history.—A. I don’t know about the memory. I think the memory is calculated altogether too much at the present time in our schools. That is the reason why I think the memory is broken down so early, like a horse that has worked too hard when young. The object of the teacher should be to get few things into the memory rather than too many; but that is matter of theory, and I may be wrong. I have no doubt, however, that this system would be as well qualified for development as the ordinary studies of the school.

Q. So that it would not be a loss!—A. Not at all; the power of attention and application is developed in a very high degree in that way.

Q. Then even if this course were introduced at the expense of some of the time now devoted to some of the text-books and studies of the schools there would be no loss to the scholar!—A. I think that the introduction of the system of what I call mechanical education in the schools of Massachusetts and Connecticut, as I have known them while I was a member of the State board of education, would have the effect to crowd out and extrude from our common schools one-half the geography and one-half the grammar that is now taught. It would have a beneficial result even if nothing were substituted that was itself directly beneficial.

FAULTS IN THE PRESENT SCHOOL METHODS.

Take the simple study of geography. The amount of gazetteer information that is crowded into our grammar-school course is positively absurd. I remember once asking my little girl, twelve years old, some question which I did not suppose she would answer, but I did it in fun, rather to tease her, and she replied, “I can’t tell you that, papa, but I can tell you the names of all the principal towns in Siberia.” I was at the time a professor of history, and I didn’t know the name of a town in Siberia, and I don’t want to. It is not of the slightest consequence for any literary or specific purpose that I should. Take another case, I do not want to revile the common schools, but I think it is fair to state it: One of my boys, twelve years old, came home one day and said that the supervisor was coming on in a few days, and going to examine the boys in geography; and to meet that examination that boy of twelve got forty-four fair-sized pages, which he wrote out himself in order to get it more thoroughly, of information of a purely gazetteer, encyclopedic character. Thirty-three cities of Asia were on that list, and that boy
not only got it up, which might have been a reasonable work, but committed it to memory.

Now, no such information is of any earthly value whatever to any scholar for any purpose, because no man can afford to put into his memory all that is in a gazetteer. He has not the nervous nor brain power to put it there. It is highly artificial work, and he has other needs for those powers without straining them so much in one direction. There is no psychologist in the world who would for a moment approve of such studies for boys of twelve. Now if that could be extruded from the common schools it would be an advantage to the pupils. It is the same way with arithmetic. The children of twelve years of age in this city are practiced in exercises that are more difficult than any bank cashier in Boston performs from January to December. The common-school arithmetics in use here exact from children the performance of mental operations far more difficult than any bank cashier or accountant in a store has occasion to perform, and, I think, that is absurd as well as mischievous.

**Physiology and Hygiene in Schools.**

Q. Now, I want to ask your attention to two other points. One is, what you think of the introduction of the study of the laws of health in some simplified and yet essential form of text-book, and also in regard to the sanitary conditions and regulations in accordance with which a human being ought to live his life, in order to discharge his own responsibility to himself when he becomes a man, and to others.—A. I have a right to favor the introduction of that course of study in schools, because it was my father who caused to be introduced into the State law of Massachusetts the provision for the study of physiology and hygiene as a common-school study, not as a science for the sake of the science, but as a means of instruction for the regulation of the lives and conduct of the school children. I thoroughly believe in the introduction of primers in physiology and hygiene into our schools. Some very excellent little books are now being written and brought from England for the benefit of some of our schools, and I think they should certainly be introduced into all our common schools. Of course, in the primary classes the instruction should be by word of mouth from the teacher, and not from the text-books, but the study should be recognized in the lowest grade of the common schools.

In this State, I think, a decided effort is being made in one special branch of the subject—that is, the physiology of tobacco and alcohol. I don’t know but what it may have legal sanction—I ought to know, but I confess I do not—but I know many of the schools instruct their children in the physiology of tobacco and alcohol.

**Education in Sanitary Science.**

The Chairman. By the sanitary conditions that I mentioned, I mean the rules in accordance with which dwellings should be constructed and places of labor built. Every man who has to live in a house ought to know whether that house is well ventilated, and before he undertakes to establish a family, he ought to know whether he is placing them in a position where they would very soon need the attention of a doctor, if not of an undertaker. Might there not be ingrafted upon the common-school system some general idea of these laws, so that boys and girls, when grown up, would know something of them, so that they
would know whether they were living in such a way as to preserve their health or to injure it?

The Witness. I should say that questions of sanitary engineering were too dependent upon difficult laws of physics to make the subject a high-school or grammar-school study, and I think, probably, the high school or grammar-school study of that subject would be as likely to result in that “little knowledge” which is often “a dangerous thing,” as in any general improvement of the people. But I think it is proper to give such instruction as to enforce upon the pupils the consideration that there are certain unsanitary conditions that lead to disease and death, and that houses may be badly constructed, and to give them examples of the spread of scarlet fever, diphtheria, &c., by the want of sanitary regulations, and, generally, to bring their attention to the subject of hygiene as one about which they should reflect and make inquiry as to whether or not they had placed themselves in proper condition.

For example, only two or three hours ago I heard Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, in a lecture at the Harvard Medical College, use this expression: That the mere phrase “drain fever” had saved thousands of lives. That expresses what I want to intimate, namely, the idea of enforcing upon the minds of children that these dangerous sanitary conditions might exist, and often do exist, under the very fairest show of modern improvements—that their minds should be fixed upon the subject, and their apprehension excited, so that they might take some method of satisfying themselves, by experts or otherwise, as to whether they were surrounded by the right conditions. But the questions of drainage and ventilation are exceedingly difficult questions. They depend upon certain laws of physics, with regard to which there is apt to be some mistake. One of the most eminent English physicians, in a work published twelve years ago, said that he had taken part in many of the sanitary arrangements of certain cities in England, and that up to a certain point (although he was a great author) all his work had been prejudicial to health. It was done in good faith, but under misapprehension in regard to the conditions of proper drainage, and proper ventilation, so he said, and he considered that he had done harm to the people of those towns where he had been instrumental in establishing the arrangements to which he referred. The most elaborate system of ventilation would be apt to fail under certain conditions. For example, a system of ventilation that may work upon one side of this building would not work at all on the other side, or a system that would work well on the first floor of this building might be insufficient on the fourth. But it would be advantageous to say to children that they might be in greater danger to their lives in a nicely decorated and so-called modern house, than from the presence of many recognized physical dangers, as by climbing up and down a broken ladder, for example.

The Chairman. We have hardly touched the matters included in the resolution, but I was anxious to hear you on the matters that we have touched in the interest of the rising generation.

Weeks’ Statistics of Wages.

The Witness. May I say that there is in the Census Office in Washington, a report by Mr. Joseph P. Weeks, who is now abroad, which contains a good deal of statistical matter in regard to times of payment of working people, rates of wages, the existence of trades unions, the facts of strikes, &c., the largest amount of statistical information, I think, that has ever been gathered in this country.
Q. It was collected in the process of taking the census under your direction!—A. Yes, he was the special agent for collecting information on industrial matters.

Q. Is it just now being published?—A. It may be in the Printing Office, but of course the statistics of wages are very voluminous. In some cases his statistics of wages go back to 1830 or 1840, and it is the only book in which wages in this country have been carefully compiled, where the question of workingmen's wages has been reduced to exact figures. I should think that report might be almost invaluable to your committee, and I presume it will be placed very cheerfully at the disposal of the committee.

Q. It will be printed before a great while, I suppose!—A. I trust so, but the Printing Office is very heavily burdened with the vast amount of matter that is there.

The CHAIRMAN. These various other questions in regard to transportation and the influence of corporations on our industrial question we cannot well go into, although we would be very glad indeed to get your views on them, but if you have not the time to spare, I suppose it would not be satisfactory to you to go into them. We would be glad to hear from you for a full day at least.

The WITNESS. I am sorry that I have not more time at my disposal.

DISTRIBUTION TO LABOR AND CAPITAL, OF RESULT OF JOINT PRODUCTION.

Q. Perhaps I might ask you this question, and if you can reply to it without burdening yourself with too many particulars we should be glad to hear you. That is, whether you think the wage-working people of this country, all things considered, receive, as a rule, an equitable share in the distribution of the products of labor, or the avails of the production of the country. Do they get as much as belongs to them, so far as labor is distinguished from capital in production?—A. It is difficult to say what is equitable. I should have to answer that by saying that the character of our population being what it is, and the relations of labor and capital being what they are, I think that they have received very nearly, if not quite, as much as the normal operation of economic laws would bring to them. I think they have not suffered greatly from their own ignorance or immobility as they have in other countries. They have not suffered much from inherited abuses, as they have in other countries. They have suffered very little from monopoly of land, because land here has been free and a resort to it has been very easy. They have suffered very little from restrictive regulations. So that, looking to one cause or another, I should judge the working classes of this country, in the past, have received very nearly, if not quite, all that the normal operation of economic laws would bring to them from the products of their industry. That is the only test I could apply.

LAND NATIONALIZATION.

Q. Do you think that any change could be made in the system of ownership to the titles of property, either real or personal, in this country which would operate to the advantage of the people or to the advantage of the working people as a special class? For instance, could the theory which we sometimes see advanced, of nationalizing the land, be made operative in this country or be made beneficial to the masses, if adopted? What would be your view in regard to that?—A. I think
the system of nationalizing the land, as proposed by Mr. John Stuart Mill in England, as it has been since proposed in the same country by Mr. A. R. Wallace, and as it has been proposed in this country by Mr. Henry George, would simply be an inconceivable curse to the people of the country, and especially, most of all, to the laboring classes.

Q. Why so?—A. Because I believe that private property in land is an essential condition to the proper development of the resources of the soil, and I believe that the nationalizing of the land, with the invitation which it would carry to corruption and official abuse, would bring upon us evils which really we have not now the imagination to conceive. I think we should have to realize it before we could appreciate the evils. I think the proposition made by Mr. Mill was made in good faith. He was a great economist and a wise man, and I think the Government has a perfect right, if it is best for the community, to resume the ownership of land, compensating existing owners for their property. I hardly know an economist that does not recognize the fact that property in land differs from property in the products of labor, but private property in land has been established in almost every civilized country of the world for the public-good.

In this country, when we started out a hundred years ago, we had an immense public domain, and Hamilton and all the other statesmen of the time looked to the public domain as a source of great revenue. We very early came as a people to the conclusion that no advantage which could be derived from the use of the public land as an official reserve, would compensate in any degree for the disadvantages of retaining that great body of property in the hands of the General Government. So the Government went to work first to selling the property at a minimum price, and finally fairly giving it away to bona fide settlers, with the conviction on the part of all people that it was for the interest of the State and of all classes that the land should become private property. That system we pursued even with land that was unmistakably the property of the State. Now, that the people of the United States, who have persisted in that course for a hundred years, could so far reverse its policy as not only to resume the land which it had given away and sold, but to take possession of land which was private property before the United States of America was a nation, is not, in my belief, a practical proposition.

Q. You think if it were done it would be attended with great damage to the country?—A. I think it would be attended with inconceivable mischief. Look merely at the officialism which it would entail. Think of the whole body of rents of this city being collected by the city of Boston! The abuses at present are enough, with the little work we call upon the municipal authorities to do, and the small resources in their hands. If the making and unmaking of leases—if the ownership of all this property—were in the hands of the city I cannot believe that any citizen would care to remain in it.

Q. Unless he held an office?—A. Yes; or were a corruptionist. We know how these swamp lands, for example, at the south and west were sold, and what the tendency was to a combination of rings and bidders to force the sales for fictitious advantages, and make changes in hours and days of sale for the purpose of passing this property into the hands of individuals. If the whole landed property of the country were to be brought into the hands of the State, a dozen wars of secession would seem to me to be a trifling evil compared with it. But that is a political question of which I have no more means of judging than you gentlemen.
Edward Atkinson examined.

By the Chairman:

Question. You have perhaps seen the resolution under which we are proceeding?—Answer. I have.

The Chairman. We will thank you to offer such observations, in your own way, as seem to you to be pertinent and material for our consideration under the resolution.

The Witness. In view of the nature of the testimony borne by some of the witnesses who have been before the committee, and in order that I may save my reputation and may not be considered "a crank," it is perhaps as well for me to state at the outset, that I appear before you at the request of your chairman, and not as a volunteer philanthropist.

What legislation can, and what it cannot do.

I have no special plan or patent method to submit to you for abating want or abolishing poverty by statute; nor for rendering every man, woman, and child capable of obtaining a good subsistence without working for it. None of these benefits can you confer. You can create nothing by statute; if you could we would all elect ourselves legislators. All that you can do by statute is to alter the distribution of our annual product. You can take from one and give to another, either directly or indirectly. You can alter the legal-tender acts, or you can maintain the coinage of silver dollars worth only 83 cents. If you do maintain this base coinage you will soon make the rich richer, but you will also make the poor so much poorer that even in this land of rich abundance poverty will abound. It is within the easy power of legislators, however, to make the fortunes of the few and to mar the fortunes of many persons. You can render subsistence more difficult than it would be if good judgment only were applied to the framing of laws. One has said that "the chief function of modern law-makers has been to remove legal obstructions created by the legislators of the past." A good subsistence consists in an abundant supply of food, fuel, clothing, and shelter. Can you increase this abundance?

No nation has more than two or three years' subsistence.

In this country there is always enough for all, but where is it? We hear more of overproduction than of any other alleged evil. We always have enough somewhere, yet we are always within less than a year of starvation—less than two or three years of being naked—and within less than ten years of being without shelter, if we cease to work for our living. In the richest State of the Union in proportion to the number of inhabitants, namely, Massachusetts, if all the substance which has been saved in more than two centuries of existence from the labor of our forefathers and of ourselves, and which now exists in what is called fixed capital, to wit, our railroads, our works, mills, storehouses, dwellings, even our churches, schools, and the like, could be reconverted into the food, fuel, and clothing which were consumed in the process of the production and saving of this capital—if we then stopped work, ceased to make exchanges, and lived for awhile upon our present reserve of capital we should be without food, without clothing, and without shelter in two years or at the utmost in three years. The richest State in the world never has exceeding three years of annual product in the form of fixed capital on hand at any one time.
LABOR BECOMING MORE EFFECTIVE YEARLY.

But in a civilized State, which has been long endowed with common schools, in which services are exchanged, in which justice is assured, and in which men respect each other's rights, but leave each other free, not because it is lawful to do so, but because the vast majority intend to live rightly and justly and to govern themselves, an annual product more than ample to save every man, woman, and child within the State from want is easily assured by the co-operation of capital and labor working freely together. As time has passed during the last fifty years such an ample subsistence has been and can be assured to each and all with less hours of work and less exhaustive labor as each year passes, if instruction and intelligence keep pace with capital. I am inclined to think that every intelligent workingman in the State of Massachusetts has become a third more effective than he was twenty or thirty years ago by the application of larger capital to production, if his power be measured by the quantity as much as by the price of the things upon which he exerts his labor or for which he can exchange his wages.

SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITS IN MASSACHUSETTS.

The attention of the Southern members of this committee should be called to the great fact that the deposits in the savings banks of this State are over $240,000,000, averaging more than $125 to each man, woman, and child, and that nearly every other person in the State is represented by name upon the books of a bank. What the South needs to-day more than Northern capital is a safe way of saving its own small sums. When the South learns this lesson it will soon become rich, and not before.

EQUALITY OF SUBSISTENCE A QUESTION OF DISTRIBUTION.

The whole question of substantial equality, not in property, which is secondary, but in subsistence, which is the main thing, is, therefore today a question of distribution rather than of production. Now, although there may be this almost measureless quantity of the things which men need to supply their material wants each and every year, yet the poor we have always with us, and the pauper is to be found in all our cities and in many of our towns, and although we in Massachusetts have imported most of our poor, it behooves us to remove the causes of want if we can do it by legislation or otherwise.

HENRY GEORGE'S THEORY.

It is alleged by Henry George that these bad conditions have arisen merely because the rich have grown richer, and that, as a necessary consequence, the poor have become poorer. I venture to deny the premises on which the allegation is made, and to pronounce this conclusion utterly false. Nay, in order to present the case with the most startling clearness, I may venture to affirm that the late Cornelius Vanderbilt was the greatest and most useful communist of his day, and I mean by that that he may be taken as the exponent of a small class of men who have achieved enormous fortunes in a single life, and yet have done more than any other men to bring an ample subsistence within the easy reach of all at a less and less cost, whether cost be measured in labor, in price, in wages, or in purchasing power of the laborer.
If poverty has appeared to increase alongside this accumulation of wealth it has not been because of the wealth, but for want of such intelligence on the part of those who are poor as would enable them to grasp the benefits which the great masters in the application of capital to useful purposes have brought within their easy reach.

If men are poor to-day in this land it is either because they are incapable of doing the work which is waiting to be done, or are unwilling to accept the conditions of the work. There are twice as many clerks as are needed, and not half enough skilled mechanics; twice as many poor sewing women who can only sew in the poorest way, and not half enough skilled seamstresses; twice as many men trying to live by their wits, and failing in it, as there are capable of applying their heads and hands together to useful arts; twice as much capital waiting to be used as there are men capable of using it profitably to themselves and safely for those of whom they borrow it.

MISTAKE OF THE ANTI-MONOPOLISTS.

I will not weary you with an essay upon this subject of the function of capital, but I will endeavor to illustrate these propositions by a very simple analysis of a loaf of bread. I had long been wishing to take up this subject for my own purposes, when the request of your chairman to appear before you gave me the necessary incentive.

Before I enter upon this analysis let me say a few words as to what is expected of your committee. You are asked by very many of those who have appeared before you to fix the price of bread to the consumer by statute, and you are expected to make bread plentiful and cheap among the poor.

This is not boldly stated, but is the end sought by so-called "anti-monopolists" and some others who have appeared before you. To make bread cheap and plenty is a most excellent object, one greatly to be desired and one which will cover you with immortal glory when you have achieved it, if you succeed. I propose to aid you to the extent of my ability in this work, and to show you how very far short of the grand purpose have been the measures yet proposed and urgently demanded of you by a very large number of philosophers and philanthropists, who have borne testimony in this and other States. I am neither. I merely compile statistics, ascertain facts, and attempt to see what they mean. How has this request been presented to you? Simply on one single point, namely, that you shall take the control of the railway service of the United States and regulate the method and rate of traffic by a national statute. The opponents of alleged monopoly say that the railway magnates make bread dear. I will endeavor to prove to you that the regulation of the railways is but a very small part of the work which it will be necessary for you to do, and will require very little consideration on your part compared to what remains if you adopt the proposed methods of the anti-monopolists.

GRAIN CROP OF THE UNITED STATES.

The grain crops of this country in an average recent year weigh 75,000,000 tons, and a wheat crop of 500,000,000 bushels constitutes 15,000,000 tons out of this total; the rest is chiefly corn. The hay crop weighs 32,000,000 tons in a fair season, and the output of our coal mines
is from seventy to eighty million tons. Food, either in its original form of grain and hay, or converted into meat or into the products of the dairy, fuel and timber for dwellings, i.e., food, fuel, and shelter, constitute 70 to 80 per cent. of all the commodities which are moved upon all the railroads of the United States. All the fibers of cotton, wool, and flax, and all the metals mined, amount to less than 10,000,000 tons against nearly 200,000,000 tons of grain, meat, fuel, and timber. It is true that food and fuel may only be moved one and a half times upon the rail, either in their original form or when converted to use, while the fibers, fabrics, and metals may be moved, in one form or another, three or four times. In spite of this, not less than 80 per cent. of the work of the railway is to move food, fuel, and materials for shelter from the producer to the consumer, and therefore it might be inferred that cheap bread depends in greatest measure upon the work of distribution by railway.

**THE DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENTAL REGULATION OF RAILROAD CHARGES.**

Under this impression, the railway service is the mark for meddlesome legislation in almost every State, and the great fortunes of the railway magnates have excited more jealousy than any other cause of prejudice against wealth. You have therefore been urgently required to report acts for the regulation of this service by national statutes. I say you are required to do this work if you can. If you cannot make bread and meat cheap by such statute regulations as may be presented or which may occur to you, then you are required to let well alone and to lead the people to a true knowledge of their own conditions, and to see to it that they are not misled by cunning men, or by silly sentimentalists, who are incapable of really grasping the subject upon which they bore you with their shallow arguments.

**FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF RAILROADS IN FRANCE.**

In this connection I may refer you to the utter failure of the state railway system in France, and to the fact that the German system is only kept up as a part of the great military burden by which the German Empire is being crushed into poverty and socialism.

There is an article by Léon Say in the Journal des Économistes—I think the last number for 1882—in which he showed that the cost of running the railroads under state management in France was steadily rising until it had become more than 80 per cent. of the gross receipts; that the freight charges were steadily increasing, and that not only no profit but a steady loss was occurring all the time; he also proved that state railway management was utterly corrupting the whole civil service of France.

Q. To what does he attribute the gradual increase of cost of transportation?—A. The incapacity of the state to do that kind of work.

Q. That is his general proposition!—A. Yes; and the state railway service has become so dangerous to the finances of France that since that article was published the legislature of France has been led to substantially surrender the state management of the railways, to make bargains with the private corporations to take back their control, and to give the whole thing up themselves.
I am prepared to admit that the railway has been a most important factor in distributing food among the people of this and other lands, for without it thousands might starve, but I shall also prove to you in the analysis of the loaf of bread that it has become relatively the factor of least importance at its present cost of all the items which constitute the cost of bread to the consumer; therefore, before you undertake to regulate the railways and thereby to reduce the price of bread, meat, and fuel you must give your attention to vastly greater elements in their cost, which may be more readily made subject of statute law than the railway service can be, if either kind of work is to be taken in charge by the State.

I shall take as my unit 450 bushels of wheat to be converted into 100 barrels of flour and then into bread, and I shall present to you all the elements of the cost of this bread both in figures and by graphical illustration, as follows:

What makes the price of bread in Boston? Four hundred and fifty bushels of wheat are required to make 100 barrels of flour. In the left-hand column it is assumed that this wheat has been raised near Chariton, Iowa, and milled in Chicago. In the right-hand column it is assumed that the wheat has been raised near Glyndon, Dak., and milled in Minneapolis.
No. 1, $4.05, is the price which the farmer receives in Iowa, at 50 cents per bushel; $3.60, in Dakota, at 30 cents per bushel.

No. 2, $17.50, is the charge made by the railway for moving 450 bushels of wheat from Chariton to Chicago, and 100 barrels of flour thence to Boston, $117.50; Glyndon to Minneapolis and thence to Boston, $82.25; cost of railroad service at 70 per cent., $138.25 of the total charges.

No. 3, $60.00, cost of milling.

No. 4, $45.00, cost of barrels.

No. 5, $30.00, merchant's commissions and cartage in Boston.

No. 6, $200.00, cost of labor in making 100 barrels flour into bread in a small bakery.

No. 7, $210.00, cost of fuel, yeast, salt, &c., used in converting 100 barrels flour into bread.

No. 8, final cost of bread ready for distribution, average 3½ cents per pound; varying a little with the quality of the flour and the quality of bread. Iowa flour yields 270 and 290 pounds per barrel; Dakota flour yields 250 and 300 pounds per barrel.

No. 9, the price which the poorer people of Boston pay for poor bread, made from a medium grade known as 'baker's flour,' averages not less than 6 cents per pound, which makes the cost of distributing 100 barrels of Iowa flour baked into bread, No. 9, $60.50, and 100 barrels Dakota flour, $587.50 at the minimum yield of 270 and 290 pounds bread to the barrel. When either kind of flour is treated so as to yield 300 pounds bread to a barrel and sold at 8 cents per pound $200, or $120, is added and the final cost of the bread to the consumer is at the rate of 38 cents per barrel of flour, No. 18.
It will be observed that if the railways earn as profit 30 per cent. of their charge, their profit on each barrel of Iowa flour moved about 1,500 miles is only $3.54 cents, and on each barrel of Dakota flour moved nearly 2,000 miles, only $3.94 cents. In point of fact the actual profits on grain and flour carried long distances is much less than 30 per cent. of the charge, and the actual profits for the above distances does not probably exceed 25 cents per barrel and 50 cents per barrel, respectively.

I find that about 6 cents a pound is the average cost of bread of a poor sort in small shops. Iowa flour will make a pound of bread to a pound of wheat when treated in the ordinary way. Dakota flour, which is stronger, when well treated, will make 300 pounds of bread to the barrel. At 6 cents a pound, the sum paid for the bread made from 100 barrels varies. The cost of distributing the bread to the poor in Boston after it is baked is, at the minimum quantity to the barrel, $562.50, and at the maximum quantity to the barrel $707.50, or in each case more than double the original cost of the wheat. The cost of bread baked and ready for consumption is $3.5 cents a pound. In this city there are institutions that can and do make contracts for bread of the best kind at 4 cents per pound. People who buy in the poor shops, on credit or otherwise, pay 6, 7, and 8 cents per pound. In order to see how some who are not quite so poor suffer I went to my own grocer and priced his bread, and I found that I pay 8.5 to 9 cents a pound for the bakers’ bread used in my family. Therefore if I extended the diagram I have given, so as to show the cost of bread in my family, I should have to extend the sheet of paper considerably; but my purpose only is to show the cost of bread to the poor, and having done so, I now submit this proposition: If you are going to regulate prices by law you should undertake first the simple process of regulating the price of distribution charged by the bakers and grocers, and in doing that you may learn how to regulate the railroads.

The railway charges are now so small that it does not leave you much of a margin to work upon and to save, but you cannot fail to notice that the charges made by the bakers and grocers is very large, and gives you an ample margin for legislative action. If you reply that all attempts to regulate the price of bread have failed, may I be permitted to rejoin that all attempts to regulate the charge of the railways have also failed, except perhaps in Belgium, where the Government has once at least been obliged to prohibit the private corporations which own a part of the railroads from lowering their charges, lest the Government railroads should be unable to compete with them.

I will again call your attention to the graphical table of the cost of bread in Boston.

It will be observed that the average profit of the railroads for moving the elements of bread from the center of Iowa or Dakota to the seaboard, even at 30 per cent. of the charge, is only about equal to the cost of the barrel in which the flour is customarily packed. It will also be observed that the largest single item in the cost of bread to the consumers is the charge upon it after it has been baked.

LOGICAL CONSEQUENCE OF THE DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENTAL REGULATION OF RAILROADS.

Your committee has been asked by what are known as the advocates of “anti-monopoly,” to frame and present to Congress such laws as will forbid capital taking the advantage of labor by means of excessive
charges for railway service, which charges are said 'to make the rich richer and the poor poorer,' and to 'make bread dear.'

The distribution of bread by bakers' wagons and through grocers' shops is, as I have said, simple but costly; the distribution of wheat and flour by railway is complex and difficult, but it is now done at so little cost as to leave little margin to be saved.

If your committee will first regulate the distribution of bread and reduce its price by statute, and, second, reduce the cost of barrels or require the substitution of cheaper sacks, you may then be fully prepared to frame suitable statutes for the regulation of the railway service. I recall this subject because the advantage of this method is that you can begin in Washington, and, by reducing the cost of living there, you can make the salaries of Senators and Representatives in Congress more adequate. When you have fixed the price of bread by legislation, you will of course take up meat, timber, and fuel, and after you have established an economic millennium in Washington the several States, cities, and towns can supplement your national statutes by adequate municipal ordinances, in order to complete the system.

You will understand, of course, that in such an argument as this it is necessary to make average statements. The 450 bushels of wheat which I have taken as a unit will commonly make 35 barrels of the best flour called "patents," 50 barrels of medium, called "bakers," and 15 barrels of common.

In a general way it may be said that 27,000 pounds of wheat will make 20,000 pounds of flour, and this flour again will be converted into 27,000 pounds of common baker's bread; while the best "patents," skillfully treated, will even work up to 30,000 pounds of bread. If the price of a service is in any manner to be taken as evidence of an abuse or of a monopoly, the excessive cost of distribution at retail must command your attention. It matters not that most of the keepers of these small shops work as hard as their customers and do not become rich so long as they remain small shop-keepers; nevertheless they make bread dear, if the price of their bread at retail be compared with the wholesale price at which good bread is now supplied to public institutions.

**EFFECT OF RAILROAD CHARGES ON COST OF MEAT.**

I have not been able to make a complete analysis of the price of beef in Boston, but this much can be submitted. Texas, steers worth 4 cents per pound live weight at Emporia, Kans., can be and are brought to Boston at a charge of 1 cent per pound. What it costs to fatten and kill them I know not, but this I do know that if the price of my sirloin is high the railway charge has little to do with its cost to me. Salt meat is brought at as low a charge as grain—hence railway charges have little to do with the high price of meat in the Eastern States.

It therefore follows that the monopolists, if *any such there are*, who are grinding the faces of the poor and rendering bread dear are not the Vanderbilts, the Tom Scotts, or the Garretts, but they are the nameless bakers, grocers, and others who have added this enormous charge to the cost of bread and meat. The whole railway service, from the field to the baker's oven, costs but half a cent per pound, but the service of the baker, and the grocer, and the shopman costs 2½ to 4 cents per pound of bread. If you will analyze your pound of beefsteak, or if you are a Yankee, analyze the salt pork with which your beans were baked for your Sunday breakfast, I think you will find the greatest monopolists, *if any there are*, are running the butcher wagons and the
provision shops of your cities. After you have succeeded in abating these enormous charges; after you have regulated the simple traffic of the baker, the grocer, the butcher, and the provision dealer; after you have prevented them from "grinding the faces of the poor," then take up the railway question, if you please, and see what is left for you to do. In dealing with this simple matter of the shopman and of the service of distribution by cart and wagon, you may learn how to regulate by statute the complex operations of the great railways of the United States, which have taxed the biggest brains and the ablest men of the land these twenty years or more. These men have laid the foundation upon which you can work.

LOWNESS OF RAILROAD CHARGES GENERALLY.

There is nothing in the whole cost of the subsistence of the people of this country which has been so greatly reduced since the end of the war as the cost of railway service to the railway companies. There is no other charge made by any body of men for the service which they render which has begun to be reduced in such measure as the charge made for the railway service as compared to what it was less than twenty years ago.

It must, of course, be a very simple matter for you gentlemen to take up this work where these men must leave it, when the nation undertakes to render the charge yet less. The only trouble is these railway men have done the work so well that there is very little left for you to do; not much margin to work upon, and not much fame to be made by "anti-monopoly" legislation.

Last year, 1882, the work of the railroads in moving merchandise, of which as I have told you 70 to 80 per cent. constituted food and fuel, was done at a charge, in round figures, of $480,000,000, at an average of 1.2 cents per ton per mile. Had the rate charged for this service been at the average rate from 1865 to 1869, this service would have cost the people of this country more than $1,000,000,000. I make it over $1,300,000,000; but let us be conservative, even in statistics.

The one great factor, more potent than all the rest in the prosperity of this country, in its ability to resume specie payments, and in its ability to make payments on the national debt, has been the reduction in the charge for the railway service; and this reduction has been accomplished by the consolidation and efficient working of the great through lines which Cornelius Vanderbilt began and which has been continued by his successors, by Scott, Chapin, Garrett, Huntington, Ames, Forbes, Perkins, and other men, who have been the agents by whom this great railway army of nearly five hundred thousand men engaged in operating, and perhaps as many more in construction, have been organized and directed.

ONE DAY'S WAGES PAYS THE RAILROAD CHARGES FOR A YEAR'S SUBSISTENCE.

I must repeat again one sentence in which I have often presented this case. The 300 pounds of Western meat and 200 pounds of Western flour which constitute the year's ration of food, which must be drawn from a far distance by the mechanics and laborers of Massachusetts, can now be moved a thousand miles, from Chicago to Boston, at a measure of one day's labor of a common laborer, or at $1.25, or it can be drawn 2,000 or 1,500 miles, from the far plains of Dakota or Nebraska, for one
Jay's wages of a skilled mechanic, or $2.50. This is what has been accomplished by the men whom I have named. Am I not right in saying that they are the communists of the age? For every cent which they have saved and reinvested in railway service have they not saved some other man a dollar in the cost of his subsistence? Have they not made a good subsistence possible to all at least cost? Is not this the single great fact which marks this time as compared to all other times—that one day's common labor, 1,000 miles' distance, and the moving of one year's subsistence, are synonymous terms?

We may state this case in this way: While the gold prices of Western farm products have been substantially maintained from 1869 to 1882, although subject to many fluctuations, the steady reduction in the charge for moving them over the railways of the United States amounts to a sum of over $1,500,000,000 in sixteen years, or more than equal to the entire payment of the national debt which has been made in that period, even accepting the maximum amount of our debt at over $3,000,000,000 on the 1st of August, as it was, although so much of it had not been audited and entered that the books only showed a maximum of $2,757,000,000.

But let us have done with this method of presenting the case.

**EDUCATION AS A REMEDY FOR POVERTY.**

There is a way in which you can work perhaps; you can give cheaper bread to the poor, who now pay twice its cost; you can give cheaper clothing to the people of the South, whom some of you represent, who now pay twice and thrice its cost; you can regulate the prices of all commodities which are bought and sold in the United States, in one way only.

The destruction of the poor is their poverty. But what is that poverty? It is not want of money so much as want of intelligence—want of knowledge; how to earn, how to save, and how to spend. You can in some degree promote education throughout this land, and thus you may remedy this wrong. In that way, and in that way only, can you relieve us from the evils which press upon us, for neither you nor I nor any man can help those who cannot help themselves. We may maintain paupers only by charity; we may put them in almshouses and sustain them with the products of our own labor, but you can never remove the causes of pauperism; you can never reduce the prices which the poor and ignorant are forced to pay, until you work from within rather than from without. Even in this you must regard the limits of what can be done by legislation; you cannot even force instruction upon those who do not wish to be instructed; you cannot impose prosperity from above even if you control all the wealth of this great country. You can only aid in educating those who have begun to school themselves in right ways of living and who have begun to provide schools for their children. I believe it is as easy to render a whole generation of children incapable of self-support by wasting misdirected energy and money in a sham system of what is misnamed education, as it is for a rich man to pauperize a community by giving his money to the poor; therefore, even in national aid to education the utmost caution is required lest more harm than good be done. Men value little what they have not worked for, and the only thing which it is wholly safe to give a man is opportunity to work; you cannot give a schooling, but you may give a better opportunity to those who are already trying to go to school and cannot find one.

I have been told that in some Western States so much land has been
set aside for school purposes as to have become a temptation to abuse, and that no good schools were established until the land had been jobbed away and the people began to tax themselves and to watch the spending of the money in their own townships. Governor Grimes told me this himself some years ago in Iowa, when referring to the reservation of lands for school purposes in that State.

FALLACY OF EIGHT-HOUR LAWS.

The other point upon which I shall say a few words to you before begging you to excuse me, is upon statutes for regulating the hours of labor.

You are asked to make eight hours a day a standard of a day’s work, and to enforce this rule by statute. This demand is made upon you in the interest of labor as against capital. Paradoxical as it may seem, it would of necessity work in the interest of capital against labor if you could enforce the rule which you are asked to establish. In order to make this plain, it is necessary to treat the wages question in a thorough and fundamental way.

All wages, all earnings, all profits, all interest, all increase of capital must, in the nature of things, be derived from the joint product of capital and labor. Furthermore, they must all be derived substantially from the work done in each year, because each year represents one succession of seasons, one crop, one change of natural conditions. The larger the crop, the larger the product of the mine, of the forest and of the sea in any year. In ratio to the labor expended and the number of laborers will be the sum of things which are to be converted into money and to be divided between the capitalists, who own the machinery and the tools with which the work is made easy, and the laborers, who operate these machines or tools. In many cases capitalist and laborer are the same person, in other cases they are separate persons.

If we take the annual product in the aggregate, we find that it is made by a great subdivision of labor.

ALL MEN INTERDEPENDENT.

There are few persons left in this country who are thoroughly independent and self-sustaining, and they are to be found in the heart of the Alleghany Mountains and the Blue Ridge; in Eastern Kentucky and Western North Carolina, where their means of communication with the outer world have been so limited that they have been forced to be entirely independent of their fellow-men down to the present time. In that superb climate, upon that rich mountain soil, in the heart of the best supply of timber for our future use, you may still find a sparse population, living in dwellings which they have constructed for themselves; clad in homespun which they have woven by their own hands, upon looms built upon the spot; and in some cases even the iron has been made in wayside furnaces from the ore which underlies the soil of the farm itself. Everywhere else in this country the people are interdependent and not independent of each other. Their products are exchanged, and in this exchange their value is converted into terms of money and expressed in prices. Whatever may be the value of this annual product when converted into terms of money will be the measure of the wages and earnings of the people and of the profits of capital. A small part of the fixed capital saved in previous years will be worn out in the making of this annual product, and this must be restored be-
fore the next year, lest all the people become poor alike. A small part, yet much larger than it ought to be, must be taken out to sustain the Government by taxation, national, State, and municipal. A small part, very small indeed, can be taken from this annual product to increase the capital of the country.

I can find no trace of capital within the limits of the United States which would represent 5 per cent. of each year's annual product since this nation was founded a century ago; which has been saved, accumulated, and is now possessed as capital by rich men or by men of property, whether rich or of moderate means.

It is impossible to bring this subject into statistical form with any absolute accuracy, but I think every student will agree with me in this conclusion.

NINETY PER CENT. OF EACH YEAR'S PRODUCTION CONSUMED IN THE PROCESS.

My general conviction, from all the examination I have given the matter, is this: That not less than ninety parts of each year's production are and must be consumed in the process, and therefore constitute its cost, and that not exceeding ten parts of each year's production are or can be set aside for the maintenance and increase of capital, perhaps five parts for manufacture and five for increase. In the long run capital itself is so much subject to depreciation by the waste caused by new inventions, new methods, and new appliances as to make it certainly doubtful that over 5 per cent. of each year's product is really maintained in such a form that it can become permanent, individual wealth.

In the last ten or fifteen years the accumulation of capital has been more rapid, and I attribute this to the fact that the wholesale prices of grain, provisions, and timber, have remained substantially the same, varying somewhat with seasons from year to year, while the cost of moving them has been reduced in the enormous measure indicated in the first part of this argument. The benefit of the reduction of the railway charge has therefore been mainly gained by producers rather than by consumers. It must have averaged $300,000,000 or more per year for fifteen years if the rate of each year be compared with those of 1866 and 1869 inclusive. In 1882 this gain was from $500,000,000 to $800,000,000, while the prices in gold of leading crops and timber varied little from those of 1866 and 1869 inclusive.*

PROFITS OF CAPITAL IN THE UNITED STATES.

There is one rather simple way of justifying this conclusion. If there is any branch of work offering, in this country, which will pay 10 per cent. upon the capital needed for its production, that branch of work will be undertaken by somebody. In the manufacturing arts, in which the largest proportionate capital is invested, it takes only about one dollar of capital to two dollars of annual product. In these cases 5 per cent. or five dollars in a hundred of the product will yield 10 per cent. upon the capital, and capital will rush into that branch of business very rapidly under such conditions. I do not think the New England cotton factories have paid 6 per cent. from the start up to the present time. I think an investment in a Boston savings bank is a better investment.
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than cotton-mill stock has been. The railway service of the United States does not pay 5 per cent. upon the capital, even after you have wiped out all the watered stock, so called. If you take the railway service of the United States as a whole it has cost more than the present value of all the stocks and all the bonds now outstanding. There has been as much loss if not more on many railroads as there has been profit on a few, and Mr. Fink proved to you that the whole railway investment of the United States at its nominal value of about $7,000,000,000 only paid, I think, a little over 3 per cent. This is an immutable law. The competition of capital with capital tends or gravitates constantly to reducing the share of the annual product which capital can secure to itself. Now, then, what becomes of the rest? After the taxes are paid it must go to those who do the work; it cannot go anywhere else.

WHAT ARE THE FACTORS IN PRODUCTION?

What are the factors in this annual product?

First, the fertility of the soil; the productiveness of the mines; the abundance of the forests; second, the adequacy of the capital applied thereto; that is to say, the efficiency of tools and machines in rendering a large product possible with the minimum of human labor; third, time, that is to say hours of labor. If you restrict those who do the work, by statute, and forbid them to sell the only thing which is absolutely common to all, that is time, upon their own terms, you prevent the full application of capital and labor to our resources, which are of the most ample sort. You therefore, of necessity, have less annual product, and inasmuch as there is less to be divided, the capital invested will secure a larger share, because its increase will be checked by the lessened production, and labor will get a less share from a small product than it would have under free conditions from a large one. In other words, if you could succeed in depriving men and women of adult age of the right to sell their labor upon their own terms, and thus restricted the general hours of the whole community to some artificial number per day you would have a smaller product; you would have higher prices; you would have a smaller aggregate of capital, but it would secure a larger share of the small product and there would therefore be less to divide among the laborers, both absolutely and relatively. Fortunately for working people of adult age the restrictions which you attempt are impossible to be enforced by statute or are of such very limited application as not to do much harm. On the whole legislators have not succeeded in depriving men and women of their right to free contract.

PROFITS AND HOURS OF LABOR IN COTTON FACTORIES.

The annual product of this country has therefore vastly increased in ratio to the number of laborers employed therein, and in this matter certain definite and conclusive results can be presented. The cotton manufacture happens to represent the branch of work of which the accounts have been kept in a uniform way, almost from the first beginning of the art, and it is therefore possible to present certain facts in respect to one period as compared to another. Cotton factories were originally established in several States of New England. I cannot state accurately what ratio the capital in a cotton factory bore to its annual product thirty or forty years ago. It is now about $1 of capital to a $1.25 of product. In a rough and ready way one may say that if a factory can
realize $5 in $100, or 5 per cent. of the value of its product, it will now pay 6 per cent. to 7 per cent. upon its capital. The proportion of capital to product forty years ago was very much greater, probably nearly double. And at that time it was necessary for capital, in order to realize 6 per cent., to obtain nearly $12 in $100, i.e., more than 10 per cent. of the annual product for its own use. Even twenty years ago the hours of labor in factories were much longer than they are now, and thirty or forty years ago they were thirteen or fourteen hours a day against ten to eleven hours at the present time. It cannot be said that this change has been brought about by legislation, because the reduction in the hours of work has taken place in the several States with little regard to restrictive laws. In some States there have been none until very recent years, and in many States they have been substantially inoperative, except so far as children are concerned. I fully sustain acts for limiting the factory work of children when their parents are the ones against whom they must be protected. If the parents are so ignorant and incapable as to depend upon long hours of work from their children the State rightly steps in and becomes their guardian. But in regard to adults it cannot be claimed that restrictive statutes have had much to do with the reduction of the hours of labor. My own judgment is that such acts have retarded the shortening of hours of labor rather than promoted them, because I know that working people have gone from one State into another in order to be able to sell their own time on their own terms. Under these conditions what has happened? I have in my possession a series of documents most carefully prepared by the managers of factories which were in existence in this and other States as far back as 1828 (for the period of 1840 and 1842 they are exceedingly complete). From these and other sources I find that taking the date of 1830 to 1840 the following conditions substantially existed: The operatives were older on the average than they are now. They were mostly the sons and daughters of New England farmers. The hours of labor were thirteen to fourteen per day. The earnings of women of adult age were from 50 to 60 cents per day. The factories were low studded, ill ventilated, and badly heated as compared to the present. The conditions at the present time have changed greatly. The hours of labor are from ten to eleven per day. The work is so much more automatic that a less amount of intelligence serves to operate the machinery, and the work can now be done by those who would have been incapable of attending to the machinery as it was in the previous period; the earnings of adult women are to-day double what they were in the former periods named; more than double per hour, and in many cases double per day; while, on the other hand, the price of cotton cloth is about one-half what it then was. Therefore the increase of wealth and capital, instead of oppressing the laborer, has enabled the laborers in this art (to which all others are analogous) to earn twice as much money, of 50 per cent. greater purchasing power, in ten hours a day than they could earn thirty years ago in thirteen hours.

"PROGRESS AND POVERTY" BASED ON FALSE PREMISES.

The very able work of Henry George is, in my judgment, based on absolutely false premises. I do not think it is true in any sense that the increase of wealth has been accompanied by increase of poverty, neither here nor in England; on the contrary, the greater part of our poverty is imported, and the poor of other lands have come here be-
cause here they could prosper. It is true we have great poverty, but
why is it?

It has been alleged that because the rich grow richer the poor grow
poorer. I believe this a most pernicious falsehood. It is not the cap-
talists who, by becoming rich, deprives the poor of a good subsistence;
the contest for subsistence is not between rich and poor, and cannot be
in a free country. The struggle is among those who do the work, the
incapable striving to share the benefit of the work of the capable and
of the industries. In this matter as in that of the railroad there is but
one way in which you can shorten the hours of labor; you must pro-
mote intelligence and education among the people in order that with less
labour and less capital they can produce a larger annual product, nine-
tenths of which at least must be shared by them, and cannot in the
nature of things be secured by any other class of people, either by
capitalists, monopolists, or any one else.

You cannot impose prosperity upon the ignorant or incapable by any
statutes, and you cannot restrict the hours of labor of the intelligent
and capable by statute without impairing their condition and retarding
their prosperity.

The tendency of all such attempts is socialistic and despotic, and the
policy on which they are based is utterly foreign to the principle upon
which this nation is founded—that of personal liberty.

EFFECT OF RISE AND FALL OF COTTON-MILL WAGES.

The documents I have alluded to, and memoranda of my own for a
later period, from 1828 to 1840, sustain at every point the position I have
taken with regard to cotton mill wages. These wages cannot rise or
fall without the adjustment of all other wages thereto, and vice versa.
They cannot rise by themselves. As with cotton-mill wages so must it
have been with others, according to the relative skill required in other
branches. The farmer's daughters who formerly worked in the cotton
mills have been lifted up to better or easier kinds of work; to the use
of the sewing-machine and to the other various arts carried on in the
miscellaneous manufactures of our great cities; in Boston and elsewhere
they have left room for those who now operate the factories, for whom
there would not have been either work or place had not this lifting pro-
cess of capital, combined with intelligence, been applied to the varied
arts by which the means of subsistence of the people are now supplied.

Q. Would you be willing that a copy be made of those, or some por-
tions of them, or do you think you have given the substance of them in
your statement?—A. I have given the substance of them, but you can
copy from them to any extent desired.

Q. Are they valuable enough to be preserved in the public archives?
This testimony of yours would, of course, be preserved, and be avail-
able for a long time to come.—A. They will be carefully preserved.

The CHAIRMAN. If you would have the documents entirely copied at
the expense of the committee I think it would be a public service, un-
less there is some reason why it should not be done.

The WITNESS. I do not know that there is any such reason. They
were exceedingly private at the time they were made, but they were
sent to me with liberty to use them. I would only care to omit the
names of the particular factories.

The CHAIRMAN. If you will have such matter as you choose from them
copied and forwarded to me I will see that the expenses are paid, be-
cause I can see how that matter may be exceedingly valuable.
THE TARIFF.

Q. Are you willing to be construed as saying that these changes from that period to the present in the reward of labor and in the price of the products now consumed, coming from the manufacturing industries, are due entirely to a protective tariff—you will be construed as making that statement, and that use will be made of the figures you have furnished. I wish to understand if you desired that deduction to be drawn from the facts you have stated, and from the statistics you have given.—A. I do not desire that deduction to be drawn; I think these changes have gone on throughout the period named under a law of their own, which the changes of the tariff have altered little for the time being, but that the tariff has had comparatively little to do with it. I am not speaking now either as a protectionist or as a free-trader. I do not want to go into that branch of this subject, for many reasons, but I desire to say that I do not consider a tariff as a very potent factor in altering the distribution of the earnings of the people. It does more in altering the direction of labor and drawing it in one line rather than another, but you observe that this progressive increase in wages has gone on steadily and without much variation through all the various and numerous changes of tariff that have happened from 1824 down to the present time.

As I have said, I do not think that this great question should be turned aside for the consideration of mere detail, and I regard the question of tariff as one of detail; but there are fundamental laws regulating the whole matter irrespective of statutes—laws which those statutes may slightly change in their direction, for a shorter or longer period, but cannot greatly change in their final result. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. PUGH. I understand you.

The WITNESS. In respect to the tariff itself, I would say that my position is very well known as being that of an advocate of freer trade, now tending, ultimately, but very gradually, to free trade. It is the same ground which is taken by all moderate and reasonable advocates of protection.

FEARS FROM EXCESS OF REVENUE.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. When?—A. I assign no time to that end. I dread the present condition of affairs. I greatly fear that the pressure of the excess of revenue will force such changes in the laws for its collection as to do harm in the process while ending in good; and I rather expect to have a drag on the wheel, lest the changes should be made with too great rapidity, than to be one to stimulate revolutionary methods; because next to the mischief of imposing heavy taxes may be the mischief of a bad method or undue haste in getting rid of them. A high tariff alters the whole direction of industry, and must therefore be changed with great caution.

HOW THE TARIFF SHOULD BE REDUCED.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Upon what class of articles ought the reduction to commence?—A. Upon what are commonly, but incorrectly, called "raw materials," that is to say, upon the materials in their primary form of manufacture, but which enter into the further processes of domestic industry. I think that all taxes, of whatever name or nature, should, as far as possible, b
gathered from things which represent the completed result of the labor that has been applied upon them; i. e., which are in their final form ready for human consumption, so that the taxes upon them do not get duplicated.

Q. Then the next class in the line?—A. Articles which may be called articles of comfort; of which those who consume them can spare a little (if it is necessary that they should spare a little) for the purposes of taxation, without having their ability to work impaired thereby. You can readily understand that if a man wants a supply of water he would be very foolish if he took it from the head of the fall, before it had got through the water-wheel, when he could as readily take it from the foot of the fall, after it had worked his wheel. And the mischief of a tax may be much greater if it is placed at the head of the fall, that is, upon materials on which people are going to exert their labor, rather than at the foot of the fall, where a little water may well be taken, if wanted, without impairing the industrial power of the man from whom it is taken.

Next, there is a large list left of articles which may be called in one sense luxuries, such as the higher or finer forms of textile fabrics, which depend on fancy and fashion for their sale, and a great many articles which you may pick out in the list, on which revenue duties may well be imposed for a long period to come, if the revenue is needed and as long as it is needed.

WHISKY AND TOBACCO TAX.

Q. Take the internal revenue as it now exists on alcoholic liquor and tobacco, what portion of the ordinary expenses of the Government may be derived from whisky and tobacco?—A. I have not looked into that question very much of late. The last time I studied it, the revenue from spirits (manufactured at home and imported) was about equal to the ordinary expenses of the Government, legislative, judicial, consular, and diplomatic. The revenue from tobacco was rather more than the expenses of the Army. I think the reduced revenue from tobacco under the new act would support the Army, and the revenue from beer would float the Navy, only that we have no great Navy to float. We have spent since 1866 about $350,000,000 for a Navy. I should be glad to see the results of this expenditure somewhere.

Q. The revenue from whisky and tobacco added to the revenue that would be collected from tariff duties on articles of luxury, as you class them or as they could be classed, would relieve the necessaries that go into common consumption from the burden of taxation?—A. Yes, and also relieve the commodities which enter into the processes of domestic manufacture, commonly, but incorrectly, called raw materials.

Q. Those two classes of articles, the raw materials entering into the processes of manufacture, and the articles that go into necessary consumption—A. (Interposing.) May be judiciously relieved from the burden of taxation; but I do not think that even that should be done except by measured judgment and with full time for adjustment to the new conditions.

Mr. Pugh. Of course, by cautious and well regulated reduction.

The Witness. Yes, the industries of the country have adjusted themselves to these present conditions, and they must be as gradually altered as circumstances will permit; my dread is that the excess of revenue will force the removal of duties faster than good judgment will warrant.
PROBABLE EFFECT ON REVENUE, OF PRESENT TARIFF.

Q. What is your opinion as to the results of the existing tariff upon the revenue? Will it reduce or increase the surplus?—A. I do not think that any one can yet answer that question. My opinion was when the new tariff act was passed, that it would not reduce the revenue, because the first lesson in taxation is that lower rates mean larger revenue. Whether that is to be the case with these new rates or not, no one can yet tell. But you will observe that while you nominally reduced the revenue at the last session of Congress, you also reduced the appropriations in yet greater measure, and therefore if the ordinary consumption of the country continues, you are liable to have the largest excess of revenue in the calendar year 1884, or surely in 1885, that we have ever been subjected to. Your arrears of pensions will probably be paid within two years, and the current pensions will not exceed a $40,000,000 year; so that after 1884, or thereabouts, there will be another reduction of appropriations, and again an increase of surplus, and it is in dealing with this enormous surplus that I fear the changes will be of a revolutionary character, and somewhat disastrous. I wish the reduction had begun much earlier, so that it might have been slower.

Q. You would have advised an earlier reduction?—A. I would have advised an earlier beginning, so that the changes might now be more gradual than I fear it will be.

GOLD COIN THE TRUE BASIS OF CURRENCY.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How would it do to pay the national debt while this process of reduction was going on?—A. If the people were prepared to accept a currency based on gold exclusively, I would have no objection to the entire payment of the national debt.

Q. What do you mean by "exclusively," while the paper in circulation is representative of an actual dollar in coin?—A. Each paper dollar in circulation should, in my judgment, be the actual representative of gold coin, dollar for dollar.

Q. So that if there were a thousand million dollars in circulation, there should be a thousand million dollars of coin to represent it?—A. That is the only safe theory of a paper circulation, in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. I am glad to have my opinion sustained.

The WITNESS. But I do not think the people are prepared for that. The bank-note circulation is one of the results of the war, and I do not like to advocate the removal of the bank-note circulation until the people are prepared for a positive currency based on positive coin. I would only use paper as the representative of coin, to save the wear of the coin itself.

STATE BONDS AS A BASIS OF CURRENCY.

Q. Do you see any difficulty in the selection of some other security well known to the country—State bonds or some other, giving to it the guarantee of the nation, and substituting them gradually for the existing circulation based on the debt of the country?—A. I do see endless difficulty, if the Congress of the United States undertakes to discriminate among the evidences of debt or bonds of the different States, and
to say that one shall be taken and the other left—that one State is safe to be trusted and another not.

Q. Even so far as its own guarantee is concerned?—A. Yes; even so far as its own guarantee is concerned. Could this committee choose to-day among the several State bonds?

DANGEROUS OF A SILVER STANDARD.

Q. Then you would fall back gradually on a circulation based on gold coin and silver?—A. I should upon gold coin only, as full legal tender, with a subsidiary silver coin of substantially the same value if a steady ratio between gold and silver should be established again. I do not think that the true value of silver is yet estabished. I look for more danger to the working people of this country, from the continued coinage of the present silver dollar, than from any other cause of danger now apparent.

Q. You apprehend the amount of coined silver is so fast increasing that there is danger of its becoming a standard?—A. Yes. Very great danger of it. It is said that "The Lord takes care of drunken men, fools and the United States," and in the United States we have protected pretty well thus far, but a year of bad crops, or a substitution of East India wheat for ours in Europe, would send the gold out of the country and bring us to a standard of debased silver of fluctuating value. I look upon that as the one great danger staring the whole community in the face at the present time.

Q. You would stop the further coinage?—A. I would, emphatically.

Q. What would you do with that outstanding—do you consider that a sufficient amount to be dangerous?—A. I do. In a new coinage act I would provide for making a silver dollar worth a little more than a gold dollar, if I could, by making it heavier than a silver dollar now is; just as the original silver dollar of which the present coin is an imitation was worth 104 to 105 cents in gold in 1835.

Q. Would you call it in and recoin it with a larger amount of silver?—A. Yes; and overvalue it a little on purpose so that it might gradually disappear as "the dollar of our daddies" did disappear; our dollars would then be taken by such nations as desired to use silver, and recoin. In that way our silver might remove itself without shock. There are some great forces now working in the direction of that possibility. India began to supply Great Britain with wheat in 1873. The first export of wheat from India to Great Britain was in that year. Last year India supplied to Great Britain one-fifth part of the wheat (converting flour into wheat) which she imported, and the power of India to increase her sales of wheat is only a question of transportation. This year the rail-ways of India have reduced their charges, which were double ours, so that wheat may move more freely. If England increases the capacity of the Suez Canal the wheat traffic will be increased and India may supply England with all the wheat she needs. It is a question of price, and that price depends upon transportation. If India keeps increasing the supply of wheat to Great Britain, the Indian demand for silver may absorb the whole hundred millions of silver that we have got picked away in our vaults; the growers of wheat in India hoard silver and will take it in large quantities. But that you say may deprive us of a market for our wheat, which is true; but that very deprivation of a market will turn the current of exchange against us and will call our gold from us. We are losing our market for wheat in some measure now, and we can-
not alter the conditions; we can only get such an advantage in the sale of our silver as will in a measure compensate us.*

EFFECT OF EAST INDIA WHEAT ON THE FARMERS AND RAILROADS OF THE UNITED STATES.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. What becomes of the wheat growers of the West when England is supplied from India?—A. The increase of population in this country will gradually need all the wheat that we can grow. You will observe in this treatise I have referred to upon the railroad and the grain crop in the Agricultural Journal, that whereas the course of the increased mileage of railways from 1855 to 1880 was followed by an equivalent increase in the grain crops of the United States, the more railroads there were the more grain there was to be moved. You will now observe, however, that although the mileage of the railroads has increased 25 per cent. in the last three years, the grain crops have not increased at all. We have, perhaps, reached the limit of the profitable cultivation of wheat. India is already competing with California. We cannot raise or move grain more than we already have moved at existing prices. That is one reason why railroad stocks are depressed. There are 25 per cent. more railroads, and no more crops or heavier to be moved upon them. You will bear in mind that grain, food, timber, and fuel constitute 80 per cent. of all that the railroads carry, and grain cannot be moved in any larger quantity unless the foreign price will warrant it.

Mr. Pugh. There is a large amount of statistics to show that the railroads and water transportation do not carry the surplus grain crop of the West to market; that there is a large quantity left behind.

The Witness. Then it is because it is held for a higher price. There is no end to the carrying capacity of the railroads, but I doubt if they can possibly reduce their present freight charge.

Q. What amount of the wheat of the West is carried by rail to the tide-water markets?—A. The larger part of it, I suppose, but you must call upon Mr. Henry V. Poor to show you the relative quantities I have not the data in my mind.

Mr. Pugh. I understand that Mr. Fink said the rail did not carry more than one-half of it.

The Witness. I should say that of the total food products, the railroads did carry more than that.

Q. He said that after the water-ways were closed up by ice about one-half of the crop was left for the railroads, and then they increased their rate of transportation as soon as the competition of the water-ways disappeared under the ice.—A. I have not looked into that. Henry V. Poor can give you all that information.

*Since this evidence was given I have received a letter from a gentleman in England conveying the following statement:

"In six months ending September 30, 1883, 15,000,000 cwts. of wheat were exported from India to Europe. Only 19,000,000 cwts. were exported to Europe in the whole year preceding this six months, and the trade only began in 1873."

The latest commercial statements show a continuing increase in this supply. If we lose a considerable part of our foreign market for wheat and continue to prevent the export of silver by buying up the larger part of the product to be coined into dollars of light weight, gold must soon be exported. If, on the other hand, we recoin our dollars into heavy coin and cease to buy bullion, silver will take the place of wheat in our exports and will gravitate to India via England.—E. A.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

THE SILVER QUESTION AGAIN.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. With regard to the silver question that you spoke of; if it should so come about that our own increasing home market will consume all our wheat and corn product, which is now the substantial part of our exportation, and with which we now buy foreign commodities—and meanwhile we should come to manufacture pretty much all that we need for ourselves—assuming that England gets her food from Hindostan or India, in what way would the silver question remain a dangerous one—what would lead to the exportation of great quantities of gold?—A. You have assumed in that that we cease to import.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I assume that by the time that these consequences have reached us, England is supplied with food from India, and that during the intervening time our own capacity to produce the great variety of things that we need is increased at the rate it is now increasing, so that we can be substantially self-supporting people. Do you think that is a violent assumption?

The WITNESS. I certainly do think that is a violent assumption.

Q. In what regard?—A. Well, if you will classify the imports you will see.

Q. I mean in what regard, from England?—A. Permit me to ask what difference does it make where it comes from? England is the clearing-house; that is all.

Q. You think it necessary and likely that she would always remain so?—A. I think we shall always be heavy importers. It you will examine the table of imported articles in the report of the Bureau of Statistics you will observe that about two-thirds of all the things we import are either what are called raw materials, or finished commodity like chemicals, drugs and dye-stuffs, which are necessary in the progress of domestic industry; or else they consist of tea, coffee, sugar and the like, which cannot be classed luxuries in any sense. Only the smaller part can be called luxuries, and the imports of this class are about the steadiest of the whole. I cannot conceive of such national isolation as will in any great measure check our imports, and the heavier you make the duties on raw materials the greater will be the proportionate import of finished manufactures.

FOREIGN MARKETS.

The CHAIRMAN. We have had some testimony before us to the effect that Spain, for instance, offered a very inviting field as a foreign market for a great variety of American products if we should only go there. Governor Smyth, of Manchester, N. H., testified that he had been in Spain and made careful observations, and he says there are certain goods which are sold in the stores of Manchester, N. H., at the present time, and which he named, that would bring just double that price in Spain, and that the item of transportation would be a mere trifle; that there are sixteen millions of people there, and that we certainly would be able to find a good market, because an article would sell there for $1 which here would bring only 30 cents at retail. Then, there is certainly a field where we could, one would suppose, exchange to pretty good advantage, in Brazil and South America; and it seems to me as though there ought to be some opening for the railway system which we are constructing to Mexico. It has been testified here to-day that practically upon very many valuable and important items in the way of
cotton manufacture, there is no tariff at all necessary, and that we can export to almost all parts of the world wherever Great Britain sends manufactures, if we can contrive to get there, either by the use of British bottoms or by getting ships of our own in which to send our commodities. It has appeared to me that, in the course of, say, ten years, even if we lost the foreign markets, we might get so as to make up for the exportation of coin; but perhaps not.

THE CREDIT SYSTEM IN ENGLISH COMMERCE.

The Witness. It is a matter that neither you nor I can very well forecast, but in considering the possibilities you must first consider that we cannot export unless we import. But there are other elements. If we consider the trade with South America, it is necessary to take notice of many other elements in the case than the mere price or quality of our goods. There is no doubt whatever that South America desires American goods of many kinds and even prefers them to English goods of like kind, but if you will examine the conditions of the South American traffic in and with Great Britain you will find that it is conducted on eight, ten, and twelve months' credit, granted by English bankers in Manchester and London, and that until we have supplemented our ability to manufacture by a system of banking credits with foreign countries we are handicapped.

Compare also other conditions. The English spinner spins the yarn; the English weaver (called there the manufacturer) weaves the yarn into cloth; the warehouseman buys the gray cloth without any stamp or name upon it and finishes it, prints it, dyes it, and packs it with reference to the particular market to which it is to go; whether it be Patagonia, Brazil, or Australia. The warehouseman then arranges with the banker to draw a bill of exchange for the value of those goods, or for a certain proportion of their value at six months, and, generally, in South American trade, with the expectation of renewal for six months. That bill is discounted in London or in Manchester or in Scotland, and with the money the warehouseman pays the manufacturer in cash. The trade goes on on the basis of the joint credit of the warehouseman and the banker. Hence, time is given in Brazil, for instance, for receiving the goods which are packed in little bales, with pieces of particular kinds and lengths and particular "head-ends" of particular pattern and stamp. These small bales are packed on mule-backs and carried to the fairs in the far interior of South America, at which they are sold. The time is also necessary for the trader in South America, who conducts that part of the business, to get back his money and bring it down to Rio Janeiro or to some other port, and remit it to meet the bill of exchange drawn against the goods. That whole great system of commerce, the result of decades of practice, must be established here in order that we may take away any large share of that traffic. We have hardly any of these banking facilities yet. A German merchant, whom I met lately in Manchester, England, said he would move to New York and buy American goods provided he could get the necessary credits on which to do his business, as he received them in Manchester; but there was no banking system in this country established to that end, and therefore he stayed in Manchester and bought the English fabrics. You will observe that the price alone is but a small part of the whole machinery of the traffic.

Q. You think before we could expect to largely increase our foreign commerce with any countries, it would be necessary to establish a sys-
tem of that kind, or would it only be necessary with reference to the South American market?—A. My statement is substantially true of the trade of the world. London furnishes the banking capital, and in that way, by granting the long credits which are necessary for the trade of the world, Great Britain is enabled to hold it more than by the quality or price of her goods. I think it will take so long for us to grow up to that system that in the mean time, before we do so, we shall probably have the outflow of the gold and the establishment of the silver standard if we do not stop the coining of silver at once.

Q. Then do you think that even if the gold and silver both all went it would not be any particular detriment to the currency, so long as the Government guarantees stand?—A. I have referred to those gentlemen who testify in favor of paper money as the "cranks," with whom I do not want to be identified in this hearing. I do not think their errors are worth the attention or discussion of sensible men. I would send them all where Boccaccio sent Friar John, "to the land of mendacity, where they use only paper money."

EFFECT OF A SILVER BASIS ON WAGES.

The CHAIRMAN. One investigation of the Senate, somewhat protracted—much more so than this one has been—resulted in a two-volume report in confirmation of that theory.

The WITNESS. I was seven hours before that committee, subjected to cross-examination by your colleague, Senator Jones, and I never enjoyed anything better than his attempt to break down my testimony. I do not think he succeeded very well.

Q. Neither one of you convinced the other?—A. It is not always wise to attempt to convince one who is not willing to be convinced, and does not intend to be, but as an intellectual fencing with an able man it was rather good fun.

Mr. PUGH. Mr. Jones of Nevada?

The WITNESS. Mr. Jones of Nevada.

Q. You do not think that the change to a silver basis would be accompanied with a corresponding inflation of wages so as to protect the laborer?—A. Perhaps ultimately, but the same effect would result if always does result when currency is debased. Prices would rise before wages; shrewd men would pick the pockets of the laborers before they could find out what had happened to them. Ultimately, all the prices having risen, wages would necessarily follow, but with a great struggle, and after much distress.

The CHAIRMAN. The wage workers look back to the period of inflation as to a golden age.

The WITNESS. Yes; but in order to repeat that age you must get up another war, with its excessive demand and its excessive destruction of property, in order to create the abnormal demand for labor and raise wages as they were raised during the war time. We were spending our credit then and we paid the price of that extravagance in the panic and depression which came upon us afterward.

Q. You can see no prospect of any such abnormal condition of things as would remedy the inflation?—A. I see nothing now. No chance of any remedy.

Q. There would be nothing to stimulate production corresponding to the inflation?—A. On the contrary, every man who had any sense in his head would stop investing in permanent securities; he would cease investments in fixed capital for the employment of labor; he would go
no further than he was already bound in investments, but he would speculate in all sorts of commodities for a rise in prices as the debasement of the currency began to work. I saw that done so much during the war, so shrewdly, and I saw so many great fortunes made in that way, that I should expect to see the same course of events in the same manner if we come to the silver standard.

Q. Would you see any objection to continuing the coinage of silver if it was in the form of a dollar of the increased value—which you mentioned—somewhat above the gold standard—considering that we are a largely silver-producing nation, and wish to do something to create a market for the silver of our mines?—A. If we coined a heavier dollar it would doubtless cause a quicker demand for silver for a time, especially, if India should take silver for wheat; but I do not propose the plan for that purpose. What business have you to legislate in order to make a market for silver any more than for any other product? Our production of silver is about $40,000,000 a year, and that is about one-tenth part the value of the dairy products of the United States. If you will pass an act for increasing the demand for dairy products and by creating an artificial demand for cheese at the same time that you create an artificial demand for silver; then go on and enact another statute for the creation of an artificial demand for timber, and for all other products of the mines and of the soil—why, then, you may justify the creation of an artificial market for silver, but not otherwise. Why should you buy and store silver which is one of our most unprofitable products, rather than pig iron, copper, lead, or even cheese, which improves with age, when stored in such a vault as we need for our useless stock of silver.

Q. Would that be doing so if you gave silver the same value that the gold dollar has, and enough more to guarantee against conceivable inflation?

The WITNESS. May I answer by asking another question?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

The WITNESS. How will you give the same value to silver that you give to gold?

The CHAIRMAN. I said the increased value that you suggest to the silver dollar by increasing the weight until the actual value, as compared with the gold dollar, was $1.04 instead of $1.

The WITNESS. Ah, that is another matter. That would serve the purpose of disposing of the silver, supposing no new bonanza were discovered.

FLUCTUATIONS IN VALUE, OF GOLD AND SILVER.

Q. Suppose there should be another discovery of gold mines, or of gold capacity to produce, as in California. Gold itself is by no means without its fluctuations, and it is claimed, I believe, that in the course of the four thousand years that our folks have been in this world, it has fluctuated more than silver!—A. I have studied that question a good deal. I do not think the fluctuations of gold have been so great, but I now hold that silver has been depreciated by the abundance of gold. If you will go back to 1849, and compile statistics of the production of gold from that time to the present, and place alongside of it the production of silver, you will find that there has been three times as much gold added to the circulation of the world as there has of silver, measuring at the old ratio of 13½ to 1, or thereabout; and, inasmuch as gold has been chosen by Germany, by Italy, and by the United States as the best or
common legal tender, gold has displaced silver to that extent, while the abnormal condition of things in India in the last ten years has prevented the absorption of the silver there.

Now, I hold distinctly that gold itself has depreciated as well as silver, only that the silver has depreciated in greater measure. And I think that is proved by this: In 1845, the London Economist ascertained the prices of the leading articles of commerce—twenty-two in number, dealt in in England—cotton, pork, timber, iron, lead, copper, wool, and so on. They called the price in 1845, of each article, 100, and footed them up to a standard number of 2,200. That was a standard of the prices of those articles in gold at that date. In 1872, prior to the panic, after the war had ceased to affect cotton materially, that standard number of those twenty-two articles had risen to about 3,700. I do not remember the exact point. In 1873, the decline began; in 1879 prices had got back to where they started in 1845, to wit, 2,200. Since then they have advanced again. What the standard is to-day I am not quite certain. Now, there is not one of those articles, with the exception of timber, the labor cost of which had not been immensely reduced by one invention or another, by cheaper transportation, or by some other factor; and the mere fact that the reduction of labor cost has not been followed by a reduction of the gold standard of price, is, to my mind, conclusive evidence that gold itself had lost a part of its purchasing power. And that, inasmuch as gold had become so very abundant as to throw silver out of use, silver had been yet more depreciated, though the product had been only one-third, in that period, of the production of gold at the ratio of 15:4 to 1. Now, to attempt to give the same value to two substances is beyond your power or mine, or anybody’s else. You can adjust one weight to another for the time being, but it is beyond the power of all the men, in all the lands of the world, to establish a positive measure of value; and no legislation can reach it. I adhere to the gold standard, because I believe it to be the most uniform, the most convenient, and because it is the standard of all international commerce.

Q. After all, is not the question of whether silver shall be coined or not dependent upon this question, whether the demand for the use of coin as money is greater than either one, or greater than gold alone can supply? It does not follow, does it, because you cannot absolutely and permanently adjust these two to each other so that there shall not be fluctuation afterwards, that both should not be used, because in all past experience it has been found necessary to employ both, and that for the reason that the demand for money, or for the coin value of money, has been such that neither of the metals would supply it in full, and so they took the two and made such adjustment of them as they could, and from time to time modified that adjustment? Now, if silver has depreciated as compared with gold, is it not because gold has become sufficient, or nearly so, to answer the purposes of coin to the world, and therefore the use of silver is less necessary now than formerly?—A. That is exactly what I have been saying.

Q. And therefore the time has come when it may disappear entirely from the world?—A. I have said that I think you may so recoin our silver that semi-barbarous nations will take it from us at its present rates to gold. If silver still declines in price you may again be obliged to increase the weight of the silver coin.

Q. And you see no reason to believe that in the development of commerce among the fifteen hundred million people in this world, by gradual civilization, there will be a demand for a greater amount of money; and
especially considering that they are in a barbaric condition and gradually civilizing up to a condition where they would seem to want more and more coin; you see nothing in that of the prospect of a gradual increase in the necessity for coin?—A. I see no such increase; civilized nations use coin least in ratio to traffic.

Q. These millions in Africa, for instance, do not want gold, but value in a form like silver.—A. The foreign nations may absorb our silver when you establish more commerce with them, but we cannot tell how soon that change will come. If you will admit African wool free of duty they may take silver for it.

Q. There are those hundreds of millions in Asia, and there are projected transcontinental railways there.—A. You cannot tell much about that. You cannot legislate upon such elements; they are too uncertain and remote. You cannot force silver on those who do not now want it.

Q. The position you take is that silver should be used merely as a subsidiary coin; and if so used only its intrinsic value as a coin is matter of indifference, and therefore copper, paper, or anything which the Government chooses, should be taken as subsidiary coin, and may be substituted even if it has no value at all, may it not?—A. No; I think not. I think that even a subsidiary coin should have as near a full gold value as you can establish for it.

Q. Why is it necessary that it should have any, excepting durability, and the quality of legal tender to a certain amount? Why is it necessary that for safety it should have the same intrinsic value as the gold?—A. I think all coin should have as near a uniform value as we can give to it. I should increase the weight of all the silver coins.

Q. Even the subsidiary?—A. Even the subsidiary, unless you wish to cheat the very poor.

The CHAIRMAN. That seems to be logical and consistent with your general view.

The WITNESS. I hope so. In other words, I believe in currency absolutely carrying its own value in its own body as the truest, cheapest, and best.

Q. But if the gold was as convenient to use as subsidiary coin, then you would use no silver whatever?—A. When gold becomes so plenty as to become convenient in the size of small coins, I think silver will have gone out of use as money.

Q. This matter might seem outside of the general question, but in your mind this might seem to be a great danger for the working people?—A. The greatest danger now impending, I think, the danger of depreciation in the standard of value and a sudden rise in prices without a rise in wages; or else a commercial paralysis, injurious to all alike, by stopping all constructive enterprise.

Q. And you think it might be developed by a year of short crops?—A. It might be developed at any moment. A great foreign war, in which we had no part, might bring it upon us, though such a great foreign war might create a demand upon us for other commodities, which might for the time counteract its financial effect to some extent; but the chances and changes may precipitate upon us the silver dollar as our sole or single standard. That is my fear. I think the danger is already affecting trade.

DISPOSAL OF THE SURPLUS.

Q. If not taxing you too long, I would like to ask you whether you have any suggestions to make as to the safe way of getting rid of our surplus revenue that is accumulating without at the same time in-
terfering with the continuity of business by a shock?—A. There are two ways: One proposed by Mr. George S. Coe and other bankers; that is to say, taxing small bills out of existence—one and two dollar bills—so that there should be no paper dollars less than five. I think that is his proposition. The other and, I think, the safer one is increasing the weight of the coin so that it shall be worth a little more than gold at the present price of silver bullion. Then the dealers in coin will take them off, and if the price of silver should keep at 50 pence or a little above we would get rid of as much of the silver as we wanted to without knowing where it went. It would apparently cost something, but our nominal profit on silver coinage is all book-keeping, and the real cost would be a trifle, i.e., the cost of recoinage.

The CHAIRMAN. I am glad I brought that out, but you misunderstood me, through indistinctness of statement as to the surplus I referred to. I referred to the surplus in the Treasury beyond our annual expenditure. The tariff brings us—or some form of taxation brings us—more than we spend.

The WITNESS. You must get your surplus out of the Treasury either in paying current expenses or in paying the debt.

Q. You would not suggest any public improvement upon which to spend it?—A. I might refer you to the Navy, on which we have spent more than $15,000,000 a year—about $350,000,000 in all since the war—without anything to show for it. I do not believe in taxing and then spending in that way.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

Q. You would not fix up the Mississippi River so as to make it a permanent channel of commerce?—A. I am an advocate of the improvement of the Mississippi River at a moderate cost, for the reason that it is beyond the power of States, and requires a treatment of the whole river as a unit. Carefully guarded, I would make appropriation for the Mississippi River; but what would that amount to? It would only take a moderate annual sum spread over many years, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. But many careful men—perhaps Senator Pugh—am I incorrect in saying that many careful men are of opinion that the improvements being entered upon would ultimately cost several hundred millions?

Mr. PUGH. That is as to the levee of the river, so as to protect the agricultural lands from overflow. Everybody knows that that would cost several hundred millions; but I do not know whether the Government is going into the business of reclaiming agricultural lands under the name of "improving the Mississippi."

The WITNESS. What I know about the cost was obtained from information from Mr. Henry Mitchell, the leading member of the Mississippi River Commission—a man upon whose integrity and judgment I entirely depend, and I have not derived the idea from him that the regulation of the navigation of the Mississippi River according to the plan of the Commission would cost any such excessive sum as the Senator names. I know that the appropriation made by the last Congress was more than he desired, and more than the Commission spent during the season.

Mr. PUGH. I do not wish to be understood as suggesting that the appropriation needed to perfect the navigation of the river for commercial purposes is going to cost any such sum, but I say that if the purpose is to reclaim the agricultural lands of the Mississippi Valley from overflow, why, there is no limit to the amount it will take.
The WITNESS. I should be as much opposed to any such undertaking as that as I would be in favor of the improvement of the navigation. And I only make the exception in favor of the improvement of the navigation of the Mississippi River, for the reason that States in their State capacity are unable to deal with it. The river must be treated as a unit.

DANGERS ARISING FROM THE EXISTENCE OF SURPLUS REVENUE.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Disregarding all that, and assuming that nothing can be done there that will relieve us, then we are left with the truth as it is; any reduction of the tariff which does not destroy our industries upon their present basis increases the revenue. How are we to expend it?—A. That is precisely why I say to you that not having begun reduction in time, we are now subjected to very great dangers, under the pressure of this excess of revenue.

Q. Yes; but we have to make one election; and it does not help anybody out for you to say, "Here is this great difficulty; now you Senators go ahead and save us from it." In what way is it to be done? There is the tariff; there is the business of the country based on it at the present time; there is the surplus of the country accumulating under the existing forms of taxation. If you do not reduce the tariff you get a greater surplus; if you do reduce the tariff, you bankrupt the whole country at once. That is the evil. Then you have to contrive in some way to pay that surplus out. You cannot reach a great part of the debt with it. You can reach but a very small part of it, unless you do so by a species of force, and that interference with the national banking system which you do not wish to touch in any way that I see to be practical—for we have not got the dollar behind every bank note—and if we did have, it would be the same interference with the debt and with the currency. Now we have got to spend that surplus for something—either in some vast educational system, or in building up a Navy that will be of some account, one that will go horizontally instead of perpendicularly in the water. There can be no sense in increasing the Army, because there is apparently nothing to do with it if it were increased; but there is the Navy, a school system, a system of internal material improvements, such as have been suggested—any one or all of these combined would offer us some means of spending the surplus. Might not such an expenditure be attended with less evil than a continual increase of the surplus, or the effort to destroy the surplus by the danger to the business of the country—to commit a sort of commercial suicide by interfering with the business of the country? In what way are we to get out of this?—A. That is precisely what I said to you—that I did not wish to discuss the question before you. It is for that reason that I have ceased to take any sort of interest in the contention between free traders and protectionists.

Q. I thought it was generally accorded all around by the free trader and protectionist that there can be no violent removal of the tariff?—A. There ought not to be.

Q. That there ought not to be a violent removal of it for the reason that there cannot be without disaster?—A. There may be partial disaster. You cannot cause any general disaster.

Q. The partial removal of the tariff increases the difficulty because it increases the income, and the income is the source of danger unless we spend it?—A. Yes.
Q. To spend that income is the source of danger?—A. I can give you my opinion if you ask it. I cannot lead you out, but I see the difficulty as plainly as you do. What will happen is this: that if you attempt to make these greater appropriations merely in order to get rid of money for which the people now feel that they have been unduly taxed, they will turn you out of office and put in Representatives and Senators who will abate the taxes and run all the risk of so doing. There is where the danger is coming; that instead of the taxes being abated gradually, by a moderate and prudent system, they will be abated under the passion and prejudice of a sectional and bitter demand for the removal of taxes without regard to whom it hurts. And there is where your danger is coming. I cannot help you, and I do not think anybody else can. The risk of reducing the revenue must be taken. In the process some harm will be done, because it has been too long deferred, but the end will be attained and the prosperity due to a country free of debt, lightly taxed, and without a standing Army will surely follow. The danger is only in the process.

Mr. Ross. It is very evident that you Senators have discovered the same thing that we who live here have discovered. You see Mr. Atkinson has come to a standstill on the subject of revenue; but he is riding another hobby about here which this committee may not know so much about as those of us who live here, and I take the liberty to remind the committee of it.

The Witness. I will say that Mr. Ross and I are apt to ride the same hobby.

Mr. Ross. I take the liberty of putting the committee in the possession of this fact, so that they may call him out upon a hobby that I am interested in. The hobby he is riding now is technical education. This danger is not so much in the problem itself as it is in the attempt of each State, each section, and each industry to get an advantage over the other. If the wool grower insists on high duties, the woolen manufacturer must secure still higher; if the one is out of relation to the other, both will be ruined. On the other hand, if the wool growers would only study the facts of the last fifty years, and were convinced by that record that free wool gives the best protection and the highest price to the domestic wool grower, then it would be easy enough to reduce the tariff on woolen goods, and yet promote the domestic manufacture of woolens.

It is historically true that during the fifty years since a duty was imposed on wool there have been some periods when wool has been nearly free and others when the duty has been very high. The price of domestic wool has followed an inverse order; it has been highest when foreign wool has been most nearly free and lowest when the duty has been high.

Any woolen manufacturer can explain this; but if farmers will cheat themselves, who can help it?

I have said that I anticipate great danger in the reduction of the revenue, especially from customs, but it is the method which I fear, not the reduction itself. I think a tribunal could be named who would make a plan for the reduction of the customs revenue about $75,000,000 (and nothing else will suffice to get rid of surplus except the removal of almost all the internal taxes) without any appreciable harm to any one and with the maximum benefit to all—but I see no prospect of any such sensible course; the time has gone by.

The surplus and the silver dollar constitute our two great present dangers. I would, for one, even sustain the plan for reducing the revenue almost wholly by reducing or abating the internal taxes rather
than not reduce at all, if, by so agreeing, the coinage of base silver dollars could also be stopped. The friends and opponents of a high tariff both exaggerate its relative importance and thereby incumber the settlement of details with useless difficulties; hence the constant danger of minor changes in detail, which render the conduct of all business uncertain. If the subject could once be fairly treated by an impartial tribunal, a simple tariff might be agreed upon which would have some prospect of stability. Instability is almost the worst of evils.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not mean by applying the word “hobby” to it to indicate that it is at all objectionable?

Mr. Ross. Not at all. Mr. Atkinson has just returned from Europe and is full of valuable information on that subject. I would like to have the committee probe him a little, and see if he would not be willing to get us out of the difficulty by having part of the surplus appropriated in establishing some form of technical schools throughout the country and so letting us have the benefit of some of it in Boston.

The CHAIRMAN. We would be very glad to hear Mr. Atkinson’s views upon the matter of technical education.

Mr. Ross. So as to get an appropriation of money for that purpose.

Mr. Pugh. That would only take a very small portion of the money.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course it would not help us out until it was gone into on a large scale, but we should be glad, Mr. Atkinson, to hear your views on the subject.

The WITNESS. Money alone will not establish technical education. It is only a small part of what is needed.

The CHAIRMAN. Won’t you please let us hear from you on that subject?

The WITNESS. I am willing, if it will not weary you.

The CHAIRMAN. We are willing to be a little wearied for the sake of instruction.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN EUROPE.

The WITNESS. The marked feature throughout Europe, in France and Germany, Holland and Sweden first, and now in England, is the establishment of technical schools of the first, second, and third class. We have started fairly in the first class without teaching the alphabet, and we are now finding out the way to supplement the higher education with which we began, with the subsidiary branches of purely technical or trade education—industrial, mechanical, and manufacturing.

All I can say is this, that in every principal manufacturing town in France, Germany, and England there is now, or soon will be, a special school well endowed and thoroughly equipped for scientific instruction in the particular art that distinguishes that town from its fellows. I know more of course about the textile industry, because I have been in that all my life. At Crefeld, in Rhenish Prussia, there is a weaving and dyeing school occupying buildings as large as either of the buildings of the Institute of Technology, for the single purpose of teaching weaving and dyeing. These buildings were paid for, one-half by the Prussian Government and one-half by the city of Crefeld. There is another at Chemnitz, in Prussia, where the principal work is knitting; another in Alsace, where worsted goods are made.

They have now established on a large and ample scale a school in Bradford, England, for teaching the making of what is here known as “Bradford goods”—worsted dress goods—weaving, dyeing, and spinning; another at Huddersfield, where they make woolen cloth and flannels; another ample technical department has been established as part
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of Owen's College, in Manchester, England; another ample technical department as a department of King's College, London; another at Batley; another at Glasgow, and so on.

There are more than three hundred common schools in Sweden, in which a certain part of the school hours of each week are devoted to carpentry.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN AMERICA.

We have nothing but a mere beginning of textile training in this country. We have half a dozen looms in connection with the school of design, of the Institute of Technology. We have not a single industrial chemical laboratory where the art of dyeing can be taken up, and followed through. We have not a single complete weaving school of any sort; I have seen more money wasted and have shared and helped waste it myself in the last forty years in Massachusetts, for want of exact knowledge of the textile arts, than would found a technical school on the broadest basis in every county in the state—and you have seen the same thing in New Hampshire. Now let us consider the next grade. You cannot teach boys particular trades, while they are going to school, but we have proved here in Boston, and the lesson has been taken from here to Saint Louis, and to other cities, that while the instruction of the head is going on—the universal tool—the human hand—can also be trained to metal working, to carpentry, and to other arts; not with a view to preparing the boy for either of these particular arts, but that in learning the rudiments of them he may learn to apply brain, eye, and hand together to any of the arts which he may take up for his life work. We have run the education of the brain into the ground and neglected the hand. We have promoted the higher education, as it is called, and neglected the secondary schools, as well as industrial training; all ought to be on an even plane, and unless they go on together—brain, eye, and hand—trained alike during the early years of life, all trained by methods that have no immediate commercial profit in view, we become one-sided. That is the reason why we have twice as many clerks as are wanted and not half as many skilled mechanics.

NATIONAL AID TO TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Now, so far as you can advance technical education by national appropriations—and industrial or technical education is about the only purpose for which I would sustain a national appropriation—so far as you can help those who are beginning to help themselves, I should fully justify relieving the Treasury of part of its surplus; it would give but moderate relief, for the reason that lavish appropriations would do more harm than good.

They are beginning industrial instruction all over Europe. That is the way they are protecting themselves against the future competition of the United States—for there is nothing that they dread so much.

COMPETITION OF IMMIGRANTS—SKILLED AND UNSKILLED.

Q. Will that process be attended by an increase of wages among themselves—for their own working people, and a consequent market for labor at home which will relieve us somewhat from the competition of the immigrant?

The WITNESS. May I answer in Yankee fashion?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.
A. Who is the cheapest man—the master of the art, who earns high wages because he is skillful or the beginner or common laborer who knows nothing?

Q. You think, then, that the American laborer of the future is likely to have to compete with an immigration which is wholly or at least more generally skilled, rather than with an immigration so largely ignorant as it now is?—A. I had not thought of it in that way, but undoubtedly it will be so. I had only thought of the increased ability of other countries to keep their present foreign markets, by the combination of greater skill, which will assure higher wages but lower cost of production. I think, however, the standard of intelligence and property among the immigrants is decidedly rising, and I think there is a tendency especially among the tenant farmers of England (550,000 in number), who are now being squeezed out of existence by American competition in grain and meat, to come over here. Artisans from the continent will also come in increasing numbers to escape the blood tax of the standing armies; and we must prepare our boys to compete with them here.

Q. Radically and finally, then, it is a competition in the race for intelligence on which the relative condition of ourselves and the others depends?—A. Of course nothing else but intelligence pays in the long run, especially intelligence in the application of science to the useful arts. There is nothing to be so little to be feared in competition as unintelligent labor; it earns low wages for want of intelligence and skill. The most dangerous competition is that of intelligent labor earning high wages, but accomplishing low cost of production by means of scientific methods. The standard of wages is but a poor criterion of cost of goods. Of course wages are measurably a standard of cost in comparing one country and the other, where the natural conditions or resources are about the same; in such case the high wages and low wages will measure the relative cost of goods if the skill is equal, but not otherwise.

In this country, for instance, in comparing one part of the country and another, it will be found that the men or women who make the best wages for themselves, working by the piece, are those who compass the production of goods at the lowest cost.

Q. At the same time, it is better for themselves, because they get higher wages?—A. Of course it is, otherwise intelligence and skill would not pay to attain.

OVERPRODUCTION.

Q. You do not look at overproduction in and of itself as an evil, but on the contrary?—A. I look upon general overproduction as an economic absurdity. There may be special overproduction, just as there is now in cotton and woolen goods, but that will not last a great while. Every million of population added to this country requires 250,000 new spindles. We are just about even now, with spindles—perhaps a little ahead—especially, in one or two branches, but in two years, or perhaps three, we will catch up; I think in two or three years the population will again be ahead of the spindles.

TECHNICAL SKILL IN DYEING.

Mr. Ross. In a meeting of some gentlemen, some two years ago, where the subject of technical schools was being discussed, one gentleman of large experience, and one of the largest manufacturers in Massachusetts,
stated it as a fact in his observation that there was not a single head dyer in the United States, at least in New England, in a large establishment, but what was a foreigner. There was one gentleman present, however, who said that that was not correct, because he knew one, and stated where he was and what he was doing; but that ended the discussion; and there was nobody who knew of another.

The CHAIRMAN. And the exception proved the rule?

Mr. ROSS. Yes.

The WITNESS. One thing might be stated there. A little while ago Germany was ahead of England in dyeing, especially in cotton velvets. The best of them were made at Hanover and in and around Crefeld. Now they are making cotton velvets in Oldham, and by virtue of the technical instruction which has already been given, they are dyeing and finishing them in England in a way equal to anything ever done in Germany. They are getting back trades which they had begun to lose, by virtue of technical instruction to the people who do the work.

Mr. PUGH. There is a very limited demand for that sort of labor if what I learned up here at Manchester, N. H., be true. The dyeing in the Manchester mills needs but one skilled man and a skilled assistant; all the other labor employed in the dyeing room is wholly unskilled. One man was at the head of the dyeing of that very large establishment, and he had an assistant of skill. The head man was an Englishman, and only about twenty-five years of age.

Mr. ROSS. There is a great field, however, and perhaps when we know how to fill it we shall fill it. I should like to have the committee hear from Mr. Atwater, himself an old experienced manager of mills in which the art of dyeing is especial.

Mr. ATKINSON. It may be true that there is but one head man at the establishment named by Mr. Pugh, and, by the way, I am very sure he is an Englishman, but I think it is an error to consider even the working dyers as common laborers, and it must also be remembered that there are considerable numbers of skilled laborers employed elsewhere in preparing the materials which are used in such a print-works.

BOSTON, MASS., OCTOBER 17, 1883.

GEORGE M. ATWATER examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:


The CHAIRMAN. The object of this investigation is to ascertain all that we can with regard to labor. You may state anything which will give the committee information on that subject.

THE APPLICATION OF DYSES TO COTTON GOODS.

The WITNESS. I thought it of sufficient importance to remind Mr. Atkinson of the fact that the dyeing department of the Amoskeag and other mills, which has become one of the foremost in New England, is supplemented not only by the laboratories of the chemical establishments of our own country, but by personal and constant correspondence with those abroad. Take, as an example, the progress made in the development and use of anilines, so termed. The colors which are now in use, and which the market demands, are colors which were unknown
to us in the days when Mr. Atkinson was spending tens of thousands of dollars in learning how to bleach cotton.

Mr. Atkinson. Mr. Atwater's point, I might say, is this: that while there may be in the Amoskeag and other factories in Manchester only one, two, or three head men, and a large number of common laborers employed applying dye-stuffs to the fabric, there are, outside of Manchester, either in this country or elsewhere, a very large number of highly trained, skillful and technically bred men at work in preparing the dye-stuffs for that application.

Mr. Pugh. This man that I speak of was engaged in preparing and mixing the dyes; he had at least 30 or 40 boilers, and he directed the mixing of the colors while the other men did the work. I inquired specially of Mr. Dean, the superintendent of that branch of the business, and he told me that this man and his assistant were the only skilled persons in their employ in that department; and it is stated in Mr. Dean's testimony that the remainder of the workers were common laborers, and that there was no skill about it.

Mr. Atkinson. Yes; I am very familiar with the process.

The Witness. The record of proceedings of the last Congress, with regard to the adjustment of the tariff, shows how prominent the aniline interest is becoming. The committee are probably familiar with it. The formula is given there. But the point in my mind with regard to the mode of establishing schools in this direction is: some goods have been sent to England within the last two months by a concern which has a very large capital, in order that they might compare the results of the present day in England with their own. The goods, number for number, yarn for yarn, after having passed through the finishing process there, have brought an advance of 2 cents a yard more than the same class of goods finished here.

BOSTON, MASS., October 18, 1883.

SAMUEL D. WARREN examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In Boston.
Q. What is your occupation?—A. Paper manufacturer.

PAPER MANUFACTURE.

Q. Please state to the committee the amount of capital and labor you employ, the condition of the laborers, &c.

The Witness. I take it that you mean at the time I commenced as a paper manufacturer, or do you mean the time I commenced in the business of paper buying and selling?

The CHAIRMAN. Your connection with the industry generally.
A. My connection with the industry dates back a half century, when I was a boy in a paper store in this city. That concern continued along until I attained my majority, when I became interested in the business of the concern. That was in 1839. In 1851 I commenced the manufacture of paper on my own account; in some connection with the concern perhaps for a while, but I mean I then acquired the ownership of paper-making property on my own account. The mill is situated in the State of Maine, and it, at that time, produced about one ton of paper per day. The capital invested at the time, in the plant, was about $30,000, or a lit-
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tless. I put the mill in order, supposing that I should complete it in three or four months at a very small cost, but as the repairs and improvements were being made and as I became more and more acquainted with the business, I found it to require still larger and larger development, and, going on from year to year with the natural growth of the business, I have never seen the time yet when these improvements were completed. I have been at it for thirty years, and the establishment has grown from about one ton a day to something over thirty.

Homes of Operatives.

The houses, which were very few in number, perhaps a half a dozen, when I went there, have become, I should think, 150. About half of those are owned by myself, and most of the other houses by the employés, but some of them by people who have built them as investments. Those houses, so far as I own them, are rented to the employés at a very low rent, not over 4 per cent. on the first cost, without taxes, which only covers about the taxes and the care that I take of them. I try to have them in the best sanitary condition possible by the introduction of pure water and good sanitary and ventilating arrangements, so that the employés are well cared for.

School-Houses and Halls to Fill the Place of Saloons.

I have aided in the building of the school-houses, doing what I could to have them built. I have done what I could in aiding and putting up buildings for halls for the Knights of Pythias and Odd Fellows, where they hold their meetings and entertainments, and have done what I could to keep the employés away from saloons, or rather to keep saloons away from my part of the town. The town that I am in is a large one, and this is one village of the town, which is supported from this mill. I have two other mills. This one I have been speaking of is the largest.

The Cumberland Paper Mills.

By the Chairman:

Q. What is the name of this town?—A. The mills I speak of are in the town of Westbrook, in Maine. They are called the Cumberland Mills. The number of hands employed is 750. Perhaps 120 of them are girls and the remainder are men. The men receive, not counting the managers, from $3.50 a day down to $1.33. Some of those at the latter rate (quite a number of them) are liberally educated young men who have come as apprentices; some are Harvard graduates, and graduates from other colleges, who have come there for the simple purpose of learning the business. I have a reading-room for all, and a moderately-sized library, a very comfortable place to read in, and, in general, I do all that I can to help them on in life, and I believe they are very well contented.

Confidence in the Employer a Preventative of Strikes.

We never know anything of strikes, nor have we any complaints in that direction. Once in a while there is something said about increase of pay. I think we have always paid them satisfactorily. In two or three instances we have been compelled to reduce the rate of wages, but we have accomplished it without difficulty.
Q. You have managed to keep the confidence of your employees, and whatever you require in the way of reduction of wages they recognize as correct, I suppose, and agree to it? — A. I think we have never made a reduction that they did not recognize as needed or called for, and proper.

CHEERFUL ACQUIESCENCE IN NECESSARY REDUCTIONS OF WAGES.

Q. And they acquiesced in it? — A. Yes; cheerfully. I never had any difficulty at all. But the reductions have been few. We had to advance wages very largely during the war, and there was considerable complaint that we did not increase them soon afterward, which I certainly did not feel that I ought to do. I did not feel that it was likely to last long, and high wages were likely to be called for, and it was quite a time, months and months, before I advanced wages, but when I did advance them I dated them back several months.

DATING BACK A VOLUNTARY ADVANCE IN WAGES.

Q. The advance in the pay was voluntarily made? — A. I made the advance in the pay entirely voluntarily, and when I did it I dated it back three or four months.

Q. Have you made an estimate of the share that the laborers get of the joint production of your capital and their labor? — A. You mean the amount that we pay for labor?

Mr. PUGH. I mean, taking the product of the laborer's work, what part of it goes to him?

The WITNESS. You mean, taking the product to be about $100,000, how much the laborers get of it?

Mr. PUGH. Yes.

THE LABORER'S SHARE OF THE COST OF PRODUCTION.

A. Oh, yes; I know that exactly. It differs somewhat with the kinds of paper we may be making, but the average of labor is about 25 percent of the cost of the product—not the selling price, but the cost of the product. For last month it was almost exactly that.

Q. Now, do you think that that is the share that they ought to have, according to the value they contribute in their labor? — A. I most certainly do. It is to be borne in mind that we furnish them nice houses, for the most part isolated—houses kept in nice condition, and with practically no return to me. They get that in addition to their wages. I believe that they feel as a rule that they are well paid. They are prosperous. Quite a number of these houses, as I have already said, belong to them—a few by my assistance, but in general not by assistance from me.

WISDOM OF ATTENTION TO SANITARY AND MORAL CONDITIONS.

Q. Their sanitary condition and condition of physical comfort has been the same, whatever the wages have been? — A. Precisely the same.

Q. Their wants have been attended to all the time, so as not to make them paupers or destroy their health or put them in hospitals? — A. Of course. I wish to say that at my last visit to the mill a remark was made there that I believe to be entirely true—that during the period I have occupied those premises, thirty years, there has not been a person
sent from my village upon the town for support—not an individual from my part of the town, from those employed at the mill.

By the CHAIRMAN:
Q. There has not been a pauper there for thirty years?

EASY WORK FOR AGED OPERATIVES.

A. Not there. I do not mean in the town; I mean in my village. Some of them were growing old, but we found enough less severe work for them to do to keep them from going onto the town.

By Mr. PUGH:
Q. What number do you employ at the other mills?—A. About 250.
Q. You have about 1,000 hands on the pay-rolls generally?—A. Yes.
Q. And the others are in the same condition with regard to treatment and wages?—A. Well, they have about the same wages, but I do not control the other places as I do this one. People find their houses where they can. One of them is in Gardner, and Gardner is a city. It is a place where there are not more than one or two houses connected with the mill. I do not have the same control over it.

PAPER-MAKING.

By the CHAIRMAN:
Q. From what material do you manufacture paper?—A. At the start it was altogether from rags, and until perhaps within half a dozen years altogether from rags, but now wood comes in as a portion of the material. We make the wood pulp ourselves, and one of those other mills is simply a pulp mill—nothing but a mill for the manufacture of pulp.
Q. As bearing on the question of labor-saving machinery—whether it helps or hurts—and the changes that have been wrought by it in the business of paper manufacture, won't you state to us something of the condition of the art when you commenced, the changes that have taken place since then, and its present conditions?

IMPROVEMENT IN PAPER-MAKING MACHINERY.

A. I can only answer, in general, that there has been a very great advancement in improved machinery. We are making machines wider and heavier, and we run them at much greater speed, making the same mill turn out a much larger product. There has been a great deal of knowledge gained in the manufacture of paper during that period, so that we treat this same stock very much better—make a very much better paper out of the same article and at a reduced cost. So that from, say, the period before the war, and comparing prices then and now, we are able to sell the paper at about 40 per cent. lower price than before the war—that is, since a period 23 years ago.
Q. That is, $100 worth of paper as then sold could be bought now for $60?—A. Yes.

WOOD PULP AS A CONSTITUENT OF PAPER.

Q. How is it in regard to the use of any other material? You have mentioned wood pulp. How came that to be available? You made no paper of wood in 1839?—A. No. The commencement of the manufacture of paper in this country from wood pulp, or the manufacture from
wood of the pulp itself, which was made and sold to the other manufacturers, was commenced in Philadelphia, or near by, at Manayunk, by some Rhode Island people—by Rhode Island capital.

Q. I was not asking in connection with your establishment alone, but the paper industry generally, and the changes that have taken place in it, especially by machinery, and coming down to the present time. The wood pulp has been invented, has it not, during that period?—A. I don't quite call it an invention of machinery. It is an invention or discovery how to treat. There were some patents claimed, but there are no patents existing, I think, upon the mode of treating wood pulp now. There have been some patents on the mode of treatment.

Q. Was wood pulp made in 1839?—A. No; it commenced in 1866.
Q. Then the use of wood pulp was commenced since the period when you began?—A. Yes; in 1866, I think.

METHOD OF TREATMENT OF WOOD PULP BY CHEMICALS.

Q. How was the use of wood made possible in the manufacture of paper; was there not some machine invented for converting wood into pulp?—A. There are two kinds of pulp made of wood. The kind that I allude to, and which comes into my business, is that which is chemically treated. It is boiled in caustics, under a pressure, and the process disintegrates the fiber and gets rid of the silica, resins, and all that.

Q. Is that or has that been a patented process?—A. There have been patents claimed under it, but I don't know that they have been established. I had some patents that I thought were valuable, but I had to conclude that they were not.

Q. Well, as a result of all these improvements, whether in the way of discoveries or improvements in machinery, which have been the subject of patents, and which patents may now have expired, how does the amount of production which one laborer can accomplish compare now with what one could produce in 1839 or 1840, and along there? Perhaps you can get at it this way: You had a mill that could produce one ton a day in 1839?—A. Yes.

Q. How many hands were you employing then?—A. I cannot recollect, but it is certain that the increase in the productive capacity of machinery has been very great.

PATENTED WOOD-PULP MACHINES.

I want to go back a little to make clear my reference to the wood. I think you have on your mind the mechanically prepared wood, which is quite another thing from the chemically prepared wood. There were patents on those machines. I am not interested in that department of business, but there were, I think, patents existing on those machines, although I believe they have expired. The growth up of wood-pulp mills in different parts of the country, and especially in those sections where wood pulp is easily obtained at moderate rates, has greatly cheapened, as I have said, the price of paper. Those mills furnish the pulp for the paper manufacturers, and when they do it is already about half way on to paper; it has become pulp. We take rags and make pulp of them and then make the paper, but the wood-pulp mills take the wood and make the pulp and sell that to the paper manufacturers.
Q. Some manufacturers of paper manufacture also their pulp, do they not?—A. Yes; quite a number of them.
Q. So that the manufacture of pulp is one part of the process of paper manufacture?—A. Yes.
Q. And in your mills it is subdivided?—A. In the large mill I speak of they both exist. We manufacture the pulp that we use in the other one, and manufacture pulp that we sell.
Q. Chemically prepared pulp that you sell?—A. Yes. They are both chemically prepared, but one is manufactured at the mill where I use it and the other where I sell.
Q. You do not manufacture pulp by machinery at all?—A. No.

INCREASE OF PRODUCT PER MAN IN FORTY YEARS.

Q. Are you able to state with more precision than you have done the relative product from a single hand now as compared with what one man could produce in 1839 and 1840? You stated that the product was very greatly increased. Can you say whether twofold or threefold or fourfold?—A. I should not think it was anything like that.
Q. Or one-half?—A. Well, as a haphazard guess, I should say perhaps 35 or 40 per cent.
Q. The product per man, you think, has increased 30 or 40 per cent?—A. Yes; by the better knowledge of how to treat the thing, and by the machinery.
Q. How long have those who have been longest in your employ worked for you?—A. As long as I have been there. I have some men who have been there the whole length of time.
Q. Thirty years?—A. Yes. This mill I started in 1853.

WAGES OF PAPER-MILL HANDS.

Q. How are the rates of wages of the different hands or classes?—A. Well, I don’t know that I can tell you exactly as to the classes. The principal men that are there—whom I would call the overseers, for although we have no such title there they are practically that in their departments—get, say, $3.50 a day. Those that work on the engines that grind the pulp and run the machines get $2.75. I don’t know but what they have second hands in reserve. We run twenty-four hours in a day, and of course each set of hands works twelve hours. That is the extent that we run the machinery that absolutely produces paper. I don’t think we have over one hundred (I should say from seventy-five to one hundred) hands that work at night. The remainder work in the daytime—those who run the grinding machines for the pulp and the machines that manufacture the paper. The preparation of the stock and the finishing of the paper is all done in the daytime. The boilers are filled with stock in the daytime and are run all night.
Q. How about the other help?—A. The machine men and the engineers—those that run the engines for grinding the pulp (not engines for generating steam)—get, I think, $2.75 per day. I could easily get the figures for you and give them to you if you wish.

The CHAIRMAN. That is near enough.

The WITNESS. We have some that work for $1.33 per day. Among those are apprentices I have alluded to. The girls earn from 80 cents to $1 a day—about one hundred and twenty of them.
FEMALE LABOR IN PAPER-MAKING.

Q. Is the work of severe character for a female to perform?—A. It is work they like very much. It is only of two kinds.

Q. What is it?—A. The sorting of the rags and the getting and counting of the paper, nothing else; it is work that is all done in the daytime.

Q. No child work?—A. No child work at all.

Q. These men are there with their families, many of them?—A. Yes.

Q. And they feel well located for health?—A. I should judge so.

Q. You speak of there being one hundred and fifty houses, and that you own about half of them; I did not understand whether the whole village was owned by those who depend upon this mill for a livelihood?—A. There are a few people in the immediate neighborhood that are connected with farms, that do not have direct connection with the mill, or but a very few that get their employment entirely from the mill. There is no other industry in the village only as the mills call for help and get it.

Q. Are there stores, hotels, churches, school-houses, and the like in that same village?—A. Oh, yes; churches have been built there since I went there. There were none there at that time. A parsonage and two school-houses have been built, and very nice ones, too.

PROVIDING SCHOOLS FOR THE LABORING POPULATION.

Q. Do you have anything to say or do about the school-houses?—A. I have had a good deal, yes.

Q. You say they are very nice school-houses. Tell us what they are. —A. I do not mean that there is anything remarkable about them.

Q. I do not mean in the matter of cost, but in the arrangements and appointments. They are good school-houses, I suppose?—A. Very nice school-houses. One of them is a two-story brick building, with one department below and one above, which some of our people didn't like, and thought they had better be on one floor, so they built a new one—an additional one—a pretty, picturesque, school-house, of old-fashioned style, and of one story, spreading over more ground, and having both departments on one floor.

PUBLIC HALLS FOR LABORERS.

Q. Are the stores there in any way connected with the mill and its management?—A. In putting up this building for halls, that I have referred to, the having of stores was one of the objects kept in view. The Knights of Pythias, Odd Fellows, and Masons wanted halls for themselves, and the people in general wanted another for general lectures, &c., that they proposed to get up. In putting up that building, I have put four stores underneath the halls—very nice stores—in which I have no other interest than the renting of them at a low rate. There are quite a number of other stores in the village. Then we have a barber's shop and a dentist, and such things.

Q. Have you anything to do with the disposal or ownership of the land in that vicinity?—A. Not a bit. I have never sold a particle of land, or bought any that I did not need to use.

Q. Others came in and bought and disposed of it?—A. Yes.
ACCUMULATIONS MADE BY LABORERS UNDER PROPER CONDITIONS.

Q. And these men who have been in your employ have, you say, some of them, accumulated money, and some have homesteads?—A. Yes. I could get that in better detail from the manager of the mill, but it is not a question that I inquire into very much except in a very general way.

Q. I only wanted to see what workingmen can do under those conditions, with an employer like yourself, and with reasonable pay and economical and industrious habits—things that go to make a thrifty and happy working population. I wanted to know whether there is a chance for a man, whatever his wages, to get a living and save something from them for his old age. You can tell us something of what visible property you know these men to possess, stating how long they have been in your service?—A. You might naturally think that I could, yet I am sorry to say that I have not kept myself so posted on what this and that man have been doing as to give an intelligent answer to that. I know they have been saving up money. I know where they have $30,000 that our foreman there has helped them to invest.

Q. Not any one particular man, but all of them together?—A. Yes, aggregating that amount; and I know that many of them do own their own houses, but to what extent they are encumbered I do not know.

LABORERS’ HOMES.

Q. Do you know the value of any of those houses, with the lands and appurtenances, or about what they may be worth?—A. I think the houses they would build would generally run up to $1,000 or $1,200 or $1,500.

Q. I suppose these houses have little yards or gardens attached?—A. Yes, yards always, but they have not much to do with gardens. They don’t have time to do that.

Q. Are the buildings set close together, or are they isolated?—A. They are isolated.

Q. Land is not, I suppose, very valuable there?—A. No, sir.

Q. Still, it is as valuable as it ought to be where a workingman wants to get it for a homestead?—A. Yes.

Q. How does it happen that you have got on in this way with your help without any strikes or disagreements? You must have had some principle on which you conducted business in dealing with your help

"IT PAYS TO TAKE THE BEST CARE OF THE HELP."

A. Well, I have always felt that my interest consisted in taking good care of the help, and giving them good homes and the best sanitary conditions, and to show an interest in them.

Q. Do you think it makes a difference to operatives or working people whether their employer manifests that disposition or not; I mean in the amount of production that can be realized from them? I am not speaking of sentiment.—A. I do, most emphatically. I think it pays to take the best care of the help.

Q. Why?—A. They are more loyal and do more labor, and are more careful to see that the labor they do is good labor. They will be more interested in the success of the employer.
WHEN LABOR BECOMES INTERESTED IN THE EMPLOYER'S SUCCESS.

Q. Do you think if that principle were generally acted upon by employers there would be any great difficulty in this country between labor and capital, as it is called?—A. I cannot perhaps touch very well on that. I should say here that I am differently situated in regard to labor from the manufacturers at Fall River and such places. There they employ very largely foreigners from a good many parts of the world. My employés are almost entirely Americans.

Q. Do you think human nature is any different in Americans from what it is in foreigners?—A. I never have got along as well with foreigners as with Americans.

Q. The conditions are somewhat better, but do you not think that in the long run the same principle that keeps peace with your employés would keep peace generally?—A. I think it would be very helpful toward it, but I get along better with Americans.

LACK OF SYMPATHY BETWEEN CORPORATIONS AND EMPLOYÉS.

Q. Do you not think really that the employer, as when a corporation, is a combination of individuals, a large association, on the one hand, while the laborers are a numerous class, almost a population, on the other; they are on this account very apt to lose the connecting link of human sympathy?—A. Most decidedly.

Q. And do you not think that right there, in a restoration of the old relations that formerly existed generally between the employers and the employed, and which you, it would seem, kept up, would be found, to a large extent, a remedy for the difficulties of the situation?—A. I should think it would be very hopeful.

A VOICE (in the audience). I should like to ask the gentleman how it would be if he should die and his mills fell into the hands of a corporation—whether the same condition of things would continue, because all large manufacturing places that have had at first only one "boss" get generally, when he dies, into the hands of some corporation; I should like to ask him the question whether these grand ideas would last with a corporation in such a case?

The CHAIRMAN (to the witness). You have heard the question. You can make such answer as you think fit.

The WITNESS. I think that would depend a great deal upon who the stockholders were. If kept in a family, the same thing might be kept up, but if it dropped into general ownership of people who didn't want anything but their dividends, it would naturally run like corporations do.

Q. Do you know any way to prevent this tendency to concentrate capital under corporate management in these times?—A. I don't think I could tell you how.

Q. But, nevertheless, in the nature of things, there is no reason why a corporation should not have a soul, is there?—A. Practically, I think, it oftentimes looks as though they had none. I don't know whether it could be prevented or not.

INCREASE OF HUMANITARIANISM IN CORPORATE MANAGEMENT.

Q. Is there, or is there not, coming to be concerned in the management of many large corporations more of this humanitarian sentiment?—A. I think it is increasing decidedly.
Q. Public attention is being more directed to sanitary measures and the proper treatment of people?—A. I think public interest is, but I think individual sentiments are having their effect.

Q. You think that is having an effect?—A. Most decidedly, and that is what would work the change more than anything else.

CONSIDERATION OF THE LABORER'S INTEREST THE BEST POLICY.

Q. Suppose you had had no benevolent impulses or kindly feeling—everybody can see from looking at you that you treat your help well without knowing anything more about it—but setting everything else aside, if you were a Jew like Shylock, do you not think you followed the course that will after all bring you the most money?—A. Yes, decidedly.

Q. And corporations may follow the same course?—A. I think so.

Q. I do not suppose the help care what motive actuates their employers provided they get justice and are well treated; it would not make so much difference with them, would it?

LABOR'S APPRECIATION OF SYMPATHY AND INTEREST.

A. Well, I think the help appreciate sympathy and interest in their welfare.

Q. That is precisely the point I wanted to get at. You find among your working people a kindly impulse that you happen to manifest yourself, do you not?—A. Always.

Q. You do not find that there is so much difference between one man and another?—A. They drop in, as a whole, all right. Of course there are differences of opinion, and wide differences, but as a whole they seem to be entirely loyal.

Q. Is there any other observation that occurs to you to make?—A. I think not.

BERGTO, MASS., October 18, 1883.

EDWARD L. DAVENPORT examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:


Q. What is your business?—A. I am a compositor on the Boston Daily Advertiser.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand you want to make a statement to the committee.

The WITNESS. Yes.

MISUNDERSTANDING OF COMMITTEE'S PURPOSE.

Q. What is it?—A. In the first place I would like to say that there is a feeling among workingmen in the city of Boston in regard to this committee which I think results from a misunderstanding. I know that in Washington this committee had several good representatives of the workingmen before them, and took a great deal of testimony about which we know nothing further than that when the committee was in New York I saw that there seemed to be a good deal of trouble between the newspapers and the committee.
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THE CRITICISMS OF THE NEWSPAPERS.

There are a great many people in the world, and there are many workingmen outside, who do not take much stock in the newspapers. I don't know as I blame them much for that, but here is a little scrap that I cut out of a newspaper which shows what they think of the work of this committee:

Senator Blair's labor committee is gathering up a great variety of nonsense, more or less vague and useless, on the relations of capital and labor. What information of real value it is getting could be easily procured by a bright boy from public and private books. The great majority of its witnesses are visionaries and cranks, each of whom has a panacea for curing all the ills of society. The basis of this panacea is always the same. It is that somebody should give something for nothing, and that the author of the scheme should be enabled to live in luxury without work. There has not been such an opportunity for universal babblement, with a prospect of having the trash printed at Government expense, for many moons, and all crankdom is stirred and encouraged.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further that you wish to say?
The WITNESS. Well, here is another little paragraph that I have cut from the newspapers—in another interest.
The CHAIRMAN (after reading the article). This has no connection with the committee; it is an item about a larceny. But we have nothing to say on the subject which you have mentioned. We have had a good deal of that matter in one shape or another.
The WITNESS. Well I have no scheme to put before the committee.
The CHAIRMAN. I show you a list of the witnesses examined up to October 3 that I had prepared in New York for the use of the committee. If it is any satisfaction to you, you can read the list and see who the "cranks" are.
The WITNESS (after looking at it). I know some of them.
The CHAIRMAN. There was no witness examined in New York who was not as well entitled to be heard as the editor or publisher of any of the papers of the United States, as far as I know; they were honest, straightforward men, with their own ideas generally, well loaded with facts, and they expressed themselves, as far as I know, properly, and behaved well—certainly as well as the average of witnesses who appear before investigating committees. They were selected with a great deal of care, and were representative men and women. There is no man in the whole list who ought to be stigmatized as a "crank."
The WITNESS. I am in favor of newspapers myself. I wish there were more of them.
The CHAIRMAN. But you know the newspapers sometimes get incorrect information, and do not always do justice even when they mean to; but you need not trouble yourself with this sort of matter. In the end the newspapers will do justice to the committee and to the witnesses who have been before it. If there is anything further that you wish to say, you may now proceed to say it.

FREE TRADE.

The WITNESS. I was very much interested in what Mr. Atkinson said. I believed a great deal of what he said. But there is one difficulty—and this is the way a great many other men feel as well as myself—why not put into practice what Mr. Atkinson says? He is afraid to cut down the tariff. I say I am a free trader, and I mean by that absolute free trade. But Mr. Atkinson says we cannot come down to
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it. Nobody expects to get the tariff off right away, but if a slight reduction of the tariff will increase the revenue, I would cut it all off for a few years.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

If men want civil service reform, let them abolish the taxes that are of no use at all in the country. We cannot get along without Senators, Representatives, and a President. We cannot get along without governors for our States, nor without sheriffs and other officers; but I believe we could get along and be better off if there were less policemen and less jails.

ABOLISH JAILs.

I believe you may just as well kill a man as to put him in jail. I have seen boys in jail, and I have seen the way jails were run. I have had years of experience from the position of an outside looker-on with a chance to see how jails are managed. I can see right through this late investigation that has been up in this State, and I am only sorry that General Ludlow says he doesn’t know anything about it. He ought to know. I know. I know where the trouble is, too. There is one way to remedy it, and that is to make men honest, and when you can do what Mr. Atkinson spoke of last night you have got the millennium. Now, here is Mr. Warren, who has been on the stand. He is a man that is used to running a mill for himself in the country parts. That is an entirely different state of affairs from what he would have in the city. Look at the Boston Herald and the Boston Advertiser—large daily papers in this city. What are the men that own the stock of those corporations—for that is what they are and we might as well call them that—what do they know or care about the men that work? What do they know about me or about the editors or reporters? They know nothing about them and care nothing about them. And, on the other hand it might be said, what do we care about them? Business is being run now upon the principle of business. Men are hired just the same as you would buy cattle or sheep in a great many businesses. Mr. Atkinson talked last night about skilled labor and education. What is the good in a great many businesses—what is the good in our mills, for a man to be educated? When it comes to a question of money, these people say what he shall get. Of course, education is a benefit beyond its money value, and I claim that a workingman wants something besides food and clothes in this country.

RECREATION FOR WORKINGMEN.

Q. What does he want?—A. He wants recreation. Why should not a workingman have it as well as other people? I cannot express myself as clearly perhaps as I would like to. I would like to have had a little time to prepare myself. I ran a paper in the State of Massachusetts for five years, and I always made it a rule to pay more to the men that I hired than anybody else around me did. I paid a dollar a week more than those right about where I was. Perhaps that is the reason I didn’t succeed.

Q. What grievances are there that the people of Boston or its neighborhood are suffering under now, according to your observation?
EVILS OF CORPORATE ORGANIZATION.

A. I think one of the grievances is the tendency of corporations now to cut down the people who work for them to the lowest cent possible, and to put into high places in their establishments overseers, foremen, and superintendents who are shrewd, grinding men, for the purpose of grinding the last cent out of their workmen and putting it onto their capital. We have had exceptions to that.

A FAVORABLE EXCEPTION.

I would mention, as an exception to that, that a few years ago the president of the Boston and Providence Railroad (who had a pretty good salary to be sure) told the directors they should take $5,000 a year off his salary before cutting down the wages of the workingmen, which the directors had determined to do.

Q. Did they take it off his salary?—A. I don't know.

Q. Were the workingmen cut down?—A. That I don't know either, but I remember that statement was made at the time in print; that is where I get most of my information from—from print.

Q. The point you make is that you think a more kindly and sympathetic style of men should be put in charge of work?—A. I certainly do.

FOREMEN EMPLOYED TO "GRIND DOWN" THE WORKMEN.

Q. You think it is often the case that a man is employed in order that he will get what he can out of the laborers, instead of treating them fairly and giving them a proper chance?—A. He is to get all he can out of them at as small a rate as possible.

EXECUTIVE ABILITY TOO HIGHLY RATED.

Q. At a low rate of wages?—A. Yes. The article which is paid so high is called executive ability, and that is an article which I think is rated altogether too high.

Q. What do you find executive ability to mean in practice—as a workingman?—A. As a workingman, I find that in practice it means a man who can get the very cheapest kind of workmen that he can get, and get them to work for the very cheapest wages possible, and thereby get his own pay raised. I have heard a good deal of complaint in various trades in that respect.

THE CAPITALIST MOSTLY TO BLAME.

Q. What was the other matter that you were going to speak of besides this of the overseers?—A. I was going to say in regard to any trouble between workingmen and capitalists, that I for one think the capitalists are more to blame than the workingmen. I think myself that in this country, if possible, as far as law is concerned, there should be no classes.

VIEWS ON AN EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

I am not a believer in an eight-hour law, if you must put it generally; that is, to have a sweeping eight-hour law. As a workman I am not in favor of such a law, but I am in favor of an eight-hour law as the workingmen in many businesses desire. It would not do on a morning news-
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paper, and it would not do for me if I was working myself. I want to work all the hours I have a mind to. I have worked fifteen hours a day many a time, and work now twelve to fifteen hours a day, on days that I work. I did that on my own paper when I had one.

Q. Do you work by the piece?—A. Yes; we all work by the piece—all compositors on newspapers.

THE EIGHT-HOUR LAW INAPPLICABLE TO NEWSPAPERS.

Q. So you work longer or shorter hours as you please?—A. No; we have regular hours of going to composition on newspapers.

Q. You say the office expects you to work twelve or fifteen hours?—A. Well, in order to do that number of hours' composition you have your type to distribute. The men upon the morning newspapers used to work seventeen hours a day. There is one thing in regard to that which people don't understand until it is explained, and which I never saw publicly explained, and that is this: a man is not obliged to work every night.

METHOD EMPLOYED BY BOSTON GLOBE AND HERALD.

Take, for instance, the Boston Globe and Herald. They are good specimens of that principle; they are what they call edition papers. There are certain men that are expected to be on the Globe at 10 o'clock in the day, and there are certain men on the Herald that are expected to be there at 12 o'clock, or at 1 o'clock, no matter what time they get through the night before. But we have what we call a "slide," which picks off so many men. These papers have a Sunday edition. They work seven days in a week; but we have "subs" as we call them—that term being the short for substitutes, of course—and a man can work or not. Three years ago they told me in the New York Herald office that they had one man that had worked nearly two years every day. Now, if I hadn't known in regard to this sliding arrangement I should have supposed that this man had worked steadily for three hundred and sixty-five days, but he had not, for the reason that there were nights when there would be men off; for example, if they were running, say, eighty-four men on the Herald, there would be for a time ten men off. Of course these things are technicalities with us, and are probably only understood by men in our business, and I suppose it is the same with other businesses. But I have gone into a printing office at 8 o'clock in the morning, and, with the exception of the time spent at my meals, I have not gone out of the office until after 9 the next morning.

UNFAVORABLE TO LEGAL REGULATION OF HOURS OF LABOR.

Q. Would it do you personally any good in your business to have an eight or ten hour law, or any other limitation of the hours of labor?—A. No sir; if I could have my way, I would not have any laws regulating it at all.

Q. You would leave it wholly to the men employed?—A. Yes; but you could not do that in every business, perhaps, and I don't think it is proposed to make a law. I don't think anybody asks for a law that you should not work so many hours, but the object is to have a law defining what is a legal day's work.

Q. But you leave the parties at liberty to agree that the work should be longer or shorter than a legal day's work?—A. I would, myself; that is for men, of course.
RELATION AS TO CHILDREN’S LABOR.

Q. You would make it different as to women and children—or children at any rate?—A. I would as to children.

Q. But when a woman was old enough to go and speak for herself—when she had attained her—majority—you would give her the same right to contract as a man, and would protect children because they are children?

WOMEN AND MEN ON THE SAME FOOTING.

A. My theory is that if a woman comes in and works alongside of me she ceases to be a woman so far as those things are concerned; she takes her chances with me.

Q. She enters into competition for pay?—A. Yes—just as she does on a railroad car. I notice in a railroad car men and women all rush in together.

Q. Do you see any reason if she gets in there and works at your side why she should not receive as much pay if she does as much work?—A. I don’t see any reason at all, but the trouble is these men who hire women hire them because they can hire them cheaper.

Q. That they will do more work for the same pay?—A. They do less work for the same pay.

EQUAL PAY DRIVES WOMEN OUT OF COMPETITION.

Q. It would be a protection to you as a workman that women should be paid as well as you are?—A. I certainly think so, but the employer would not hire them, and instead of women now having to work they would be taking care of their houses and the children—instead of being in workshops.

Q. Can you tell why it is that women are obliged, when they do work, to perform the same amount of labor for less pay than a man would receive for the same amount—why do they have to work cheaper than men?

WOMEN PAID IN PROPORTION TO SKILL.

A. I couldn’t answer that question, sir. I know that as far as my experience goes in regard to women in this country, they can be hired because they work cheap. I have seen good women compositors—first-class, but as a rule, they do not make as good compositors as men, and I think that is the general impression in the business. I think that men who are hiring them think as I do in regard to that.

Q. Do these women who make first-class compositors get the pay of good first-class compositors?—A. In some cases they do. In one case which I had in mind when I made that remark, they did not; they got 25 per cent. less than the men, but they didn’t work at night.

The CHAIRMAN. I have forgotten the exact figures, but I have seen them. You must remember, however, that there are 100,000 or so more women in the commonwealth than men.

The WITNESS. Yes.

EFFECTS OF THE NUMERICAL MAJORITY OF WOMEN.

Q. They cannot all be married, then, unless some new rules are introduced. Now, do you see any reason why women, who have to get a living, should not have a chance to get it in other employments than
sewing or knitting or housework! Is there any reason why they should not go in and compete with you as far as they can?—A. I have no objection, individually, but there is where we are getting our trouble. Are we to be treated like animals? Are we to be crowded to the wall?

Q. By these women, do you mean?—A. The educated man to-day—the physician and the lawyer—men who twenty years ago would have been ashamed to call themselves working people, are waking up to find that they are working for a living. Take a reporter—and no man works any harder than a reporter does (they need not put that down, as General Butler says)—

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes; let them put that down.

The WITNESS. There was a time when the reporter for a newspaper would not have been called a workingman. I have had a man laugh at me at the idea of my calling myself a workingman, because he said type setting wasn't working. And it is growing worse and worse in this country every day, and I believe there are reasons for it, too, and reasons that we can't get at ordinarily.

EFFECTS OF IMMIGRATION.

Q. What are they?—A. We talk about the pauper labor of Europe. We are put in competition not so much with the pauper labor in Europe as we are with immigration. Anybody and everybody can come to this country. This is a free country, or supposed to be, though it is not so free in some parts of it. It is free right in the city of Boston and right in the State of Massachusetts, for a man that works for a living to hold his tongue sometimes. I have found it that way. I have found it even when I was running a newspaper; it would have been better for me not to have said certain things. I was told that I would be made to suffer for it, and I was made to suffer for it, because I dared to differ from people who were in the same body with which I had been working.

EFFECTS OF FEAR UPON WORKINGMEN.

There are workingmen in the city of Boston that would be good witnesses before this committee, but they don't dare to come before this committee, because if they did they would lose their places.

The CHAIRMAN. They can send written communications to this committee.

The WITNESS. How do they know that their names would not get out?

The CHAIRMAN. They may sign other names if they please. They need not divulge their names. If they are honest men and the document bears internal evidence of being sincerely straightforward, it will find the committee and will be considered.

The WITNESS. Well, all men can't write.

The CHAIRMAN. But there is no man that cannot find some one to represent him, who can write and talk. But it is quite evident that the laboring men can write and talk, for you are here and you talk with some capacity.

WORKINGMEN PREVENTED FROM TESTIFYING.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Have you any idea what these men would testify to if they felt free to testify?—A. Well, I don't think it is so much the facts that they
would testify to as it is the very fact itself—that is what it is—the very fact that these men would come here and testify before this committee. In some businesses men have been marked. There is no doubt about that; I know it. They have been marked for having anything to do with any movement which was supposed to look to an improvement of themselves. I have heard men say how workingmen had better work. “You had better let all these subjects alone; keep out of politics,” they say, to the workingmen.

WORKINGMEN ADVISED AGAINST POLITICS.

Only a short time ago, in the Boston Herald there was an article on workingmen in politics, and stating that they hoped there would be no workingmen’s party. Now, individually, I agree with the Boston Herald upon that point, but we find that it is very hard to find workingmen in politics. I have been in politics myself all my life more or less—and I am not ashamed of it. I don’t think that politics is necessarily dirty work, although it is pretty dirty in Massachusetts this fall. But as I understand politics, it means the science of government, and that certainly is not dirty work, and if anybody ought to be in it it is we men who work for a living. But I am sorry to say, that in places among workingmen I doubt whether 10 per cent. of them vote upon ordinary occasions. I know that in some shops not 10 per cent. of the workingmen who have votes vote upon ordinary occasions. I usually vote at both ordinary and extraordinary elections myself. I seldom lose a vote, and and don’t intend to do so.

NEGLECT OF POLITICAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES.

Q. Why do they not vote; is it because they do not care to?—A. They don’t care. Of course, that is the difficulty. Men have a public right—and I do not object to their exercising their right—to not vote and not take part in politics. If they will let me exercise my right, I suppose I ought not to find fault. But I have heard men say that every man ought to be made to vote. I think, however, that if a man doesn’t want to vote he has a perfect right to abstain from voting, but he should not find fault with the laws in that case, but with himself.

Q. Have you any other point you wish to present?—A. If I had time to come in here during the session of the committee and hear things that were said, I might be able to say something.

FREE-TRADE VIEWS.

But I was pleased with many things that Mr. Atkinson said and that Mr. Warren said. But, as I said, why not apply Mr. Atkinson’s theories? He is a free-trader. And suppose, as he says, that he did bankrupt some people; my opinion is in regard to that that it would be a benefit to the country if some people were bankrupt. There are plenty of men to-day that are supposed to be worth hundreds of thousands of dollars that are not worth a dollar any more than I am, and their credit would not be worth a cent if their circumstances were known. Now, wouldn’t it be a blessing to the country if those men were bankrupt? I raise that as a question.

The CHAIRMAN. His objection seemed to be that it would bankrupt those who are conducting business, and men who are in good circumstances and really have capital and whose business is a sound business.
OPERATIONS OF FREE TRADE.

The Witness. Well, it is a question whether their business is a sound business or not. What is a sound business? Is it a sound business if a man is supposed to be worth $1,000,000 when $500,000 of that money or property is held by his wife, and he is carrying on a business, and has notes outstanding to the amount of $600,000, which is $100,000 more than the amount of his real capital? Is that a sound business? It would not do to say that I have given a case that does not exist, because it is a case that does exist. Public sentiment now has come to be in favor of a man who, if he buys a house, puts it in his wife's name. What is that for? They don't say so, but the meaning of it is that he must put it in his wife's name so as to cheat his creditors.

RELATIONS OF PERSONAL EXPERIENCE.

I would like to ask another question about witnesses testifying before this committee. Is a man's personal experience a fair one to judge by? Here, for instance, is Mr. Warren, who comes here and testifies in regard to a certain state of things. It is evident by looking around the room, which I did while he was talking, that few of us here agree with Mr. Warren, and I am inclined to think that that is an isolated case. That is why I made a note: "Big cities vs. Small towns; men vs. brutes; large gardens vs. no yard at all." In the city of Boston here are families, who think they are living nicely too, who are living in flats and on floors, who have to hang their clothes on the roof, and have no yards for their children to get fresh air in. I remember being in a real-estate office in this city and hearing a lady inquiring for a house to hire and wanting to get out of the city. She evidently knew very little about trees, grass, or the conditions of life itself in the country.

STATISTICS OF LABOR.

In regard to the number of people out of employment, that is something which we very seldom get at in statistics. I don't believe in those statistics. I will say right here that I don't believe in any national bureau of statistics or State boards of statistics, although there are plenty of other men that do believe in them. We do not get at the figures that we want. And I blame the workingmen themselves very much for that. For example, supposing that there are 3,000 printers, counting compositors, pressmen, and everything, right in and around Boston. Suppose that only 2,500 of those men are working. In finding out how much these men are earning we don't take and divide the aggregate earnings by 3,000, but by 2,500. Now, there are plenty of men in my business, as well as others, that only work part of the time, and that are just as good workmen as anybody else. When I was running a newspaper I have seen just as good workmen as ever took a stick in their hands, just as good compositors, who could find no work. It is easy enough for a man to say that anybody can get good work that wants it, but it isn't so easy. I have been out of work, and I have seen that I could not get work to do; that is, work that I could do. I am not strong enough to dig drains; if I was I would rather dig drains than starve; but there are some things that I would rather starve than do, though they are not connected with work.
SKILLED LABOR.

In regard to skilled labor, there is plenty of labor that requires very little skill at all. Take it right in the shop. In a shop of 50 men where there is only one foreman there may be 10 or 20 of those men that, so far as skill is concerned, are just as well fitted to be foreman of that shop as the man that is foreman. I think myself that skill has very little to do with it. I think that brass, push, and cheek have very much to do with it. It is a struggle and war. I think there have been times when I have been out of work when, if I had been desirous and willing to crowd somebody else out rather than take my chances for a vacancy, I would have got work. But I haven't gone on that principle. In fact I have gone upon the opposite principle. There is where this executive ability comes in. We hear a good deal about executive ability; it brings a great price in some places.

Q. You think it is the ability to execute, do you?

NEWSPAPER REPORTERS’ WORK.

A. Often so. Here are men, for instance, sent in here to report and describe the proceedings of this committee at these meetings. Now, I take it for granted that those who come here for that purpose are the best qualified to judge of what is done at those meetings, and to judge of the sentiment, &c.; but the reporters here know as well as I do that what they carry to the paper has got to be subjected to somebody else.

Q. What of it?—A. They won't find any fault, of course, at any cutting down that is done, or anything of that kind; but supposing that report is changed, as has been done in the newspapers sometimes. Newspapers have changed telegraphic dispatches in politics to suit their own political views—putting in or cutting out the word “not,” for instance.

CRITICISMS OF THE COMMITTEE’S WORK.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps that is the way you happened to get such accounts of the meetings of our committee in New York. We could very rarely recognize the proceedings of our own committee from the newspaper reports.

The WITNESS. Well, I notice here that the Herald this morning has two columns, and the Advertiser has quite a good report, too.

The CHAIRMAN. I have looked at those reports, and it does not seem as though we were under the same national flag; it is an altogether different state of things.

The WITNESS. Well, New York and Boston are two different places.

The CHAIRMAN. There was less opposition the last month we were there than the first month. There had been apparently a determination made to misrepresent everything that the committee did, and to impugn the actions of the committee; and there is no objection to that statement being reported if the press see fit to do it. But the last month we were there there was a very marked change in the disposition of the press toward the committee.

The WITNESS. I don’t think myself that the workingmen have anything to fear from the press.

APPRECIATION OF THE COMMITTEE’S WORK.

The CHAIRMAN. I have here a letter from President Jarrett, who, with a committee of three or four highly intelligent gentlemen, repre-
sented the workingmen of Pittsburgh and vicinity, and of the Iron and Steel Amalgamated Unions. They came and testified, and they were somewhat hurt by the manner in which they were treated by the press. After they went away they sent us this letter, which has not seen the light before. You may read it.

The WITNESS. I don’t think, as I have said, that the workingmen have anything to fear from the press. It is different with men working in business perhaps. But I worked myself in an office in the country where we compositors one year ran the Democratic caucuses.

The witness read the letter alluded to, as follows:

[National Lodge Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers of the United States, general office, No 116 Smithfield street.]

PITTSBURGH, September 22, 1883.

Senator H. W. BLAIR,
New York City:

My Dear Sir: Our committee arrived home safely on Monday, after testifying before yourself and Senator Call.

I am requested to return to you the acknowledgments of our executive board for your courteous and kind treatment of our committee at New York. We fully realize the importance of the work undertaken by your committee, feeling the necessity of a close and thorough investigation into the existing relationships between labor and capital.

Whatever may be the ideas of the New York press, in belittling the work as done by your committee, and thus influencing the press throughout the country to view your efforts from a wrong standpoint, I can assure you that the workingmen generally view the matter differently. They are expecting that your committee’s labors will bring forth good results. Should it fail to do so it will then be soon enough to criticize.

It is true that men of very queer notions of the question of labor and capital are privileged to testify before your committee, but how are we to know their ideas of things in a de facto sense except through their testimony? We can conceive of no better way of getting this testimony than through your committee. We are pleased that yourself and colleagues go on quietly with your work, paying little attention to insults and invective heaped upon you. You have our best wishes, and we earnestly pray that the good work, of a proper interest in the welfare and comfort of the laboring classes of our country, increase until perfect harmony exist between employers and employees.

Yours, very truly,

JOHN JARRETT,
President.

WM. MARTIN,
Secretary.

The WITNESS. There is a great deal of trouble caused in this world, as he says, by misunderstanding.

CHANGE OF TONE OF NEWSPAPERS.

The CHAIRMAN. Since this witness has called up this press matter, which I never proposed to allude to—this little scribe in the Herald and so on—I want to say in connection with it all (and I will not allude to it again in any way) that the last month we were in New York the tone of the press toward the committee was quite different from what it was originally. At first it seemed as though there was a settled purpose—and oftentimes by false report—to drive the committee from its work and from the city. In fact we were at one time notified to go—to “move on”—by some of the editorials. [To the witness.] Is there any thing more you wish to allude to?
ARISTOCRACY OF WEALTH.

The Witness. I think laws should be made for the protection of all, although I don't think they are so made in this country. The laws are made in the interest of many, and we are getting to-day in this country what some people say we have not in any other—that is, an aristocracy of wealth. I am inclined to think that it is what you and I and many other people dread—a mere aristocracy of wealth, without anything else—without education or refinement to feed it. There is one good thing to be said in regard to that, that if a man gets wealth, and has not any education himself, he generally educates his children.

EDUCATION.

I think myself that every workingman and every poor man is bound, if he can, even if he has to suffer for it, to educate his children. I dislike to see, as I do see every day as I come into the city, children put to work to help maintain the family, when it is apparent to me as anything can be that they don't need to be put to work; that is, the family had better go without some things that they have than to have their children put out to work before they have a chance to have anything of an education. I know I don't treat my children that way. I have a boy in Harvard College who has just gone in, and I intend to keep him there if I can. I intend to keep him there if I have to go on one meal a day. I have lived on less than that.

Q. Not a great while, have you?—A. Well, not a great while, of course.

Q. Not as long as Dr. Tanner?—A. No, but I would not care to tell, because I don't want it to go into the papers how long I have lived on two little Boston crackers. I have a vivid knowledge of it myself.

Q. Have you a family besides that boy?—A. Oh! yes; I have a wife and six children.

Q. Have you any means of supporting them but your own work?—A. That is all.

Q. What can you earn a day when you have work?—A. I can earn in a night $3 or $4, but we don't have work all the time. I am not able to work all the time. I am not strong.

EARNINGS OF COMPOSITORS.

Q. Have you any objection to stating about how much you earned last year or a year back from to-day?—A. Well, I have seen the time, when I was well, when I could earn $25 a week fairly; and I have earned more than that, but I can't do it now, because I am not able. I can't work as hard as I used to do. When I was down South on public business several years ago I ran against a bullet one morning.

Q. Is that the occasion of your disability to work?—A. Yes, sir.

PENSION.

Q. Have you a pension?—A. Yes sir. I was asked a little while ago by a man who didn't know about those things, but who thought from the big statements made in the papers about pensions that a man who had one had a good thing—pensions do look big from the statements made about them; he asked me whether my pension was large enough to support myself and family. I was a little inclined to laugh at him, but I didn't. I told him that my pension was $6 a month. I would much rather be well.
DIFFICULTIES OF FINDING EMPLOYMENT.

Q. Is there any other matter in your mind that you would like to state?—A. In regard to the employment of men, I find myself that it is difficult to get employment sometimes.

Q. When people are unemployed here do they have any difficulty in going out West or on to a farm or into some new pursuit? How is that? Can a person who is starving to death in a garret get to a farm in the West?—A. I am glad you asked that question. A great many newspaper editors—I know one in particular out in the country who is always advising people to go West, and I have often wondered why he didn't go, because he is a strong, rugged man. If I were strong I wouldn't like anything better.

THE STRONG SHOULD GO WEST.

Q. Your idea is that the man who can go is the man that ought to go, and leave the chance to the man who can't go to find the living at home?—A. Yes.

Q. There are not many people who believe in that principle, are there?—A. There are many people that do like doctors—they never take their own medicine.

Q. Does any way occur to you as to how these evils can be remedied?—A. Not by law.

Q. Well, by gospel, then—or any other way?—A. I think when that time comes that Mr. Atkinson spoke of last night, that would be the millennium.

Q. Well, do you feel like waiting for the millennium?—A. Well, no; but I am good for a good many years yet.

LAWS CANNOT RELIEVE SUFFERING.

Q. Here we are, and every one of us will be hungry before night, if we are not now. I mean that the want is pressing. Does any way occur to you to relieve the immediate suffering and grievances of the time—since you say you think the law cannot do it?—A. The law cannot. What a man needs oftentimes is immediate help, and not red tape; but there is a good deal of red tape even there. If I have had nothing to eat for a couple of days, and I ask a man if he will help me, and I tell him that I have had nothing to eat for a couple of days, I think he ought to take my word for it. I would take another man's word, and I think any man ought to. But we are told in the newspapers not to help people that apply, but to send them to the Associated Charities.

ORGANIZED CHARITIES A HUMBUG.

If a man has been already two or three days without food it is poor comfort for him to wait while he is getting at the Associated Charities and getting help from them, if he gets anything; and, as you say, a man can't step right out from a garret and go West. You have made a good point there, I think. I think this idea of organized charities is a great humbug.

Q. You speak as though it were difficult to get immediate help from the charitable organizations.—A. I know from personal experience that a man might starve to death while he was trying to get help from those
organizations. I had a fall last spring, and it broke me entirely up, and I had some experience of these organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, go on and tell about it.

The WITNESS. No, sir. I would not for the world—with my name to it. No newspaper would print what I would or could write of my experience for the last six or eight years.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean with reference to the practical working of the organized charities, and the method of receiving immediate help when needed.

PRACTICAL WORKING OF CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS.

The WITNESS. The practical working of them is not to give immediate help, but to prevent it; the practical working is to see how little people shall have. I don't say that there are not people that are begging who might go to work, but there are people who are sometimes in necessitous circumstances that need a little assistance immediately—a man who perhaps wants a meal or wants something to eat. Suppose, now, that I was a single man, and was what we call "on the road"—and I have seen many of them when I was out in the country, when I had a paper.

PRACTICAL CHARITY.

I have had men come to me for assistance, and I have given them assistance. I have taken a tramp who was a printer and helped him out many a time. I used to make a practice to take such a man to a hotel, tell the landlord to give that man a supper and lodging and a breakfast, and I would pay for it; and I never yet found a single case where that man wasn't willing and glad to work for me if I had work to give him the next day; and I never had a case where such a man didn't stay with me and work just as long as I had the work to give him to do—not one. And I have had a man who was pretty well dressed but had a little sack with him come to my office and ask to be allowed to sleep in the office, because he said he didn't want to go to the station-house, and I told him, "Sleep in my office." I used to get a good deal of information from the man who kept the lock-up in the place, and I told the keeper of the lock-up when I first started there—and he can support the statement—that if any printer came to town and was in want he should send him to me. And this man was not the only man that came to me. Very few printers ever got locked up in that town.

ORGANIZED CHARITIES PREVENT INDIVIDUAL ACTION.

Q. The substance of what you say is that the organized charities, which are understood to distribute the benevolence of the community, are in the way of spontaneous action of individuals, and prevent individuals from doing what they otherwise would?—A. That is certainly the way the newspapers put it. People are advised not to give. Several years ago—I think that was before the war—I worked for awhile in an office in this city, and I had some experience in regard to the Boston Provident Association. One of the rules was that when people applied for help single men got 50 cents a week and married men or men with families $2.

Q. Well, was not that enough?—A. How could it be?

Q. At the rate of two crackers a day, that would be fourteen crackers
a week; could you not live on fourteen crackers!—A. Every man will not do as I would do.

Q. Well, that is some help of course, but not enough for a man to live on!—A. Hardly.

There is a friend of mine, Mr. Enwright, who is here in the room, who asked me to ask for him the privilege of appearing before the committee at one of its sessions.

The Chairman. Let him make his statement.

BOSTON, MASS., October 18, 1883.

MICHAEL H. ENWRIGHT examined.

The Chairman. I understand you have some statement to make to the committee, but I see that you are somewhat nervous. You may dismiss all feeling of that sort. What we want is a simple, plain talk.

By Mr. Pugh:

Question. You reside in this city!—Answer. Yes, sir; I am forty years of age, and my folks came here in 1846, so I have lived in Boston all my life, with the exception of a little time that I spent in the Navy. I never appeared before a committee but once, and that was the time that I was porter in a grocery store, and there was a movement on foot for lessening the hours of labor.

WAGES REGULATED BY THE PRICE OF FLOUR.

I testified there that workingmen's wages ought to be ruled to a great extent by the price of a barrel of flour, that if a barrel of flour sold at $10 it took a whole week's wages to buy it, and there was nothing left for a man to put by for a rainy day. I may make some animadversions here, but I hope I may be excused, for I feel a little bit nervous.

THE WORKMAN THE EQUAL OF ANY.

I am a workingman, and socially and financially I am hardly the equal of thousands of men, but physically, politically, and morally I am the equal of any man. I contend for that right. Morally, I can be as good as any man; mentally, I try to be; and therefore I say that this committee, belonging to Government, is the source and foundation of the workingman's interest. You are the men that make the laws and we are the men that send you to make them, and my vote is as good as Jay Gould's or Vanderbilts'; it counts one, and why I should be always put down I don't understand.

THE WORKMAN'S POLITICAL RIGHTS.

Politics make the laws of the country, and my right there is as good as anybody's else, and why I should be always put down below people who have no more political right than I have I can't understand. I contend that in the city of Boston, or State of Massachusetts, I am compelled to educate my children. Probably I may not be educated myself, but if I have only a dollar a day I have to educate my children, according to the laws of Massachusetts, for such a length of time in the public school, or have my children taken away from me. Now, if it takes a
week's wages to buy a barrel of flour for four or five children, it will take a week's wages once a month to buy the barrel of flour, and how I can live and pay $10 a month rent and $10 a month for a barrel of flour, and give my children good clothing, I don't understand. But if I was getting $25 a week I would rather pay $20 for a barrel of flour than be getting $12 a week and paying $10 for it. That is the way I look at wages—in proportion to the groceries we buy. And I find that hard workingmen, whose flour will last them from a month to six weeks, according to my experience in the grocery business, would be most comfortable on such a plan, because their money would go farther. The barrel of flour that costs $10 will make one-third more bread than the barrel of flour that costs $8—in the baking they argue that way—but still it used to cost generally within a dollar or two of their wages to buy it, and that occurred probably once a month, so they would have to buy it on installments, because they could not pay for it all at once.

GOVERNMENT WAGES A PROPER STANDARD.

Now, as I said, I am the political equal of anybody, and I think that Government pay ought to be the standard of pay where it is necessary to employ laborers. I am speaking of the feelings of my own associates. I do not go around like my friend of the type, stick, and galley, but those that I associate with don't see what right the Government has to appoint a commission at the Charlestown navy-yard to go out to the different yards outside of the navy-yards to find out what the employers are paying their men.

DISCRIMINATIONS IN WAGES.

I contend that if that engineer in charge of such a committee was to be put on a tug-boat in Boston Harbor he would not get half the wages he is getting from Government, and what right has he to go around to find out what private individuals were paying their men and then go back and cut down the pay of the men in the Government shops? They have no right to discriminate against me. I am in Government employ myself. I pull an oar every night aboard a vessel coming into Boston. My friend, the printer, is a protectionist; but you don't give me protection enough.

PROTECTION AGAINST IMMIGRATION.

You protect the manufactures, but just as soon as the men get dissatisfied he can trot over to England and bring lots of labor here without paying any duty on the men that he brings. Iron costs $28 a ton in Philadelphia, and supposing the iron dealers here should undertake to strike against the iron manufacturers of Philadelphia, could they go to Europe and bring over a lot of iron here without paying duty on it? No. Then what right has an iron manufacturer to send to Europe and bring over a lot of people here to take the place of men who are on a strike? That is the way the workingmen are arguing about these things. The dominant party is losing strength in this country every year by allowing men to do that. I see the Allen line of steamers, because there was a strike among their men, brought a lot of men from Canada to East Boston and gave to them the places of a number of good American citizens who were paying taxes and supporting their families, and who had to lie idle while a lot of fellows from Canada were doing their work. Is that protection? I say protect the men.
IMMIGRANTS SHOULD GO WEST.

I had no idea of coming here until last night. I believe to-day that the United States is an association of States under one general government, and there are lots of others that believe that, and, of course, sixty or seventy or one hundred years ago it was all right to induce people to come to the United States and build them up, but now that the United States have become self-sustaining I think the line ought to be drawn a little close, and not allow these people to come here. These farmers and people coming from Europe should be sent out West instead of staying in Boston. The idea of advising me to go West, who have never been on a farm in my life, and have been handling goods, &c., is absurd. But these farmers coming from Europe should be sent West, and then they would not be taken in the place of the laborers here.

NATIONAL IDEAS.

These are national ideas now. I am only talking upon the plane of political equality—where my vote counts—because the manufacturer's vote is no more than mine. Politics make this country, and we all help to make the law-makers, and we are all equal in that respect.

I saw that Mr. Edward Atkinson stated last night in his testimony that eight hours a day of work would be apt to favor capitalists.

BOSTON FIREMEN.

Then you may as well consider the city government of Boston a capitalist, from the very fact that she has a fire department with married men engaged upon it that are on duty twenty-one hours a day all the year round. They get every fourteenth day off, and ten days' yearly vacation; but every other day of the year they are on duty twenty-one hours, devoting twenty-one hours out of the twenty-four of their time to the city of Boston, and don't see their children once in six months unless in this time they are off.

DAILY DUTY TWENTY-ONE HOURS.

It is an outrage and a shame that the city of Boston should be so economical as to demand twenty-one hours of a man's time in an engine-house—all his time except during meals.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you say that they work every day that way?—A. Every fourteenth day they get off.

Q. I would like to know what they do with the other three hours?—A. They eat their meals; they go home to breakfast, dinner, and supper.

Q. They are on duty twenty-one hours a day?—A. Yes.

Q. Then those three hours are not to sleep in?—A. No; they get their sleep in the engine-house.

Q. And they are only disturbed by fire?—A. Yes; but look at these men—married. They may join the fire department when single, and when they get married and have families they never see their families or children.

PROPOSED REMEDY.

Q. Would you double the number of men in the fire department?—A. I will tell you what my idea was, not taking the word out of your
month, Senator. I have talked to firemen, and we have thought that the day ought to be divided into three watches, and have two-thirds of the men on duty all the time, but with one-third at home ready for fire work in case of necessity; to have the society of their families for the time being. I declare, it seems too bad to see men devoting their time twenty-one hours out of twenty-four to the city of Boston, and no time to be at their homes to look a little after their children or to be with their families.

Q. Do you think the city could afford it?—A. Why shouldn’t it? The employees spend their time mostly right in Boston. They do not travel to Newport or such places; and I think the merchants would rather see the men get good pay, because they would be better citizens, and would spend more money for the necessaries of life. When they get only $1.50 or $2, it leaves them nothing to spend, hardly, after paying their rent. Some people who are getting $40 a month are paying $25 for rent right here in Boston, and some of the firemen that get $1,000 a year—which is $80 a month—pay $40 a month rent.

POOR PEOPLE ON BOSTON COMMON.

Under the former city administration there was a lot of old crippled soldiers and old women that could not do anything much for a living; but, instead of going to the poor-house, they had a lot of little stands on the common where they had been for many years. But under the present city government they have all been driven off.

Q. Why?—A. Because they say they used to create too much dirt. What harm would it be to have a laborer there to clean the dirt off?

Q. What has become of them? Did they get employment anywhere else?—A. I don’t know, sir. They wandered around and scattered. I know three or four of them myself that came to me growling about it, and saying that under a Republican administration they could have had a good place on the common, but under the Democratic administration they have been kicked out.

Q. What I want to know is what becomes of them?—A. Well, I don’t know, sir. A man said to me last year, “I do not know what to do; I want to have my taxes paid.” I said, “What is the matter?” Said he, “I have not hardly had a day’s pay since we were turned off the common.” He had one of these cameras—giving an exhibition of pictures. I used to go up there myself of an evening and take my children along, and buy cakes and candies for them there, but now I can’t do it. People that are busy in the day-time will often want to go up there in the evening, and look around and get a little fresh air with their children, and what harm is it to buy a little candy for them? But, then, it makes too much dirt!

LAWS TO BENEFIT WORKINGMEN.

Q. They do not like to have peanut shells up there?—A. No; that is the idea. I am arguing this from the poor man’s stand-point. I do not care what the manufacturer’s sentiments are, or what laws you make; but I say that the law-makers are put in by the workingmen, and they ought to remember the workingmen when they are making their laws. That is especially true in regard to protection. I contend that a workingman in this country has no right to be a free-trader, because when that time comes we will have lots of growling.

26—0 3—(5 LAW)
PROTECT AMERICAN LABOR AS WELL AS AMERICAN GOODS.

I say if we are to have protection, let us protect the laborer that is manufactured in the United States in preference to the laborer that is manufactured in Europe—every time. I say “protect American labor as well as American goods.”

Q. You put it on the ground that he is an American production?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Just as much so as a piece of goods?—A. Yes. I am not an American man, but I claim America as my country. I was only three years old when I came here, and I don't know any other country.

Q. You came here as raw material; but in your case the manufactured product is American?—A. Yes. I say that, as American citizens, ought to be protected that way.

The CHAIRMAN. You know we all hold that there should be no tariff on the raw material.

The WITNESS. That is all right.

IMMIGRANTS CONSUMERS AS WELL AS PRODUCERS.

The CHAIRMAN. But right on the point you mention, there is, of course, a very serious problem involved, and a great deal of complaint has been laid before us growing out of it. I think you would do well to bear in mind in connection with it, however, one element in the problem that is not generally alluded to, as it has been laid before us. That is this, that the foreigner who comes here is not merely a producer, but he is also a consumer, and coming with, oftentimes, no knowledge of our language and no knowledge of our institutions he does not produce, perhaps, more than he consumes. In other words, he makes a market for all the increased production that results from his labor. There is a difference between the human commodity coming here and the raw material that enters into the ordinary manufacture, in that respect; and the man helps to make a country, and his family adds to the population and helps to make our institutions. So that, as a result, we have a great population.

The WITNESS. I agree with you in that; but when I came to Boston it was a town—nearly forty years ago. It became self-sustaining. As I stated, this was an association of States, and there were lots of inducements given to people to come here when the States were not self-sustaining. Now that they are the line ought to be drawn to give the people that are here now some chance.

IMMIGRANT FARMERS TO BE TRANSPORTED TO FARMING REGIONS.

Q. Do you think it would be sufficient to transport these people who come here to other parts of the country?—A. Yes.

Q. For instance, if they are farmers they should be taken on to the land?—A. Yes; or down where Senator Pugh lives—down South.

Q. But a great proportion of them are operatives, are they not; you would leave them in the city, would you not?—A. Oh, no; there are very few operatives coming here.

MOST IMMIGRANTS VILLAGERS OR FARMERS.

Q. Most of the immigrants who come here could work better on the land than anybody else?—A. Why, of course they could. Very few of them come from cities. They all come from villages and outside.
Q. Well, if that is the fact—

The Witness (interposing). I do not know it; I would not say it for a fact.

CLASS LEGISLATION IN EUROPE.

The Chairman. I was going to ask why the congested cities of the Old World do not send their overpopulation to this country any more than we do ours to the West!—A. They do not have so much political power there as we have here. I am speaking of the political aspect of the situation. Politically, we are all equal in this country; but it is not so in the old country. They have to make their laws to suit a certain class there. I have seen the time that you could join a lodge of Odd Fellows or Free Masons at a very cheap rate when they were not self-sustaining; but as they became more prosperous and became self-sustaining, they drew the lines closer, and made restrictions to their constitution and by-laws, so that there are some of those associations to-day that you cannot get into at all, they are so strict.

EQUAL LAWS FOR ALL CLASSES.

Now I say it is pretty much the same thing in the United States, where a place becomes self-supporting and self-sustaining, each man having the same political rights, ought to use his best endeavors to hold things in his own hands without allowing strangers to benefit from it. That is the way I look at the United States. I say the Government has no right to send out commissions asking what outsiders are paying for their employés. They have no right to do it, to discriminate against their workingmen. Now, for instance (and I do not care whether you publish this or not), I contend, looking at it from a political point of view, that the Government ought to use the same endeavors towards the lower class of employés that it does towards its higher class. Governments are supposed to interest themselves in favor of the laborer, and when the legislators get to Congress, I think that, as law-makers, they ought not to discriminate against the laborer as much as they do. I hope what I say won’t affect my position. I am only an oarsman.

The Chairman. You will not lose your place if you do make it public.

The Witness. I am only an oars man, and they say you can pull a man down in one-eighth of a mile, if you pull hard enough. I have pulled twenty miles in a night, in hard weather; but I do not think that ought to work against us and take away our places from us that we have had a number of years.

VACATIONS FOR $3,000 CLERKS; NONE FOR LABORERS.

I used to have a vacation, but here the Secretary of the Treasury sends word that we cannot have a vacation unless we work two weeks’ extra time. I do not call that a vacation at all. It does not make a man as good a citizen to be treated that way. They give vacations to the clerks that get $3,000 a year, and do not ask them to make up the time; and if the Government does it for those clerks, they ought to do it for us.

Q. Do you think you are as much entitled to a vacation as Senators and Cabinet officers, and all that class of persons!—A. Yes, sir; in proportion.

Q. You assert that here!—A. Yes, sir.
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RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

The Chairman. Well, go on.

The Witness. I was pulling a cotton-hook for some time. At that time they were laborers and they could not get a vacation. There was no fault found. Some of them have been sworn in and have asked for a vacation, and word has come that they are not entitled to it. At the same time, when we went to get our vacation, we were classed as laborers, because we were sworn in as officers. I do not care to have this go out, because I attend to my business. I ran an elevator for John Wilson & Son, the printers, here, in Boston, who are now in the Riverside Press. I elevated paper up several flights in Boston for several years, and I have worked as hard as any man, and I am willing to do it today. I am not an educated man, but I have intelligence enough to see where I am crowded. And I say that where my political rights amount to as much as the political rights of merchants, they have no right to crowd me to the wall and refuse me a vacation when clerks getting better pay are allowed that privilege. I do not refer to Senators, because they are elected.

Q. You refer to salaried people?—A. Yes.

ORGANIZED CHARITIES.

Q. Is there anything else you wish to say?—A. I wanted to speak about the organized State board charities. Although a temperate man, I was out of a job at one time, and a man asked me if I would go and tend bar. I did, and I worked for a long while; and finally I started business for myself.

Q. In what line?—A. In the same line—the liquor business—and stayed in it eighteen months, and it came near ruining me, and everybody belonging to me. But I became temperate in 1873, I think it was. I saw what was going on in the business, and I could see that there was lots of beer drank in places—in residences—while the men were away at their work. I went to the head of the board of associated charities in my ward, and spoke about it.

LIQUOR SOLD TO CHILDREN.

I said I did not find any fault with a man selling liquor to another; but I did find fault with places that sold to children, and I thought there ought to be some kind of organization effected whereby men could be procured to go to those places and stop the drink. He immediately referred me to another gentleman. I went to him and spoke to him of my scheme; told him what I had seen in going round, and that I thought if they could prevent the selling of liquor to minors, a great good would be done. He said, "If you have any information to give me in regard to these places, you can do so, and we will see that they are shut up." I said, "I am not a spy; that is not my idea. Policemen will not do it, because politics have an effect on them; but if you organize a public fund and pay men out of that fund, you can get the men that will prevent the selling of liquor to minors." "Oh, well," he says, "have you no better information than that?" I felt really that I was giving him a good scheme.

THE LAW AND ORDER LEAGUE OF BOSTON.

In a very little while I noticed that they organized the "Law and Order League," and I pretend to say that it was my idea that originated
what is called the "Law and Order League," in this city. I am not a prohibitionist, because I think that where most liquors are sold the people become richest in commerce; where people most easily find that they can get and retain luxuries they become richest in time. Look at London, Paris, and New York, for instance, where you can get anything you like.

But in regard to the associated charities, I say they are as far away from charity as Boston is from California.

Q. You mean they are difficult to get at?—A. Yes.

Q. For the same reason that the former witness (Mr. Davenport) said?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You corroborate what he said?—A. Yes, sir.

LABORERS' EARNINGS PROPORTIONED TO EMPLOYERS PROFITS.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything else that you wish to say?—A. Well, I wanted to say that if workingmen are paid in proportion to the earnings of any class of manufacturers so that if they are any way honest, or their tendencies are to be gentlemen, they can put a black suit on their backs on Sunday, it would make a great improvement in those men. I do not know a man who would not rather be out with a nice suit of clothes on on Sunday, with his children, than to be bumming around the corners spitting tobacco juice with a pair of overalls on. Some people have to borrow a black coat to go out with their children on Sunday.

POOR CLOTHES CAUSE POOR CHURCH ATTENDANCE.

Q. Such people do not care to go to church?—A. That is so, sir. You have got that right. Lots of people do not go to church because they have not got the right sort of clothes.

Q. Do you suppose the religious people of this city know that there was a minister who testified before us in New York that multitudes of good people failed to avail themselves of religious institutions because they were afraid that other people were so much better dressed than they were?—A. I believe that is the gospel truth.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Do you know who are to blame for this position of these people?—A. The man that is going to get a job asks first for work. If he gets it it is all right. When he is sure that he is there, then he asks what wages he can get. That is my case.

CAUSES OF LOW WAGES IN CITIES.

Q. Why are wages lower than they ought to be?—A. It is on account of the way people live in cities. Now, suppose I lost my job to-morrow in the boating line, and could not get a job for three or four weeks; I am not well off in the world's goods, but I am sure of a resting place, probably, as long as my father-in-law lives. He owns the house I live in, and I pay him a cheap rent—well, really, I don't pay him anything, because the house pays for itself, and I take care of it. But I contend that the workingmen who have to pay such heavy rents cannot save any money. As I was saying, if I had to lose my job, and had to pay $15 or $16 a month rent, and could not get work for three or four weeks, where would I be, with the landlord after me for the rent?
OVERCROWDING OF CITIES ONE CAUSE.

Q. I just wanted to get your idea of who is to blame for the condition of things you are describing?—A. The crowding of cities by the laboring population.
Q. Well, who is to blame for crowding the cities?—A. I should say the Government. I know that in John Wilson's place there was a strike, and the men were locked out, and they sent to Canada and brought one hundred and fifty men from there, and these men staid in Boston.
Q. Then you say this crowding comes from immigration?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Allowing people to come here?—A. Yes, sir.

ONE REMEDY, BUREAU FOR DIRECTION OF SURPLUS LABOR.

Q. You think they ought not to be allowed to come!—A. No, I don't think anything of the kind. I do not want to do anything to prevent men from bettering themselves; but there ought to be bureaus of immigration to send men where they would be useful. This place is full.
Q. What are you going to do with their personal liberty when they come here? Are you going to put them where they do not want to be put?

CORPORATIONS IMPORTING CHEAP LABOR.

A. No, sir; I have seen three steamer-loads of immigrants brought over here for a special purpose.
Q. What is the result of bringing them here?—A. They take the place of other people who are here.
Q. Who brings them?—A. The corporations.
Q. Manufacturing corporations?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. What benefit do the corporations get from bringing them?—A. They get cheaper help.
Q. Then what becomes of all this protection you favor? who gets the benefit of it?—A. There is no protection to us then.

THE TARIFF LAW NO PROTECTION TO LABOR.

Q. Then you say the tariff law does not afford any protection to the laboring class?—A. It does not; that is just my argument.
Q. All the benefit goes to the manufacturer?—A. Yes, sir; exclusively.
Q. Then if it keeps on that way you are not in favor of it?—A. Of course not.

ARBITRATION A REMEDY FOR STRIKES.

Q. Now, how do you propose to prevent the manufacturer raking in the benefits of the tariff?—A. By having a commission appointed for different portions of the United States: one for the New England States, one for the Southern and Southwestern States, one for the Western States, &c., and when a strike occurs between laborers and a manufacturer, to compel the people to work for that manufacturer until arbitration is entered into, and undertake not to allow a man to leave the establishment; that is, if it is going to hurt the employer or in any way destroy his interests; make a law compelling workingmen to work for the manufacturer until the arbitration board looks into it.
Q. What government in this country—city, State, or Federal—has
any power to compel people to work against their will!—A. You are the law-makers.

Q. I know, but what power have we got to take away the right of a man to work as long as and for whom he pleases? What would become of the liberty of the people if we were to take away that right by law?—A. Well, the manufacturers organize an association.

Mr. PUGH. Well, that is private.

The WITNESS. Yes; but it is in entire opposition to the rights of the workingmen. The workingmen could organize an association in opposition to that probably, and would it not be better to make a law to combine these two elements together socially than to have them forever striking and closing up mills and sending outside for foreign laborers, and things of that kind? Would it not be better to appoint a commission or board of arbitration to look into these matters?

Q. I notice by the newspapers that some workingmen at Saint Louis have been striking within the last three or four days, and that they have held a convention, and have voted universally against settling their difficulties by arbitration. How are you going to agree, then, about a remedy?

"JACK AT THE BENCH AND JACK AS A BOSS."

A. I must say to you that we have never had, in my estimation, proper workingmen's leaders, for Jack at the bench and Jack as a boss are two different men.

Mr. PUGH. I agree with you.

The WITNESS. I can certify to it by illustrating a strike in the office of the daily Evening Voice. There was a young Scotchman in that office who could talk eloquently. In time he became superintendent of an iron foundry in the West, and they were having a grand public meeting at Faneuil Hall to raise stock for the daily Evening Voice. He wrote back and said that when he was a workingman he did everything he possibly could for their interests, "but now," he says, "since I have become superintendent of this iron foundry I cannot take an active part with the men, for if I should I should lose a salary of $4,000 or $5,000 a year." That is why I say that Jack at the bench and Jack as boss are two different men. I do not know but what I have probably made a fool of myself this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Not at all.

Mr. PUGH. You have spoken a great many truths and given a good many facts.

The WITNESS. This is the first time I have ever appeared before a committee in my life, and I feel much obliged to you gentlemen.

BOSTON, MASS., October 18, 1883.

DR. TIMOTHY D. STOW examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You are a physician?—Answer. Yes.

Q. You live at Fall River?—A. Yes.

CONDITION OF FALL RIVER OPERATIVES.

Q. Won't you state how you happen to appear before the committee, what your object is in coming here, and at whose request you come;
and then give us the benefit of any observations you choose to lay before us! — A. Mr. Robert Howard, of our city, called on me yesterday, and desired me to appear here to-day before your committee to give whatever testimony I could relating particularly to the physical and mental and perhaps the moral condition of the operatives and laboring classes of Fall River. I have made no notes, and I hardly know what your plan is; but I would as soon answer questions as to make any detailed statement.

The CHAIRMAN. We want to find out how the working people of Fall River are living and doing. You can tell us that in the way in which one gentleman would talk to another, the one understanding the subject and the other not understanding it. Just tell us the condition of the operatives there, in your own way, bearing in mind that we would rather have it without premeditation than as a prepared statement.

The WITNESS. I have been in Fall River about eleven years, though I have been one year absent during that time. As a physician and surgeon, of course, I have been brought into contact with all classes of people there, particularly the laboring classes, the operatives of the city.

THEIR PHYSICAL AND MORAL WELFARE.

With regard to the effect of the present industrial system upon their physical and moral welfare, I should say it was of such a character as to need mending, to say the least. It needs some radical remedy. Our laboring population is made up very largely of foreigners, men, women, and children, who have either voluntarily come to Fall River, or who have been induced to come there by the manufacturers.

PHYSICALLY DWARFED.

As a class they are dwarfed physically. Of course there are exceptions to that; some notable ones. On looking over their condition and weighing it as carefully as I have been able to, I have come to the conclusion that the character and quality of the labor which they have been doing in times past, and most of them from childhood up, has been and is such as to bring this condition upon them slowly and steadily.

THE EFFECT OF LONG HOURS AND HARD WORK.

They are dwarfed, in my estimation, sir, as the majority of men and women who are brought up in factories must be dwarfed under the present industrial system; because by their long hours of in-door labor and their hard work they are cut off from the benefit of breathing fresh air, and from the sights that surround a workman outside a mill. Being shut up all day long in the noise and in the high temperature of these mills, they become physically weak.

INSUFFICIENT CLOTHING AND FOOD.

Then, most of them are obliged to live from hand to mouth, or, at least, they do not have sufficient food to nourish them as they need to be nourished. Those things, together with the fact that they have to limit their clothing supply — this constant strain upon the operative — all tend to make him on the one hand uneasy and restless, or on the other hand to produce discouragement and recklessness. They make him careless in regard to his own condition. All those things combined tend to produce what we have in Fall River.
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MORAL CONDITION OF FALL RIVER OPERATIVES.

Now, first, as to the moral condition of the operatives of Fall River. I think so far as crime is concerned we have quite as little crime there as in any city of its size. We have a population rising on 50,000. There is a disposition at times, and under certain pressure, for some operatives to violate the law, to pilfer, or something of that kind, and I think it grows out of not what is called "pure cussedness," but a desire to relieve some physical want. For instance, a man wants a coat and has not the means of earning it, and he is out of employment, and being pinched with the cold, and with no prospect of getting employment, or of getting a coat by honest means, he steals one. Or perhaps he steals food on the same principle.

COMPARATIVELY LITTLE CRIME.

But so far as crime is concerned, we have comparatively little. But what I do say, and what has been on my mind ever since I came to Fall River, with reference to operatives there, is the peculiar impress they seem to bear, a sort of dejected, tired, worn-out, discouraged appearance, growing out of the bad influences of long hours of labor, the close confinement of the mills, the din of the machinery, their exclusion from social intercourse, except at night.

CAUSES OF INTEMPERANCE.

And I think we can look for a solution of the problem which the country at large is endeavoring to solve—that with reference to the intemperate habits of the laboring classes and the operatives—in those facts that I have mentioned.

LIQUOR DRANK TO STIMULATE SOCIABILITY.

I have questioned many thoughtful men and women in regard to that. I have said, "Why is it that at night particularly you frequent the dram-shops? Why is it that by day you drink; that you store enough even for the day in your houses?" The answer is, "Well, doctor, I tell you the fact is this, there is a sense of fatigue over us which we do not know how to overcome, and which we must overcome for the time being if we are to have any social qualities of an evening, and we can't do it without taking something which will bridge over the time and make us equal to the emergency of the evening or the occasion." For instance, the operative being in the mill all day long comes out at night, and it is the only time he has, unless he uses Sunday—and he uses that largely—in which to visit his friends, who are scattered here and there all over the city. Families are, of course, scattered in that way. They are either brought over here by the manufacturers or come of their own accord. One person finds a place in one mill, and another in another mill. They have no means of communication with each other except at night or on Sunday. Now, they say to themselves, "How can we fit ourselves for this social intercourse—what we deem a necessity?" The result is that a man steps into a lager-beer saloon, or often into a place where he gets stronger liquor, and he takes a glass of it, and in a few minutes he begins to feel the stimulating influence of the liquor, and it braces him up. But I have said, "How does this make you feel? You say you have been feeling fatigued in the evening and discouraged;
that your future does not look bright; how do you feel when you get
the liquor?” “Why,” he will say, “it covers that all up; we lose all
thought of that, and for the time being we feel well.” And so they go
on from day to day, and from night to night.

MONEY WASTED IN DRAM-SHOPS TO PRODUCE FORGETFULNESS.

Now, after all, I do not know of many drunkards in Fall River, but
this is true: the operative spends his 5, 10, or 15, or 25 cents a night
for liquor, and it is so much lost money to him, and yet he feels impelled
to it, because he does not know how otherwise to adapt himself to the
circumstances of the evening. It does not seem to affect his constitutio
and most of them keep up pretty well, but some succumb to it. Others
who cannot succumb to the influences of lager-beer often resort
to stronger liquors, such as brandy, whisky, and so on, to stimulate them
more, because they require more and more to keep up the effect. Those
go down to the drunkard’s grave.

PAUPERS AT THIRTY-FIVE OR FORTY.

I should say that the average man there who reaches that condition
gets to be a pauper at thirty-five or forty. The women, particularly the
English women, brew their own beer to some extent, but they buy
largely of the stores and keep beer in their houses for the day. It is a
common thing for these bar-keepers to peddle around beer and ale, to
leave from half a dozen to a dozen bottles of ale a week at a house. Al-
mmost every Saturday some families will put in from a dozen to two dozen
bottles of ale.

DRINKING TO RELIEVE MENTAL DEPRESSION.

Now, it is invariably the testimony of the more intelligent men and
women in answer to the question, “Why do you persist in drinking?”
“It makes us feel better; we are relieved of the ennui of life; we are
relieved of mental depression for the time being, and after the evening’s
social engagements are over we get home and go to bed, and think noth-
ing of it, and next day resume our day’s work.” And so it goes on from
day to day.

QUALITY OF THE FOOD.

Now, there are other things which hinge upon low wages and long
hours of labor to demoralize the operative. For instance, his food. I
think it is safe to say that the great mass of operatives there are forced
to buy the cheapest food. They go to the meat stores and purchase
joints, which, of course, made up into a soup, generally makes good
food, but it does not do to have soup all the time. Then they purchase
the cheapest vegetables and endeavor to make the money go as far as
it possibly will to supply their wants. But all that produces this con-
dition: they lack that sort of nutrition which is essential to an increase
of fiber and flesh, and to maintain that elasticity which they ought to
have for the performance of a fair amount of labor. I think if the food
of the operatives could be increased it would be better.

INSUFFICIENT AS TO QUALITY AND QUANTITY.

Q. You mean increased in quantity, in quality, or both?—A. I mean
both.
Q. You mean that they do not have enough to eat?—A. Many of them do not; they are limited in amount. I have occasion almost every day to see the manner in which the average operative has his table spread, and certainly it seems to me eminently proper that if it be within the scope of human legislation, or within the scope of the religion which men and women profess, to alleviate the condition of the laboring classes who are our producers, it should be done. We should lift them up in the scale of humanity physically, mentally, and morally. That is the great work to be done; and I do not see under our present industrial system of political economy that any good can be reached. The whole thing must be changed.

THE TENEMENTS.

Now, in regard to the tenements in which they live. Some of the corporations have very fair tenements. I would mention, as one instance, the Weetamoe corporation. The King Philip corporation, I think, has pretty fair tenements for its operatives, although many of those tenements are neglected. Whether this is because the manufacturers, or their agents, think that it is almost impossible to keep up with the destructive propensities of their tenants or not, or whether it is from sheer neglect I cannot say, but I know the defective condition of these tenements seems to be from sheer neglect in many cases.

BADLY CONSTRUCTED, UNHEALTHILY LOCATED.

For instance, the Slade buildings are very badly located. The tenements were very hastily constructed, and are poorly constructed, so that the average amount of fuel which the operative has to use has to be increased—indeed, has to be nearly doubled—in order to heat these houses during the winter. The access to these houses is in many instances very bad. They are very near a swamp where the drainage is very bad; and through the summer time water and mire are steadily upon the ground within a few rods of the building. It is a noisome, disgusting place. I have noticed, on going in and out of these buildings many times, that the steps were out of repair for long periods. There were some rows of the Slade buildings where the boards of the steps were out and the children and the tenants themselves were likely to break their limbs and injure themselves seriously while going up and down those steps in the darkness of the night by falling through the loose steps. Nothing is done about it through the sheer neglect and the penuriousness of the managers of the mill. There are some corporations at Fall River that are notable exceptions in this respect, though they have not done everything that could be done, by any means.

Q. Had you not better specify some of those so as to give the good ones the benefit of their goodness?—A. I do not care to mention names, unless the committee desire, although I shall not be backward in that respect, if necessary.

CORPORATIONS WHICH FURNISH BETTER TENEMENTS.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you ought to do so.

The WITNESS. Well, sir, so far as my observation goes, I would say that the Crescent Mills, the Weetamoe, the Mechanics, the Narragansett, the Border City (No. 1 and No. 2), the King Philip's to some extent; the Osborne (though a few of the Osborne tenements are in bad locations) are exceptions to the rule, and I hear very little complaint brought
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against those. On the other hand, I could name corporations there which are found fault with by the operatives, and they are marked as a general thing by those who look into these matters as not being exactly what they should be.

HIGH WAGES AND GOOD TENEMENTS PREVENT STRIKES.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. In respect to those mills which you have excepted, I understand you to say that the pay is higher, and the condition of the operative better every way. Why do you except them in the remarks made?—A. Because in the King Philip’s Mills they manufacture a superior quality of cloth, and I think they pay the operatives more. I have never heard of a strike in that mill, and as a general thing this applies also to the Devoll Mills. The Weetamoe corporation is a very snug one, and seem to take care of their operatives, or to give such attention as secures it. They seem to furnish them better quarters and look after their interests. I do not know that they pay their operatives any more; but they certainly do more than any other corporation to make it comfortable for their help.

NO PROSPECT OF IMPROVEMENT.

Q. Are they able in the mills you have excepted to get better food? How do they manage that?—A. Well, I think as a rule, so far as food is concerned, in nearly all the mills of Fall River, with perhaps two or three or four exceptions, the food is pretty nearly the same. Those who occupy a better position, such as the overseers, and those who get better pay, because they are spinners or may be working upon a thin fabric, are enabled thereby to have more of the comforts of life; but the average operative—for instance, the average weaver—in Fall River lives just about so year in and year out, and I do not see that he can change his condition very much on pressure. Of course, if you could instill into the minds of those who drink the necessity and duty of abandoning drink, and being at home early and sleeping as long as possible, they would be physically better, but that would be at the loss of their social ties, and they want to see their fellows of course.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are there any means taken to give them amusements in the evenings, by means of lectures or libraries, or anything of that kind?

NO AMUSEMENTS PROVIDES.

A. Not very much. We have a city library and it is frequented very much by the operatives; for even if they do not read much they are a thinking class, and they are probing this matter to the bottom, and they are the ones that are finding fault with the system.

LABOR AGITATORS NOT SELF-SEEKING.

Q. I would like to know your idea about this: Many people say that these labor agitators are a set of men who are looking for their personal aggrandizement.—A. I do not believe that that is so, sir.

Q. What would you say about that—I mean the men who are agitating the labor question?—A. I do not know any agitator in Fall River
who has anything at heart except the good of his fellow men. I think the statements of those who stigmatize them as discreditable are entirely at variance with the truth and with the fact.

Q. You have some acquaintance with them, I take it!—A. Yes.

LABOR AGITATORS THINKING MEN.

Q. What about their intellectual qualities!—A. Well, I do not know of more than half a dozen who may be called agitators in Fall River, and, indeed, I think that number may be reduced. The most prominent man there now among the laborers, that is, a man connected with the organization of laborers, is Mr. Howard. He is a man of intelligence, and has devoted much time and study to this labor question. He is of a very nervous temperament. So far as his ideas are concerned—his wish to benefit his fellows—they are all right; but he may have some ideas that are far in advance of his fellows.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. I do not understand that the class of men that are condemned as agitators, mischief-makers, and organizers, are actual workers, but men on the “make,” who appeal to the prejudices of their class for their own selfish uses in some outside matter. It is not the actual workers that agitate. I do not understand that that term covers the workers.—A. Well, that class may not do very much of that sort of work, but they think and aid the others.

MR. HOWARD AS A LABOR AGITATOR.

Mr. PUGH. Mr. Howard, I regard as a man of intelligence. I have heard him testify. He seems to be familiar with this whole question, and to have devoted a great deal of thought to it, and I think he thoroughly understands the relation of labor and capital, and the responsibilities and failures of each.

The CHAIRMAN. We called Mr. Howard before us, and we have had other just such representative men as he from all parts of the country. The congress of the Federation of Labor from all parts of the country had a meeting in New York while we were there, and we called many of their men to testify; but they were denounced as cranks and agitators. I do not know who were referred to unless those were the men. We have had no such men as Senator Pugh has been describing—outside men who stir up strife among others for their own benefit. Do you know of any such men in Fall River?

The WITNESS. No, sir; I do not.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. If you knew any such I would like to have that distinction made.—A. I know that among the manufacturers there, men of that kind are branded as agitators, and that they have some desire for their own advancement.

Q. Is Mr. Howard sometimes called an agitator?—A. He is regarded so.

Q. Do you know of any other man except Mr. Howard and his associates who are stigmatized as agitators down there?—A. Well, I am stigmatized myself to some extent on account of my radical views there. I am always ready when I see injustice to talk against it. That is a part of my democracy.

Q. You use the word “democracy” in its broad sense?—A. Yes; not in a political sense.

The CHAIRMAN. You may go on with anything you wish to say.
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THE SLADE-MILL TENEMENTS.

The Witness. I was speaking of them with reference to the character of the tenements.

I want to say a few words further relative to the Slade-Mill tenements and the condition of the operatives in those tenements, and the conveniences offered by the company. They are such to-day, so far as I am cognizant of them, as to demand that something be said about them. I have no axes to grind. I drive along quietly in my profession; but when it is necessary for me as a citizen to state what I think is right in defense of justice I do it without fear or favor.

This corporation, I said, neglects the welfare of its operatives. I will give you an illustration: I have spoken of the drainage and ventilation and the bad location of the buildings.

ILLUSTRATION OF NEGLECT.

But in regard to the water we have in Fall River, it is probably as excellent water as can be found in the country, and the city has been to great expense in providing it. There is a single source of water there, and that is outdoor. The women who do the work for the families are obliged, summer and winter, to go out of the building and go up one of the streets between the buildings and take the water from a single pump or from a single faucet which has a caliber of seven-eighths of an inch. If they have young children they leave them, of course, in the house while they go out. They are subjected to the changes of temperature which they have to meet on passing from a warm atmosphere to a cold, and quite a number of accidents have taken place in those tenements (that is, within the time the corporation has been in existence) from scaldings and burning of children on stoves and, in one way and another, during the absence of their mothers in looking after these things.

That ought to be corrected. I do not think it is true of the corporations of Fall River, as a general thing, that they leave things in that way. Most of the places are furnished with water, and they have access to it over the sink. It strikes me that that all grows out of the closeness with which that corporation attempts to run its mills.

THE OPERATIVES READERS AND THINKERS.

The operatives of Fall River, as a rule, read a great deal. A few of them (and those are the thinkers) ponder these questions very much—take newspapers of radical character, some English, but generally American, while the rest read light literature that enables them to read about something outside of their own kind of labor, and they while away the time that way, and, to some extent, gain a little knowledge. But a few, perhaps 10 per cent., may be 20 per cent. of the operatives of Fall River read better books and seek information to store their minds.

CAREWORN AND DEJECTED CONDITION OF OPERATIVES.

I think, sir, that the one thing which strikes the eye of a stranger who will take a little time, say a few days, in Fall River, is this: the poor manner in which the operatives live, their careworn and dejected condition. It is certainly a subject of remark among the men in my profession, and among men in the legal profession. I have heard some
gentlemen of the Fall River bar mention it myself—this peculiar, care-worn, dejected appearance of the operatives; the dwarfed appearance and condition—and they have raised a question as to the cause and the cure.

THE CAUSE AND THE CURE.

Q. If there were not other particulars as to the conditions you might raise the question of cure, having stated the cause?—A. Well, I do not know that I have stated the cause perfectly. I may be very radical in regard to these questions, and I try to get at the bottom of things. My opinion is that three or four of the main features of our political economy require to be materially changed before you can expect to benefit the masses.

MONOPOLIES TO BE BROKEN UP.

In the first place, I think monopolies should be broken up, and that the monopolies of the many should be broken up or changed so that there could be no monopolization of it; and that the monopoly of transportation should be materially changed. Many other things would be necessary, but I think those features of our political economy——

The UNCHAIRMAN (interposing). The land, money, and transportation! The WITNESS. Yes—ought to be materially changed.

VIEWS ON THE LAND QUESTION.

Q. In what respect?—A. I think that the land belonging to the Government—land not sold—should be reserved for actual settlers, in quantities sufficient for their necessities, and no more.

Q. How large lots. You know that is the law now?—A. That would depend upon the quality of the land. I should think as a rule 50 to 100 acres would be sufficient for any person to have to cultivate.

MODIFICATION OF THE HOMESTEAD LAW.

Q. Would you apply the homestead law, but reduce the quantity so as to have some for the future?—A. I would reduce the quantity. Of course mechanics, men who follow mechanical pursuits, do not require as much land; but every man ought to be entitled to what would be necessary for a garden, and a commodious building spot, so that his house should not be so near his neighbor's as to be exposed to fire or pestilence.

GOD'S LAWS NULLIFIED BY HUMAN LAWS.

That the Government should see to. I do not know why this Government should neglect that provision for each and every person. I think the violation of God's laws in regard to these things has brought about all our troubles, and we have attempted to adjust them by weak and human laws, frequently taking away the liberties of the people and injuring them more than anything else.

LAND GRANTS FORFEITED AND LARGE ESTATES DISTRIBUTED.

The lands which have been so profusely given to railroad corporations, which they have not earned, and which it can be shown they have not earned, and have forfeited, should be restored to the people, and my impression is that as population advances it will be necessary to
fix it so that here or in New York, or anywhere in Northern States where land is high the large estates should be broken up on the death of the occupant. It is difficult for a man to go from Fall River and get cheap land any where this side of the Rocky Mountains, and when he has got his family there he has not got much to get along with. This idea of parental government need not be brought up. We are all here to help one another in this world, and this should be seen to, or else it is Government’s failure.

MINING LAND RESERVED.

Q. You were going to say more about the land.—A. Nothing in particular, only about the quality of the land. Wherever in the location of land an individual strikes a valuable mine, I think there should be in the contract between him and the Government a provision with reference to the sale of the land, whether he buys it or whether it is a gift to him, that the Government should reserve the power and the right to hold that mining section for the benefit of the whole people, and not allow it to pass into the hands of any individual or clique.

TRANSPORTATION REQUIREMENTS.

In regard to the matter of transportation, in order to enable the population of our great cities—these great surging masses who are crowding each other every day in order to fill their stomachs—to be relieved from the pressure, the law should be so fixed that persons wanting to go out and get upon the land so sub-divided should have access to that land, instead of spending all they have laid by for a few months to get there.

PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY.

I look at that matter from the Christian stand-point. I believe if the religion of the day were what it ought to be we would have a very different condition of things, because it is a fraud and humbug, and that is the reason why the present condition prevails. I believe there are some sincere Christians and that there is a genuine religion, but we are far from possessing it.

THE BANKING SYSTEM AND INTEREST.

Q. Is there any other point which you wish to present?—A. Well, I could say a few words in regard to money; but I do not think that would be necessary. As a Jeffersonian Democrat I should totally oppose the present banking system. I believe it is an injury to the country. It has its basis in interest, and interest is the thing that eats the vitals of the country.

THE BONDED DEBT.

The bonded debt of the country should have been paid before this. It is likely to be a burden upon the shoulders of the people for many years, if it ever be lifted. I do not view money in any other light than that it is a medium of exchange; it is a recognition when received by one individual of that individual having given an equivalent for it in product or in labor, and is a bond, the bond of brotherhood between man and man, and it should be so accepted, and will be accepted, and is to-day very largely accepted.
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MONOPOLIZATION AND GAMBLING IN MONEY.

If we could only blot out the gambling in money which exists we could get along very well. Monopolization of money, of course, makes it difficult for the comparatively poor manufacturer to get money, unless he borrows it at a high rate of interest, and the higher the rate of interest the worse he is off. In order to shield himself he takes it out of his laborers. He cannot take it out of his product very well, for he is in competition with other manufacturers of more wealth, who do not have to borrow so much; so he gets his profit back out of his laborer or consumer, and the poor man, as a rule, is a great consumer in this country of ordinary fabrics.

THE RENT, TRANSPORTATION, AND MONEY QUESTIONS.

It certainly seems to me that the Government needs to recognize at once the supreme necessity of changing those three features—the rent question, the transportation question, and the money question.

Q. The special evils of Fall River, as compared with other places, you say, are the absence of proper sanitary conditions, the absence of proper food, and the inclination to extort rather too much labor for the wages paid by the manufacturers?

A. Yes, I would say this: that the manufacturers are somewhat in debt. In 1872 they put up some ten mills, and I think at an expense of eight or ten million dollars; I think the most part of the money was invested by parties out of town; but they were in debt, and the panic of 1873 came on, and they had to borrow money from time to time, and have felt, as all men feel, like turning the load over onto other shoulders in order to relieve themselves; the consequence was that reduced pay took place and the operatives had to suffer, and we had strikes; that, I think, is due to our pernicious money system largely.

GRADUAL IMPROVEMENT IN SURROUNDINGS.

Q. Do you think that on the whole the condition is improving in Fall River, and do you hope one of these days to see these abuses improved?—A. Yes; I think it is safe to say that to some extent the surroundings of the operatives are improving. I do not see very much improvement in the quality of the food they are able to buy, nor in the quality of the clothing; it is rather in the improvements which the manufacturers from time to time are enabled to bring to bear upon the mills—upon their own property—to make it more attractive.

INADEQUATE WAGES.

As to the rate of wages they pay I am not very well posted; I know the general complaint is that the operatives do not get sufficient pay.

In the solution of the great problem it is absolutely necessary, I think, that the Government shall turn its attention to the fact that the laboring classes of the country are certainly entitled to enough to live on comfortably and respectfully. That they should be robbed—and they are robbed directly and indirectly by our present policy—is a great injustice.

27—G 3—(5 LAW)
THE INTERESTS OF LABOR AND CAPITAL IDENTICAL.

Q. You think that labor should be well taken care of before capital gets any profit?—A. I think that all that capital gets it gets from labor, and it is for the interest, even of capitalists, that they should first, above all things, see that the laboring classes of the country are well paid, well clothed, well housed, and made comfortable in their work; that they should have access to public libraries and to parks and public improvements of every kind. I think this is necessary for the improvement of the individual, physically, morally, and mentally.

THE AGGREGATION OF WEALTH WORKS INJUSTICE.

Q. And that this, for the safety of capital itself, should be first secured?—A. Yes, I do not see how you can maintain capital in this country, as it is now getting into the hands of a few men, unless you do that thing. The tendency seems to be to the aggregation of wealth by these processes. The most wealthy men seek to rob or fleece those below them by watering stock, &c.

Q. There is a great deal of that; but, after all, is not the great mass of capital in this country dedicated to wise, conservative industrial production?—A. I presume it is; I think it is.

Q. Is there any danger that we may confound the abuses attending the exception, and identify those abuses with the great mass of capital which may be more conservatively and usefully employed?—A. Well, I should have to weigh that perhaps some little time to give you a very definite answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I shall not ask you to go into it.

The WITNESS. It seems to me, however, that the tendency of the times is to a concentration of wealth, whether that wealth consists of money or of property.

THE BIG FISHES DEVOURING THE SMALLER ONES.

Q. Yes, but the concentration of wealth for wise purposes and conservative uses is one thing, and the concentration of wealth for speculative uses is another. Do you not think that it may be that most of the abuses that attend its use are when it is dedicated to insane and it may be almost malicious speculation? You speak of the large fishes devouring those of a smaller size, and those again devouring fishes of a size still smaller. Society seems inclined to consume itself?—A. Yes, I think that is the tendency, and this tendency on the part of the few who have made power by hook or by crook to do all this, unless checked by some plan which shall distribute the products of labor to the masses, will, it seems to me, eventually break up the Government.

______________________________

BOSTON, MASS., October 18, 1883.

CARROLL D. WRIGHT recalled and further examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Will you please continue your explanation of the work of your bureau, and the aid which legislation must, in your opinion, give to labor.

NEED OF CLEAN HOMES FOR OPERATIVES.

Answer. I think the chief work which legislation can now do with reference to the general labor question, is in the matter of homes of the operatives.
Q. Do you mean in Massachusetts, or in the country generally?—A. My remarks, so far as tenement houses are concerned, would apply to the country generally. When law will give power to local boards of health, or which would be better still, give agents of a State board of health the power to insist upon clean homes, great strides will be made. At present, if I understand the matter, local boards of health have only the right to enter houses after an epidemic begins; that is, they have no power to enter the stable until after the horse is stolen. If they had power to insist upon clean homes, as they have power to insist upon clean factories in our State, much could be accomplished.

POWER OF MORAL FORCES IN DEALING WITH LABOR.

There is another thing that, so far as my own investigations are concerned, is needed above all others to benefit the operatives, of our State at least, and that is more thorough recognition on the part of employers of the power of moral forces in the conduct of their business, and in their relations to their employés.

Q. Moral forces such as what?—A. Such as caring for the operatives in their relations outside of the mill. In fact, I would do just what Mr. Warren testified he has done for thirty years. If that can be done, if the operatives can only understand that there is an interest in them besides an obligation to pay them wages, they are usually loyal, and, so far as I have seen, are content and industrious under reductions when reductions are essential; but they want to feel that there is an interest in their welfare, and in their progress outside the workshop.

RECOGNITION OF MANHOOD APPRECIATED BY WAGE EARNERS.

Q. Do you think that they desire this to be manifested toward them in the way that we give a dinner to a dog—as matter of kindness to the dog?—A. Not at all.

Q. But as a right—as a recognition of manhood?—A. As a recognition of manhood. It is the manly treatment of operatives that has produced the best results, and wherever the principles that Mr. Warren has testified to have been observed in industrial establishments the employers get better product and better work for the money invested, and the employé gets better wages, and the result is a better and more thrifty community. That is clearly shown by every community that has adopted this principle.

SANITARY LEGISLATION.

Q. Is there any way to enforce this principle on the part of those who employ labor by methods outside of legislation?—A. Legislation can do but little in that direction, but it could institute the other feature to which I referred a moment ago as essential, and that is the sanitary feature. Legislation cannot regulate wages.

CO-OPERATION: STIMPSON HAT FACTORY IN PHILADELPHIA.

Mr. Edward Atkinson. What Colonel Wright is saying suggests to me that in going to Washington you will visit Philadelphia, and I suggest that you visit Stimpson's hat factory, one of the most thorough examples of co-operation between the owners and the working people that I have ever met with, and of the thoroughly right kind, the kind that pays
most profit to both. One of the curious examples which I have never met anywhere else is this: hat making of the felt kind remains in a large measure a handcraft; very little machinery is applied to it. It is continuous and exhausting work. The owners of this factory found that the interval between breakfast and dinner was too long; that the human boiler needed some fuel, and at half past ten every morning a pint of milk is served to every man, woman, and child in that concern to keep up the steam. That is the best kind of philanthropy that I know of—it does good both to him who gives and him who receives. If you go to Philadelphia you ought not to miss seeing that particular establishment.

ADVANTAGES OF LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATION.

The WITNESS. There are two things which can be done, one is the result of enlightenment, and the other the result of legislation, which can be only brought about by public sentiment secured by investigation, and the candid report of facts and results wherever such conditions have existed and the results have been known. The instances are not few—they are very numerous—where a spirit of co-operation on the part of the managers has been found, and the results indicated reached. In such establishments strikes never occur.

STRIKES AN EVIDENCE OF INFERIOR MANAGEMENT.

In fact I do not believe that a strike ought ever to be allowed, so far as the management is concerned. The right to strike on the part of employés cannot be denied, but the manager of a great industrial establishment who allows a strike to occur confesses to the public, in my estimation, a want of moral character. I say this because managers who do recognize the power of moral forces in the conduct of their affairs never have strikes.

Q. You mean to be understood that it is substantially a universal rule that strikes result from the fault of employers rather than the employé?—A. They have been the fault, so far, of a want of understanding of truer and higher principles on both sides. But this much is true, that when the wage receivers are satisfied of the moral integrity of their employers in the conduct of the affairs of the establishment they accept the situation asked of them generously and loyally.

INFLUENCES WHICH PRODUCE STRIKES.

Q. Do you think it is possible, always, by a presentation of the truth to satisfy them of the real situation, or are they sometimes inclined to doubt whether the truth is told to them?—A. It is altogether, in many cases, owing to the manner in which the truth is presented to them. The truth may be presented to a man in such a way as to antagonize him; and on the other hand it may be presented to him in such a way as to win his support. There is a great deal of human nature on both sides of the question. The fault I find with managers of establishments where strikes have occurred is that they consider human nature to be about all on one side, and not to be recognized as existing on both.

REFORMS SHOULD ORIGINATE FROM THE EMPLOYING CLASSES.

Q. You think they are in a situation, as the stronger party, to make the advances?—A. Certainly. The moral reforms should come from
that side of the question, where there is the more education, and moral qualities and strength.

Q. Do you think that it is always clear that there is the more intelligence and education and the best moral quality on the part of the employer—setting aside his strength?—A. There should be, else the employer is not fit to be an employer.

The CHAIRMAN. One witness testified before us that he had been one of an organization of employers in New York who organized to resist trades unions, and he became utterly disgusted with the employers' organization; he found that his associates knew less, and were less reliable and honorable to each other in this mutual compact than the working people were among themselves.

The WITNESS. I can easily understand that; but I had reference to that general intelligence which should exist in the employing classes.

The CHAIRMAN. I got the impression from his testimony that the employers needed to be imbued with a little charity sometimes.

The WITNESS. I should think that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. I coincide, however, entirely with your general statement.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF REFORM.

The WITNESS. That has been the result of my observation. Without classing myself as a reformer in any way, I am satisfied that those two reforms can be practically worked in this country—first, the mutual recognition, which I am sure is coming, for I see the results of it every day, of the power of moral forces; and, secondly, bettering the conditions of the home. As a rule, factories are better places to live and breathe in than the homes of many of the people who work in the factories.

Q. Do you think that legislation should extend its power in that regard beyond operatives? Are there any powers that should be enforced in the construction of houses generally beyond the houses of the mere wage-working class?

NEED OF STRINGLENT BUILDING LAWS.

A. Oh, yes. As a rule, I should have good building laws. The wealthy are supposed to have means to enable them to construct their buildings on the best sanitary plan. The fact is, however, that they do not always do it; but there is no reason in the world why dwellings should not be healthy; and I see no reason, if people won't make them healthy, why the law should not step in and insist upon it.

Q. You think no man should be allowed to exercise his rights in a way to injure another?—A. Precisely. The great trouble in cities in this State is the want of backbone in local boards of health.

LOCAL BOARDS OF HEALTH—THEIR WEAKNESS.

They are the creatures of municipal politics, and they do not like always to insist that a wealthy tenement-house owner shall do certain things which they would insist upon a poor man's doing. And so the fact is that in some of our factory cities in Massachusetts some very bad houses are owned by very wealthy men—men prominent in city politics.

Q. How would it do to make such offices for life, or subject only to
removal for malfeasance in office?—A. That might do very well; still the local official would be subjected to local influences.

Q. But still he never could be despoiled of his office?—A. Not without a hearing.

Q. Nor because he did his duty?—A. No; public sentiment would uphold him if he did his duty, no matter how obnoxious it might be.

Q. Do you think he is quite sure if he has to appeal to the general suffrage every year or two?—A. Men cannot hold such office by popular suffrage any more than the judiciary can.

Q. They are appointed by the governor, I suppose, here?

The WITNESS. The judiciary, do you mean?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the boards of health.

The WITNESS. The local boards of health are elected by the city governments, or, in towns, by the people.

Q. You mean to say that the judiciary is an office that could not be held by popular election?

HEALTH OFFICERS SHOULD BE APPOINTED, NOT ELECTED.

A. Not with the very best results. It is, however, held so in many States. Our State board of health is appointed by the governor; the local boards are selected by the local governments, or, in towns, by the people, where there is no municipal government.

Q. What remedy would you suggest, in order that you may secure independence in local boards of health?—A. I would have the agents of the State board empowered to insist upon right conditions in industrial centers.

Q. You find no lack of independence in the matter of discharging their duty on the part of the State board of health?—A. No. I think there would be no difficulty there. If a man feels free in his office from local prejudices and influence, he is much more likely to do his duty in a town where there is great necessity for it. I know that that smells a bit of centralization, but it is centralization in the interest of the whole.

THE FACTORY SYSTEM AN ELEMENT OF ADVANCEMENT IN CIVILIZATION.

Q. What is your judgment as to the general influence upon the character, the prosperity, and the happiness of the wage-working population and laboring people, generally, of the introduction of the factory system instead of our former method of performing like labor?—A. I am thoroughly satisfied that the factory has been a wonderful element in our civilization towards its advancement, for this reason: Under the old domestic system of labor, which existed prior to the factory system, there was no centering of thought; everything was diffused; the moral condition of workers under the domestic system was much worse than under the factory system. It was under it that the great pauper class of England grew up, and it was only with the advent of the factory that that pauper class began to be limited in size.

ITS RESULTS IN AMERICA.

In this country, while the factory has, on the face of it and in the minds of many, tended to degrade labor, the actual fact is that it has elevated it, for this reason: While processes have been simplified, peo-
people who have been obliged to earn their living by the coarsest muscular labor have been able to step up in the grade of employment and become partially skilled in their employment; so that instead of degrading skilled labor the factory has been constantly elevating unskilled labor to the ranks of skilled labor. I believe a very close examination of the subject would bring any one to that conclusion.

I have had the honor to make a report to General Walker on the factory system of the United States, and that is my conclusion after two or three years' special study on that subject.

**GENERAL MISCONCEPTION OF THE RESULTS OF THE FACTORY SYSTEM.**

Q. You think it has improved the health and the general conditions of life with our own working population?—A. Certainly.

Q. As well here as in the foreign country you refer to?—A. Certainly. I was speaking more particularly in regard to America. I know the feeling is that the factory system has more and more tended to degrade labor, because under that system thirty or forty years ago, as established in New England, we employed only American girls from our farm houses, &c., while now we see an entirely different class in our factories; but I fail to find that the class who used to be in factories have gone down; they have stepped up into school teaching, telegraphy, and the higher branches of labor, while their places have been filled by a class that have come up from a lower occupation.

Q. Would it or not have been inevitable that those who had possession, if incapable of rising, would have remained?—A. That certainly would have been true; while now the result is that by the factory we are constantly opening wider the field of advancement for that class of people who unfortunately stand on the lower round of the industrial ladder—we are bringing them up closer.

**THE ELEVATION OF ONE CLASS ELEVATES ALL.**

Q. Is not that universally true in the history of human affairs, that where one class of human beings rise, that rising does, of necessity, elevate all that are above?—A. That is the conclusion of my observation and reflection on the subject.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. Have you ever thought about the influences in factory employment that would have this elevating effect that you describe—the influence on the life of a factory operative that would elevate him more than he would be elevated under other conditions?

**THE OLD INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM COMPARED WITH THE NEW.**

A. Yes; if you take things comparatively—and we are obliged always to do that. Under the old system which preceded the factory, the handloom weavers and spinners did their work in the same rooms in which they lived. They were left to themselves, and to all the demoralizing influences which came from constant association, and living and working in one room. The machinery for production always disputed with the family for the room for living, and the result was very bad in regard to the morals of the people.

When the factory came, association and co-operation in many respects took place; minds were sharpened by contact, and, as factory centers
increased, the mental friction of the factory brought about efforts to introduce the lyceum, and many other of the results which you usually find in factory towns, and rarely, if ever, find in agricultural villages. There is that isolation in the old domestic system and in agricultural labor which prevents much progress. This progress has been greatest in the centers of industry as developed by machinery.

THE FACTORY SYSTEM IN ITS BEARINGS ON PROSTITUTION AND INTEMPERANCE.

Your question leads me to another thought entertained by some in regard to the old methods, that the factory feeds prostitution and intemperance. It has been a privilege of mine to examine many of the records of different municipalities in Europe, and to gather from them statistics which have never appeared in print with reference to the crimes committed in different boroughs and towns, and I have made the same investigation in this country, and, with very rare exceptions, I have found that the factory population of a place furnished a less proportion of the arrests for crime than the proportion of the factory population to the whole population of that place. Nor have I been able to find that prostitution grows out of the associations of the factory. I am well satisfied from the investigation of original statistics which I have been able to make, that the factory populations not only of this country, but of Great Britain, are making as virtuous and noble a fight for their existence and progress as any other class in the community. I have come to that conclusion, and was glad to arrive at it, because I had a different impression. The facts teach me that that is true.

THE FACTORY SYSTEM IN LARGE CITIES.

Q. Have you been able to draw any distinction between operatives in villages outside of the cities, and those in large cities?—A. Certainly. All large cities have a population which is in its nature floating, but which has nothing particular to do with the industries of the place; and the misfortune is that all the misdemeanors of that population are, in a large industrial town, attributed to the presence of the industry. You may take Manchester, England, if you choose. I used to hear very bad statements in regard to the factory population of Manchester; still the facts were that the misdemeanors which were attributed to the factory operatives of Manchester belonged entirely to what we would call the "hoodlum" population of any great city. The factory did not bring it there. It was there.

THE FACTORY SYSTEM IN VILLAGES.

But of course, the truer idea is to find the town that is built around the village. That is the factory village you refer to. In this factory village, not only in this country but in other countries, I think you will find as good a state of progress as in villages where the industries are entirely formative. I see no reason why, certainly in the future, with the growth of a better sentiment on both sides of the great industrial question, the factory should not be the most powerful agent in bringing the people to a higher moral condition.

THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION.

For instance, the temperance question is more largely under the control of the employers of labor than any other class of men. The expe-
rience of the last twenty years clearly proves that in all factory centers where the manufacturers themselves have taken an interest in the question, and have insisted upon employing only men of sobriety, there has been a vast improvement. Take the English factory towns, where twenty years ago Monday was largely lost, and Tuesday worth but little; you can now find but few places where there is any difference in the days of the week about the conduct of the establishment in respect to the drunkenness of the operatives. That old state of things is passing by. Men can be employed for the same wages who do not get drunk. And there is an esprit du corps growing up in factories everywhere, which frowns upon any general dissipation among the people in the factories. That is certainly so among the women, and I find, so far as I have been able to observe, that it is growing to be largely so among the men. Improvident habits, of course, among people everywhere is largely the cause of panperism; but how to check these improvident habits is a great question. In my own mind the most powerful influence that will check them is a sentiment which shall say to a man that without sobriety there is no employment.

CRIME IN CITIES.

Q. Some statisticians say that 90 per cent. of the crime and prostitution of the country is found in cities, and only 10 per cent. exists among the agricultural classes; how is that?—A. That may or may not be so, but if it is, it is very deceptive, for this reason, that crime is usually committed in centers, and statistics would ascribe it all to the population of that center rather than ascribe it to those parties who come in from the outside to have "a little time," as they call it, in that center. So that all of that class of statistics are very misleading. For instance, the arrests in the city of Boston must, by the statistician, be attributed to that city, while one-half of the arrests may, perhaps, be of countrymen who come in from the farms, and get intoxicated in the city. You cannot tell, unless you trace them to their source, whether they belong to the city proper or not. Criminal statistics are the most difficult to compare of all the statistics that we have, especially in our country, where the criminal codes of the different States vary very much, as they do. For instance, in our State we have one hundred and fifty, or more, misdemeanors punishable, under the statute, as crimes, while in other States there are only one hundred. You cannot, therefore, compare the criminal statistics of Massachusetts with a State having 30 per cent. less crimes classified in its statutes.

THE PRINCIPLE WHICH REGULATES WAGES.

Of course, all these investigations bring out, more or less, certain truths. They teach us as to the expediency of adopting this or that theory, of making a better division of the profits of labor between the two forces, labor and capital, but so far no investigation and no study that I am aware of, or with which I am acquainted, has established the principle which regulates wages, and until we can find out what regulates wages, it would be pretty difficult to ascertain any remedy by which profits could be more justly divided. I myself feel that the time will come when co-operative principles may be adopted, but "simon pure" cooperation at the present time would rob the wage-receiver of a large portion of his present share in the profits of manufacture.
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WHO CONTROLS THE RATES OF WAGES.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. In what class does the power exist in the largest degree to control the rates of wages—the employer or the employé, the laborer or the capitalist?—A. I should say that the larger share of power now rests with the capitalist.

Q. Then the rate of wages is dictated by capital?—A. It is dictated by the capitalists finally, but what induces them to say (I am speaking, of course, of just men) that the wages to-day must be reduced 10 per cent, and next week increased 10 per cent, is a matter which can hardly be located, except in a temporary way. Of course, if there are more goods in the market than there is any demand for, and goods must be made at a loss, and there is no advantage in the purchase of raw material, labor is the only elastic feature in the composition of the product.

But if you should, on the other hand, say that wages, under such circumstances, should not be decreased, and you would force a decrease in the price of raw material, you would simply say then that another laborer shall have his wages cut down, while the laborer immediately under consideration shall not. All raw material is simply the product of labor, and if raw material is at a certain price to-day and you force it down to a lower price to-morrow, the labor which produces that raw material must, of course, submit to a reduction, although the man engaged in the final production does not have his wages cut. It is cut somewhere on labor.

Q. Then the class that most needs the influence of moral forces growing out of the condition of public opinion is the capitalist?—A. I think so, because you need there the most even-handed justice, tempered by the very best moral sentiment and regard for the man who vitalizes the capital, and that is always the laborer.

EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF THE JOINT PRODUCT OF CAPITAL AND LABOR.

By the Chairman:

Q. I should like to know your ideas in regard to the equitable distribution of the joint product of capital and labor as it exists at the present time, whether it is substantially as well as it ought to be for the laboring classes, or whether they ought justly to have more?—A. I have never yet seen a man in any walk of life who did not want a little larger share in the distribution of profits of labor, but, speaking of justice and desire, we can separate sometimes the two elements in labor. The present relation of capital and labor is very clearly shown on pages 370 and 371 of the fourteenth annual report of my bureau.

Q. That is the last report?—A. The last report. Take $100 worth of material at the price at which the producer or manufacturer sells it at his warehouse, before it goes into other hands—

Q. That is, what he receives for it?—A. What he receives for it at his warehouse. Of $100 worth of product in 1880, 01.32 per cent. is raw material.

Q. What class of manufacture is that?—A. That includes all the industries of the State brought to an average.

Q. Including agriculture?—A. Not including agriculture, but all industries producing manufactured goods brought to an average.
THE SHARE OF LABOR.

I say that 61.32 per cent. is raw material; 20.33 per cent. is labor; 12.88 is interest and expenses (on the basis of 6 per cent. to the capital; and 10 per cent. on the product for expenses of wear and tear), leaving 5.47 per cent. as net profit to capital.

Q. After it has received interest on the capital invested?—A. Yes, after getting interest on the capital invested; it may be borrowed money, paying 6 per cent.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. And allowing 10 per cent. for wear and tear?—A. Running expenses, wear and tear, insurance, and everything of that kind, which is a just average rate. Putting it outside of percentages, that gives $1,792 as the average yearly product for each employed in the mechanical industries of Massachusetts.

THE SHARE OF CAPITAL.

By the Chairman:

Q. Now, have you ascertained what percentage upon the capital invested the portion remaining for distribution to capital would be—the amount per hundred dollars?—A. 5.47 per cent.

Q. That is the proportion of the product?—A. Yes.

Q. But I ask what rate that would be on the investment? To indicate exactly what I mean: There is a certain amount of capital invested. Wear and tear, interest, wages, and all that amount to a certain sum. Deduct that sum, and, after making the deductions, if there is $6 left for every hundred dollars of capital invested, that would be 6 per cent.

PROFITS: FIVE PER CENT. OF PRODUCT, BUT TEN PER CENT. ON CAPITAL.

A. Well, according to my report (1883), it would be $34,000,000 in round numbers on $303,000,000 capital invested, which would be about 10 per cent. on the capital invested but not on the product. It would be about 5 per cent. on the product.

Q. That is not of any consequence when you come to look at it with reference to the largest return on the capital invested. A man goes into business and puts in $10,000; that is the capital put in, whether quick or fixed. Now, he manufactures perhaps a million dollars' worth of product, and there is remaining a certain sum after making the deductions mentioned by you. That sum is distributed, and constitutes a dividend upon the $10,000 invested. I understand you to say that the sum remaining to be distributed upon the capital invested in this Commonwealth, after paying interest on the capital, is 10 per cent. more!—A. Ten per cent. more on the capital.

PROFITS, INCLUDING INTEREST, 16 PER CENT.

Q. Then if you treat it all as borrowed money, you would make 16 per cent.?—A. Yes; if you treat it all as borrowed money.

Q. And if a man owns his capital, free of debt, that 16 per cent. is all his own?—A. Yes.

Q. It is the same as if he got a compensation of 16 per cent. for the use of his money?—A. Yes.
The CHAIRMAN. There is a little apparent jugglery here, or perhaps not jugglery, but something that misleads. Such a percentage "on the product" has nothing to do with what a man makes on his investment. If there is nothing left, there is no profit at all, but whatever is remaining is a percentage on the investment.

DIFFICULTY OF ARRIVING AT THE REAL PROFIT OF CAPITALISTS.

The WITNESS. The same rule should apply all around then, but it is impossible to apply it because the capital invested is an entirely fictitious figure. It is never ascertainable with any accuracy. You can get at the product, and at the wages, and at all items that are fixed, but when you want to get at the capital, one manufacturer will return and treat as capital his plant and all the money that he has put in; another will return his money and leave out his plant.

Q. On what basis are those things calculated?—A. On the basis of product.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not see that that teaches anything.

Mr. PUGH. It teaches the actual money expended, and what he gets for his product, which is to him of more account, I suppose, than the other.

Q. It shows whether he has made or lost?—A. Yes.

Q. But does not show the relation of gain or loss to capital?—A.

No. I had not got so far as that, because another figure comes in there which I was going to quote in a different connection.

AVERAGE VALUE OF PRODUCT OF EACH EMPLOYÉ, $1,792.

Mr. PUGH. I wanted to catch that statement as to the value of product of a single mechanic.

The WITNESS. That is what I was driving at.

Mr. PUGH. You get, in that, more elements to predicate upon.

The WITNESS. The average to each employé was $1,792.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. That is the value of the product of the labor of the mechanic?

AVERAGE ANNUAL WAGES OF EACH EMPLOYÉ, $364. AVERAGE PROFIT OF EMPLOYER ON EACH EMPLOYÉ, $98.

A. That is what each mechanic, man, woman, and child produces. Now, to each man, woman, and child employed in a mechanical industry, the employer gets $98 net profit; that is giving him 6 per cent on his capital and 5 per cent on his product, &c. Each employé gets $364. That brings your point directly into relation. That is $98 to the employer as net profit on the product of each employé; it is the product of $364 yearly wages paid to each employé to produce that $1,792. The balance is raw material and expenses. That brings it into a nutshell, all of which could be found out only by the proceeding which we have gone through.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Suppose there were but one employer in Massachusetts, and the present number of employés, how much would that employer get?—A. He would get a net profit of $34,505,367.

Q. What would the laborers receive?—A. They would receive $128,315,362, divided among 352,255 of them, or $364 each.
Q. How much capital would one employer have in business then?—A. He would have $303,806,183.
Q. What he has left after paying all expenses is $34,505,367!—A. Yes; after all his expenses of labor, raw material, &c.
Q. That is to say, that would be the profit after the payment of interest on his capital invested, and all insurance and outgo of every description, and keeping up his plant, repairs, and all that!—A. Yes.
Q. So that it is precisely the same as if money at interest on the best of security should bring $34,000,000 on an investment of $303,000,000, or about 10 per cent.?—A. Yes; that is on the fictitious basis of the capital invested.

STATISTICS NECESSARILY INCOMPLETE.

Q. How is the capital invested ascertained?—A. By the answers of the manufacturers, which are subject to many variations. One man may be doing a large business on credit, and so may return a very small amount of capital invested when he is really using a great capital. Perhaps he is running his works in a leased manufactory, and has no capital invested at all in that, but pays rent. He would not return at all, as capital invested, a great plant of which he has the use.
Q. Is there not some way of specifying to men, when their returns are called for, just what is meant by capital invested, so that they may make their returns more reliable?—A. We are getting nearer and nearer to it. This is nearer than ever it was before.
Q. I suppose when you call for the information you ask for just what you want and they return it?—A. Yes; but we know that the answers to the question as to capital invested are avoided if possible.

CORRECT STATISTICS OF CAPITAL WOULD SHOW DECREASED PERCENTAGE OF PROFITS.

Q. If a complete return were made of the true capital invested, or, what would be nearer justice, the actual value of the plant at the time, because it might have originally cost a great deal more than it is worth in the market at the present time, if true return were made of the market value of capital invested, what would the result be? Would this 10 per cent. be increased or lessened?—A. My opinion is, it would be lessened; that is, that the real capital invested is more than the present apparent sum.
Q. And by that you mean on the basis of the market value at the present time?—A. Yes; on the basis of your question.

FEAR OF TAXATION INDUCING INCORRECT RETURNS OF CAPITAL.

Q. I suppose you cannot judge with any exactness, or any satisfactory degree of approximation, how much it is lessened?—A. I cannot, only that it is less, because that is the one element of industrial statistics which is the hardest to get, because it depends on the question of taxes. Sometimes census enumerators are also assessors in a town—a combination which is always to be avoided, though it will occur once in awhile. And I know, from my own experience in taking a census of the State by manufacturers (a census supplementary to that taken by the enumerators), that the manufacturers really intended to make full returns of the manufactures of the State, but the statements made to me in my private office would be sometimes double the amounts given
to the enumerator in his "round." That proved to me the fictitious value of capital in this State. Of course, it does not need to be so, because there is no use ever made of census figures except for statistical purposes.

THE QUESTION OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE SURPLUS AMONG EMPLOYÉS.

Q. What reason is there why any of this 10 per cent. should go to the manufacturer, beyond fair or liberal compensation for his services for the kind of work which he performs? He gets his interest back, the same as if he had lent the money. Now, after getting that, and large compensation—$50,000 a year, if you please, for conducting the business—a salary equal to that of the President of the United States, why should he have any more?—A. That is a very deep question.

Q. After deducting a good salary for his services, as you deduct the salary of his overseer or superintendent—give him ten times or twenty times their compensation, if you choose—but after deducting that why not distribute what is left among the people who have helped to produce it?—A. I don't think there is any underlying principle why that should not largely be done. The only reason is this—taking it for what it is worth—that in the production of all manufactured goods—

Q. (Interposing.) As long as there is any question about these working people being able to provide against the disabilities of age, and for the education of their children, until provision is made for those objects, do you not think that this 10 per cent. should be withheld from the proprietor?—A. I was going to explain what reasons there are why the distribution of 10 per cent. should not take place.

Q. I would like, before you proceed, that you should give us a full account of the way the thing stands—this matter of distribution—whether it really is so that the employer gets 10 per cent., all the conditions being right.—A. Yes, after the capital is paid 6 per cent.

Q. After the capital gets 6 per cent. and taxes are paid and everything is provided for, so that it stands precisely like a loan on real estate?—A. Yes, there is 10 per cent. on that. If this basis of capital is wrong, of course this 10 per cent. must vary. But assuming it to be correct, your question, as I understand, is, why should not any margin that exists be divided.

The CHAIRMAN. After first providing, I mean, of course, for the most abundant compensation of the employer for his personal services.

The WITNESS. Yes. That 10 per cent. includes all compensation for management, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly, and I wish you to deduct that from the 10 per cent.

The WITNESS. Your inquiry is, why, after deducting that, the remainder should not be distributed among the wage receivers.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

WHY SURPLUS SHOULD NOT BE DISTRIBUTED AMONG EMPLOYÉS.

The WITNESS. The reasons for that, which may be valid or invalid, are, that the production of goods involves time before they are sold. Labor, under the present system, receives its share of the profits immediately. Capital has to wait until the goods are sold, profit and loss adjusted, and then it takes its pay out of the remainder. Out of that remainder comes the compensation for management. Along with this
is the element of profit and loss, which must always go together. The
man is not entitled to profits on an enterprise unless he is also willing
to subject himself to the losses in the enterprise. Now, in an economic
sense, the item of wages takes no part in losses which occur, but receives
its share as upon profits. So that the element of time to bring back
the price does not affect the laborer, and the element of profit and loss
does not affect him. Those are the only reasons why that should be
withheld and not distributed. I am not prepared to say whether those
reasons are thoroughly sound, but those are the only ones I know of.

Q. Do you think it fair to treat the labor that enters into production
as a portion of the profits of sale? It is quite as impossible that the
thing could be created without the labor as it would be to create that
thing without the other raw material, and would there not be more
justice in treating labor itself as a raw material rather than as a share
in the profits of sale?

WHY LABOR IS TREATED AS A PORTION OF THE PROFITS.

A. That might be so if you could regulate all the relations of society,
but as every man is bound to buy his goods, whether a coat or an arti-
cle of food, at the cheapest possible rate, and will indulge in a good
deal of beating down before he buys it, wages must be paid out of the
profits of manufacture. I know that Professor Sumner and many econ-
omists combat that position, but it is so clearly illustrated in every-day
life that I know of no way in which it can be dodged. For instance, I
know an illustration which shows what you ask. In a neighboring
town largely devoted to the manufacture of shoes, there is a large dealer
who is very popular with the small dealers because they can buy a pair
of boots at his store for $2.75 which ordinarily they would have to pay
$3 for. Now, turn the picture around. This large dealer goes to a
manufacturer and orders 100 cases of boots of such a manufacture, and
says, "I will pay you so much money for those hundred cases, according to
sample." The manufacturer says he cannot sell them at that price; that
it is impossible; that they cost him that much. The man says, "This
is a cash order for 100 cases; you can take it or leave it, as you choose."
The manufacturer takes the order and cuts the price down 25 cents a
pair; the large dealer gives the small dealer the benefit of that, while
if the small dealer buys from others he has to pay this 25 cents a pair
more; he therefore damn the manufacturer and praises this dealer.
That illustrates the whole question. So long as there is a necessity for
buying goods at the lowest possible figure, that will continue. If you
pull down raw material, you pull down labor somewhere. If you say
you will sell calico at 4 cents a yard, and not reduce the wages of the
spinners and weavers, then there must be a reduction in the compensa-
tion of the cotton people in the South, so that labor does suffer after all.

HIGH WAGES STIMULATE CONSUMPTION.

Q. Then there is no remedy but in labor being powerful enough and
intelligent enough to defend itself all the way round; having something
to fall back upon and refusing to work until its conditions are fulfilled?—
A. I see no solution so long as selfishness breeds selfishness. When
we adopt the rule that unselfishness breeds unselfishness, and when the
position which I foreshadowed a little while ago comes about, when all
our manufacturers, or a large majority of them, adopt more thoroughly
the golden rule by which to run their manufactories, we shall have a
better state of affairs, because it is true that skilled and well-paid labor means more product; and when the manufacturer and everybody else learns that the laboring man will, with more money, have better clothes and food; that by having better pay for the time he puts into production he will be able to sustain and consume a larger result, there will be an improvement.

NECESSITY FOR MORAL AS WELL AS INTELLECTUAL EDUCATION.

Q. Would you put in moral education, too?—A. I should put in moral education, too. I do not believe much in intellectual education without moral education. Moral reform must come from the top. Political reform comes sometimes the other end up, but moral reform must come from above; that is to say, if the men having the adjunct of education and liberal bringing up cannot be moral leaders of society, it is unreasonable to expect that men who have had no education and who have been compelled by circumstances to live at the bottom should give the example. That is the way I look at it. And yet I feel that the moral character of our operative population will bear very close inspection. If it were not so, the property in our manufacturing towns would, I think, be worth but very little.

Q. If this principle that you speak of were applied, and all employers became more and more benevolent, and disposed to give their employees their rights, do you not think that the ultimate result would be the same competition that now exists when that benevolence is universally diffused?—A. The same competition, but a lessening of the substratum, and an elevation of the whole. I am perfectly well aware that when you come out of one condition into a higher all other conditions which you looked at previously become discolored.

Q. In business do you not think the good men are as sharp in competition and trade as anybody else?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. They are more honest, perhaps, in dealing, but they make as sharp a trade as anybody, do they not?—A. Yes.

Q. Can a man, because he is a good man, afford to deal more liberally with his help than another man in his line of business who is a sharp, bad man? He has got to meet that man in the markets of the world and sell in competition with him, and has he not therefore to pay his operatives in such a way as to enable him to make that competition?

HIGH WAGES INDUCE CAREFULNESS, SKILL, AND INDUSTRY.

A. That position is rather fictitious. A man who pays the best possible wages compatible with successful production, will secure a more careful and more skilled class of employees, and the result, if he is a shoe manufacturer, is that his leather will be better cut up; there will be less waste, less goods spoiled in the process of manufacture, and he will put into the market a good article every time, instead of a large percentage of defective goods. One pair of shoes is a case, not well made, and turned back upon the manufacturer, makes a large difference in the total, and if every pair of shoes is perfect, which is the result only of interested workmen, you would find not only a better profit but a quicker sale.

Q. Then your whole theory is based not upon the benevolent aspect of the case, that is, so far as its successful work is concerned, but upon the economic fact that the better treatment will enable the employer to contend in the markets of the world?
SKILL, INDUSTRY, AND CAREFULNESS DESERVE HIGHER WAGES.

A. Yes; it is clearly illustrated in driving nails. A man who is intelligent and knows the force of a certain blow, and knows thoroughly how to drive nails, can drive twice as many nails in a day as another man who does not understand it so well. If you pay the man who knows how $2 a day and the other man $2 a day for working the same length of time but a great deal harder, what is the result? You have, with the skilled nail-driver, secured twice the result that you have with the other.

Q. So that all these improvements in his condition really have to be paid for?—A. Yes; and should be. The moment a man puts intelligence into his work, he is entitled to a greater share of the rewards of industry.

Q. Knowledge is power, you think?—A. Every time.

Q. So that, after all, the power to do this is essential in the workman, and the capacity to do it is based in his own personal improvement?—A. Yes.

ELEVATE THE CONDITION OF THE WORKINGMAN.

Q. Then, the first necessity is to improve the condition of the workman—his competency?—A. If you can, improve his moral condition: I would have the moral force go along with the sanitary and mental education; all should go together; and, though you may say that competition will be the same when they all get up, while the millennium will not be reached very soon, you have elevated the standard of living, and therefore elevated his value to the State by the result of his new standard of living.

Q. As a result of this, by the establishment of the new interdependence of positions and profit realized, the manufacturer is still going to get his 10 per cent.?—A. He is still going to get his 10 per cent.

Q. Beyond wages?—A. Beyond wages, or whatever it is, for his risk and time.

"SIMON-PURE" CO-OPERATION A FAILURE.

Q. If you should adopt co-operation, you would at once see that capital gets its profit first as manager, while the laborer gets his profit last and as a result of the market.

Q. That would not be so if the manager and laborer were all one!—A. If they were all one—but the instances of "simon-pure" co-operation are exceedingly rare, and where they have been carried on they have failed.

Q. Why have they failed?—A. On account of human nature. If you and I engage to make bureaus on a venture and to divide the profits, and I find that I am making two bureaus to your one and a half, I am not going to keep it up very long.

CO-OPERATION THE THEORY OF THE MILLENNIUM.

Q. You think then that co-operation is the theory of the millennium?—A. Entirely so. I don't think industry can stand upon it except where the capacity of the operatives is entirely equal. I am not going to make two bureaus a day to your one and a half while I only get out of my two the same amount that you get for your one and a half, and that would defeat co-operation constantly. We hear much about co-
operation principles, and those principles, so far as they can be applied in industrial partnerships, and in such arrangements as we find at Peace-dale, R. I., by the Hazards, prove successful so long as the heart which dictates them is living.

CO-OPERATION IN NASHUA, N. H.

Q. In Nashua there is a little co-operative company that has recently started; do you know anything of it? — A. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Major Crowley came to Manchester and testified about it. They are iron workers. About four years ago the concern for which they were working could not pay them and they finally organized themselves, hired a little capital—$4,000, I think—and went into business together. They agreed that each man should have wages as though he were at work for some other employer. They hired outsiders also and to them they paid wages at the market rates.

The WITNESS. But that is not simple co-operation.

The CHAIRMAN. I know that.

The WITNESS. That works sometimes very well. It does at Sunset, Mass.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. These people at Nashua get along very successfully. They pay wages to those within and without the organization the same as are paid in the open market. In addition to that they have doubled their capacity twice, so that now it is $16,000, and they have distributed 10 per cent. at one time to the stockholders in addition to the wages. The last issue of stock was immediately taken up by the stockholders already in, and to the extent that it has been carried on, with the number of men in it, Major Crowley says that they have had perfect success, and that they find they are entirely competent to do the business and get along nicely.

The WITNESS. Those establishments get along very well.

The CHAIRMAN. That allows for a mixed condition—half way to the millennium, as it were.

The WITNESS. That is adopting co-operative principles, and is one of the surest roads to better conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have now been pretty well over this matter of wages. Did you have any further observations upon that subject to make?

The WITNESS. No.

TEN HOURS A SUFFICIENT DAY’S WORK.

Q. What do you think of the hours of labor—does the ten-hour law benefit Massachusetts? — A. I think ten hours, under the present condition of machinery and the conditions of the human body, are about right.

Q. But the working people want eight! — A. Yes, but if you should step below ten it would be a great injury to Massachusetts. In fact, the ten-hour law was an injury to Massachusetts in the beginning—a slight injury at first, but is none now, for our investigations show that Massachusetts with ten hours, pays as high wages and produces as much product per loom or spindle as those who work eleven and a half or twelve hours.

Q. Is that owing to the fact that labor does as much of itself, or that there are other circumstances auxiliary? — A. Massachusetts uses a very high grade of machinery. I do not suppose that a man working with
RELATION BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

a machine, where the machine only requires attention, can produce as much in ten hours as in eleven, because in the last hour the machine is not any more tired than in the first, but where the labor is a mixture of muscular, mental, and nervous strain, and all these elements which go into the conduct of machinery, I am well satisfied that the product of ten hours is quite as valuable as of ten and half or eleven hours. Certainly that has been shown in the mills in Connecticut that have adopted ten hours right in the midst of eleven hour districts.

Q. You have been lately to Europe, I believe?—A. Yes.

RELATIVE CONDITIONS OF LABOR IN EUROPE AND AMERICA.

Q. And had made observations of the conditions of labor perhaps before that time, as well as on this last occasion, and of course you have studied the subject largely. Where are laborers best off, in Great Britain, on the continent of Europe, or in the United States?—A. In the United States. Their standard of living is much higher here. The housing of laborers is quite as good abroad as here; rents are much lower; that is the result of accumulated capital and lower interest; where interest is lower, rents are lower, but wages are lower also. In some places in Great Britain and in some localities on the continent of Europe, you will find as good conditions as in this country, but take it on the whole, the standard of wages here is as high as any place in Europe.

PURCHASING POWER OF WAGES.

Q. Or else the purchasing power of the wages is greater; otherwise the working people could not get these advantages?—A. Yes; a man gets more for his work here and lives on a larger scale. I am not able to say how much greater wages are here in various industries than they are there, but there are some matters of which I have made specific study. Take, for instance, a four-loom weaver in Lancashire or Massachusetts; he receives here not much more than he does there, but the moment you step beyond that and take up six and eight loom weavers, the earnings are very much greater. A mule-spinner here earns 30 or 40 per cent. more than a mule-spinner in Lancashire.

RELATIVE WAGES IN AMERICA AND EUROPE.

There is not such a very great difference in those trades into which machinery enters largely, but in the hand trades, where skilled hand-work is employed, the supply of labor on the continent of Europe and in Great Britain being so much more than here, wages are less. Our skilled mechanics, using their minds and hands, receive much larger wages than skilled mechanics in any part of Europe.

Q. And they consume more?—A. Yes.

Q. That is to say, they have much greater advantages?—A. Yes; they live better.

Q. Are their personal accumulations relatively greater or less—I mean to say in the nature of fixed capital or a provision in the savings bank, or an accumulation to meet the accidents and casualties of life?—A. Very much greater here. The city of Manchester, in England, supports, I believe, only one savings bank.

Q. But there are postal savings banks there?—A. Yes; I am not familiar with the figures there, but, so far as I know, the savings banks show more thrift here than there.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

IN EUROPE, MEN BORN TO STATION; IN AMERICA, TO DO THE BEST THEY CAN.

Q. Our working people are more independent of their employers than those in Europe?—A. Yes; in Europe men are born to a station; in this country they are born to do the best they can, and they are bound to do it, and while they have here a school system to aid them and all the land of the country to aid them in securing a foothold, they could rarely secure any foothold in Europe.

Q. Have they a homestead law that you know of?

HOMESTEADS IN CREFELD, GERMANY.

A. In some localities you will find efforts made to secure homesteads for the people. In Crefeld they have forty thousand weavers, and four-fifths of them own their own homes.

Q. Is there any homestead exemption law there?—A. I don’t know.

Q. Do you know what the fact is in England?—A. I know of no exemption there.

Q. So far as you know, is this country the only one that has a homestead law?

HOMESTEADS IN AMERICA.

A. So far as I am aware. I have not particularly examined that feature of our condition. Our workingmen occupy more space in their own houses, they have larger breathing room, and have more use for deeds of land, of course, than in Europe, because land is easily obtained here, but until interest becomes very much lower in this country, rents will be higher here (as they always are in newer countries) than they are in England and on the continent.

Mr. Enwright. Will you please ask the witness, Mr. Chairman, as to what proportion of the factory operatives in this country are citizens, so as to get an idea in regard to their political power as against the employers?

The Chairman (to the witness). You have heard the question. You may make such answer to it as you choose.

The Witness. I have not the figures in my mind, but my recent reports will give you the exact data.

Mr. Enwright. A large proportion of them are not citizens, and of course they have not the political power that they would have if they were citizens.

BOSTON, MASS., October 18, 1883.

GEORGE C. RICHARDSON recalled and further examined.

By Mr. Pugh:

Question. I think you left off yesterday when making some remarks in regard to exporting goods. You said you sold largely for export, did you not?—Answer. Largely for export; yes.

EXPORTATION OF THE COARSER YARNS.

Q. What kind of goods do you sell for export?—A. The coarser yarns for export—from No. 9 to No. 12. In one of the newspaper reports that was made yesterday it stated that I had said we could live in our cot-
ton manufactures under free trade. I mentioned that we could compete on these goods—the coarser goods, such as we export—under free trade; not the finer fabrics.

Mr. Pugh. I understood you as you now say. It was only the kind of goods embracing drillings, sheetings, shirtings, and so on that enter into the goods which the majority of people wear.

The Witness. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. You do not include any wool?—A. I do not include any wool.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. In respect to woolen fabrics, how is it?—A. I do not care to speak on woolen fabrics, because I am not much in the woolen goods. Mr. Lyman, treasurer of the Lowell Manufacturing Company, can speak better of wool than I can, although I know considerable of the woolen business for the last few years. I know there are manufacturing establishments in this country to day that make money, but they are not so numerous as they ought to be for the benefit of the people.

DIFFERENCE OF COST OF FINER COTTON GOODS IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

Q. Have you ever compared the prices of the finer cotton goods in this country with those of England?—A. Yes; I imported fine goods for many years.

Q. What is the difference in cost to a wholesale purchaser in England, of such goods, and to a wholesale purchaser of the same class of goods in Boston?—A. In fine goods there would be a difference of all the way from 2½ per cent. to 25 per cent.

Q. Does that increase in the difference cover the goods as they become finer?—A. As the goods become finer the margin is wider; that is, the difference is wider.

"WEIGHTING" OF ENGLISH GOODS.

There is one point that I did not mention yesterday fully, though I did refer to it; that is, in regard to weighting goods, putting in foreign and good-for-nothing material to assist in making an appearance of goods on one hand and to affect the weight on the other. There is a great deal of that done. Some four or five years ago we tabulated a statement showing the difference exactly; for instance, I took American goods and matched by samples from Manchester; went into all the leading brands and imported those goods here, had them cleansed, brought into the original state the same as our goods, and the average shrinkage was 33 1/3 per cent.; ours averaged in shrinkage but 2 or 3 per cent.

By the Chairman:

Q. You can fix yours before a great while so that they will shrink more, can't you, under the existing process?—A. That is an art our people need to learn before they can compete with Europe in the lower class of goods or the finer goods. But the purchasers abroad, even in China, are much better informed on that point than they were a few years ago.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. That is in respect to woolens?—A. No; in respect to cottons.
By the Chairman:

Q. Do you not think it would pay them in the end to do this business honestly and maintain the character of the manufacture?—A. Yes, that is what we say our manufacturers have always done.

Honesty the Best Policy in Manufactures.

Q. Then you think this tendency to the use of shoddy will disappear?—A. I think so. In China the information was given in regard to this, and it created a great excitement. The Chinese merchants and people found that they had been buying much that was good for nothing, and in Shanghai there was so much feeling on the subject that they had public meetings to denounce it. They thought they had been swindled, that the manufacturer had swindled them, but that was not so, because he had made such goods as were ordered. The presentation of that point to the people all over the country had a great influence. We circulated some ten thousand circulars giving all the facts.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is there any other matter that occurs to you that might be serviceable to the committee?—A. No, nothing in particular. I went over the ground pretty well yesterday.

Arthur T. Lyman examined.

By the Chairman:


Q. What is your business?—A. I am treasurer of the Lowell Manufacturing Company, which manufactures carpets. I am also largely interested in the worsted mills at Lowell.

Q. How long have you been interested in them?—A. About twenty years. My father was largely interested in the same way.

Q. Then you know the history of the manufacturing interest for fifty years or more, by inheritance, one may say, and from personal knowledge?—A. Yes, I think I have a general knowledge of the corporations manufacturing in this part of the State, as good a knowledge as anybody almost.

Q. How far back can you remember with any particularity, yourself, the condition of the manufacturing interests and of the wage-working people of the State?—A. I was treasurer of the "Appleton" and "Hamilton" mills in Lowell in 1860. Since 1866 I have been continuously treasurer of a fine cotton mill at Holyoke.

Relations Between Employers and Employés in Massachusetts.

Q. As you have observed them, what have been the relations between the employers and the work people engaged in manufacture in this State during this time?—A. Well, in my own case they have been entirely pleasant and friendly. There is nothing that we have any connection with that we have had any strikes or disagreements in.

Q. You have known of strikes occurring?—A. There have been strikes, yes.
Q. Sometimes of a serious character?—A. Nothing that I remember in the mills that I happened to have any connection with.
Q. But I mean in the State?—A. There have been some in Fall River. I don't know whether at Lowell or not.

CAUSES OF STRIKES.

Q. We are directed to inquire into the causes of strikes and their remedies. To what causes do you attribute strikes?—A. Sometimes a strike occurs because the people receiving wages and making the strike feel that they are not getting adequate compensation, or generally I may say they feel that they are not getting a fair proportion of wages. Sometimes, of course, they are mistaken as to that. A mill that is using money in selling its goods may appear to any one in the mill to be very actively employed, and of course every effort is made to push the full product, but no one can tell by looking at the machinery working whether the mill is making money or not. So, of course, they are often deceived in that matter. In this country they have not such good information as in England.

TRADES UNIONS IN ENGLAND.

Q. Why not?—A. In England the trades unions have become more developed than they are here, and not only with relation to causing strikes, but also in preventing them. The officers of the trades unions there, I think, as far as I have noticed, have a greater feeling of responsibility in advising a strike when there would be no good reason for it than perhaps a similar class of men in this country have had.
I remember a case of, I think, the miners in Cornwall, England, a few years ago, where, owing to the rapid fall in the iron interest, a reduction of wages became unavoidable. The miners did not know all about it, and threatened to strike. The officers of the trades unions, after investigation, advised the miners that they had better not do so; that there was a sufficient reason for the reduction of wages in the fall in prices. Of course there is no positive remedy for it except generally fair treatment on both sides, and an avoidance of misrepresentation and of misunderstanding, both of which are difficult to avoid under certain circumstances. But that is the only remedy that I can see.

FULL REPRESENTATION OF FACTS INDUCES ACQUIESCENCE IN REDUCED WAGES.

I think when the operatives understand that the circumstances fairly require a reduction of wages they are reasonable and will acquiesce in it.
Q. Where that information is given to them, and they are dealt with as reasonable men, you think they will acquiesce?—A. I think so.
Q. You think the result could be attained in that way without trades unions as well as with them?

USEFULNESS OF TRADES UNIONS IN AVOIDING LABOR DIFFICULTIES.

A. Well, probably; but then their trades unions I think have, on the whole, very likely rendered some assistance, in England, especially, more than here. I think some of their officers in England investigate matters more. It may be that distance creates a more favorable im-
pression of them, but it strikes me that their leaders and officers there investigate the subject and find out whether there is really a sufficient reason in the general state of the trade. Undoubtedly in the present state of England in the cotton trade, there is reason for complaint on the part of employers, and so there is in a good many trades in this country, also, at the present moment. Of course, the employer is willing to stand it as long as he can, because the man who only gets his day's wages of a moderate amount, and whose wages go in so large a proportion into the first cost of living—that is, into bread, meat, and rent—would be seriously affected by a reduction, whereas if a man has two or three or five thousand dollars a year a reduction of 10 or 20 per cent., although, perhaps, affecting some men seriously, does not really touch the question of bread and butter.

WEEKLY OR MONTHLY PAYMENTS.

In 1878, if I correctly remember, the cotton mills in which I was then engaged, and in fact all the cotton interests of this State, were at a very low ebb, culminating at perhaps the worst point in the winter of 1879 with reduced wages, the reduction being about 10 per cent. in December of that year. We were not making money then, and were losing on the wages, if I remember rightly, and we issued a circular to the operatives employed at that time in Holyoke, giving them a statement of the reasons why the reduction was inevitable, and also at the suggestion of my agent up there, or, perhaps, at my own suggestion, we paid them once a week to see if that would give them some advantage. We put that question to a vote among them—whether they would prefer to have weekly payments in cash, and they decided, on the whole, in favor of it.

Two or three years afterward, as matter of curiosity, I had a poll taken among them again as to whether they preferred to have wages paid once a month, once a fortnight, or once a week. Quite a number said once a month; the larger part of those who were heads of families preferred to have their pay once a fortnight or once a week. Whether they do get any real advantage it is difficult to decide.

ADVANTAGES OF CONCENTRATION IN PURCHASING.

They cannot get the same advantage in this country, I think, as in England, because in England there is a much greater development of the co-operative stores for distribution. Most of these have failed in this country; I don't know why, perhaps from the fancy which people have in this country of going to so many different places, to so many different butchers, bakers, &c. In England business is very much more concentrated. I suppose, and if the classes of people who patronize co-operative stores would go to them in sufficient numbers and concentrate their purchases I should think they would get a large advantage.

They also get, of course, an advantage if they go to one place, even if there is no co-operation about it, but simply to a cash store, because a man who has a store can sell two pounds of tea as cheaply as if he sells one, so far as his labor is concerned, and if a customer goes to two stores he has got to pay a portion upon two rents.

CO-OPERATION AND INDUSTRIAL PARTNERSHIP.

Co-operation and industrial partnership has been suggested as a remedy for strikes. Those features have not, so far as tried, operated
entirely in that way, and of course employers and employed are frequently unreasonable, but you cannot persuade many people to do what is for their interest to do or what it is fair they should do.

Co-operation in England in the matter of distribution of goods has been eminently successful, and co-operation in the production of articles has been attended in some cases with success, but in general I should say that co-operation in production has not been successful.

CO-OPERATION IN PRODUCTION—CASE OF LECLAIR, IN PARIS.

There is a case, however, that may be called co-operation in production, of a man named Le Clair, in Paris (France), who was one of the most marked successes in that direction. He employed many men all over Paris to work for him, and, largely, without superintendence or oversight. But he found that he was losing money on his business, and that they were all idling away their time; so he offered to give them a share in the profits. The result was that his business quite changed in its character. The men really went to work and did something. They were not employed to work, as mill-hands are employed to work, on machines. It was largely a matter of their own personal attention and manual labor. You may take the case of a plumber, for example, who sits in a house and apparently does nothing for a long while, while he were working for his own interest or working really for his employer's interest, it is fair to suppose he would occupy himself diligently.

DOUBTFUL VALUE OF CO-OPERATION IN MECHANICAL BRANCHES.

But when it comes to a matter of machinery—where the machinery is a very large portion of the outlay, as in a cotton mill—the machinery there absorbing a very large part of the capital invested, and where the labor is comparatively simple and comparatively small in quantity and value, that case is at the other end of the line. If you could get machinery to run by itself, for instance, so that it would need to be attended to only once a week, it would make but little comparative difference whether it was attended to all the time or not. In fine cotton work, if I could run every loom myself, I should give it, as an owner, personal attention, and should attend to saving the waste, &c., which would make a very large difference; and I should avoid a large expense in the matter of oversight. That matter the operatives could largely save, of course. But the question whether any division of profits would induce them to pay the personal attention which the owner would pay, is a peculiar one—the amount they would receive being so small at the end of a year. I have thought a great deal over the matter, and it is beset by great difficulties.

SHOULD SURPLUS BE DISTRIBUTED TO LABOR?

Q. Colonel Wright just testified before you came in (taking his figures from his own last report to the legislature of Massachusetts) that the manufacturers of the State, after paying wages to their help, and after paying every form of outgo; after paying interest at 6 per cent. on the capital invested, and after paying for repairs, insurance, and in every way preserving and maintaining the machinery, &c., up to its full efficiency, make last year 10 per cent. upon the capital invested; so that in effect the matter stands as though the manufacturing interest, if represented by a single employer, had realized to him for the year previous
the same as 16 per cent. upon a mortgage investment. Now, assuming that 6 per cent. fairly and justly belongs to him as an interest upon the investment, is there any reason that occurs to you why the laboring man should not have some portion of that 10 per cent.? He has received simply his wages, obtained and paid at the lowest possible point, being competed for in the general market; the manufacturer has got everything back excepting compensation for his personal services and attention to business for the year. Now, assuming that he should receive a salary just as the wage-worker receives his wages, and assuming that he should be very liberally paid, because a man superintends that which is his own with a degree of efficiency which he does not ordinarily evince as a salaried man; assuming, then, that he is very well paid out of this 10 per cent., is there any reason why a part of what is left of the 10 per cent. should not, in part, be distributed among the working population? — A. That would depend, would it not, on the rate of wages that these laboring men were receiving?

WAGES IN 1882 IN EXCESS OF 57\(\frac{1}{2}\) PER CENT. OVER WAGES OF 1862.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, they get their wages the same as raw material is bought.

The WITNESS. We paid in wages in May, 1882, an excess of 57\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent. over the wages of May, 1862.

Q. So that the laborer is better off now than he was then? — A. Yes; and how much of that 10 per cent. or of that 16 per cent. has gone into that 57\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent. I don’t know. You start at a point at which you cannot tell whether that provision has already been made fairly or not. Of course, you can’t say at any time that the laborer has received 16 per cent. because there is no particular capital on which he receives his pay. Therefore you can’t tell whether the division is fairly made or not, if the capital is receiving 16 per cent. I did not hear Colonel Wright’s statement of the figures, but I should judge from my own experience that that was a most excessive estimate of the profits of capital.

The CHAIRMAN. It was much larger than I had understood it to be, but he says those are his figures. He says, however, that there are some doubts of their full reliability, because men sometimes make unreliable returns as to the capital invested, and he thinks the amount of capital invested is really larger than is returned to him; he thinks that the 10 per cent. would be diminished if the true valuation of the plant were to-day put in.

INCREDULITY AS TO 16 PER CENT. PROFITS OF MANUFACTURERS.

The WITNESS. I was going to say that, as to the corporations at Lowell, if he takes the number of shares of capital, that does not represent the capital at all, or the value of the plant. To carry on the business it would take two or three times the amount of capital that stands on the books. As dealing with the question of the division of that 16 per cent. at the present moment, some of those mills which he included, if he took all the mills in Massachusetts, are not making any money at all, and there are some that in the last two or three years have lost very heavily.

Q. Then there are others that are making more than 10 per cent. because 10 per cent. is the average. Of course, there should be no division where there is no profit, but there would be some mills making perhaps 20 per cent., if there are others making nothing? — A. I do not
think I know of any case where they are making 20 per cent. or any-
thing like it on the capital in the mills. I can tell you two or three
cases where the whole capital was lost, as in the case of the Manches-
ter; that mill stands and looks very fine to-day, but the original share-
holders lost all. The Atlantic Cotton Mills in Lowell paid out dividends,
but they were paid out of the real capital, because at the end of a cer-
tain period of time the mill had all to be renewed; the machinery was
all used up, and that renewal took all there was of it.
Q. Do you know at what rate the capital of the country has in-
creased? — A. No, sir; I do not.
Q. Or do you know anything of the rate at which the property of the
country, as a whole, has increased? — A. I do not know that.

DIFFICULTY OF ASCERTAINING PROFITS.

Q. The census shows something of that, but I do not know myself
how to ascertain the profits made in the manufacturing industries for
the last forty years. I do not know that it exists anywhere. I have
inquired of several gentlemen who ought to know, but do not. Do you
know? — A. No, sir; I do not. There have been losses in mills.
The CHAIRMAN. But I mean the average profits on capital invested in
the cotton business for, say, twenty, thirty, or forty years!
The WITNESS. I don't know.
Q. Do you know any way in which one can search for really reliable
information on that subject? You see it would afford the fairest basis
as to inquiring how labor is treated from year to year, for if, in the fluc-
tuations in the fortunes of capital the wage-worker gets, on the whole, as
much as the capitalist, that would be one showing, but on the other
hand, if the capital gets 10 per cent. all that time, after paying for every-
thing, it would seem to show that there is not a fair division of the
"joint product," as the resolution of the Senate expresses it.

ANNUAL PROFITS OF MANUFACTURE FOR THIRTY OR FORTY YEARS
10 OR 12 PER CENT.

A. Ten or twelve per cent., I fancy, would represent the profits of
manufacturing in this State for the last thirty or forty years, keeping
the plant and things whole; perhaps more; but that certainly must be
under the average rate of profit in the United States, or out of this
State, on a great many enterprises. They would not be satisfied with
10 per cent. in a great many of the States of this country. That is, the
advance in profits by doing business in the West is considerable. A
large part of the profits here has been from the development of the
West; that is to say, the percentage of profits has been much larger of
late years than the profits on the manufacture of this State at present.
I think it would have been very much more for my personal interest,
for instance, to have got rid entirely of all manufacturing interests in
this State ten or twenty years ago and to have employed the capital
outside of it.
Q. At what rate per cent. do you think it would have been as well
for the interests which you represent to have invested money on good
security rather than to have engaged in manufacture—say from the
time you have been in business? — You mentioned 1860, did you? — A.
Yes.
AT WHAT RATE COULD MONEY BE INVESTED TO EQUAL THE PROFITS WITHOUT THE RISK OF MANUFACTURE?

Q. Now, take the capital which you have been connected with—the management of which you have been acquainted with from 1860 to the present time—consider what it was, what it has been all the way down, and what it is now. At what rate per cent. do you think it would have been as well to have invested, in such way as to have been absolutely secure of your interest, and to have been rid of the business of manufacturing?—A. That is a very hard question to answer, because those twenty years have been years of great fluctuation.

The CHAIRMAN. We have got to answer it in some way, and if you do not answer it, we may, on the evidence before us, have to answer it in such way as perhaps to lead you to wish you had told us.

EFFECTS OF THE WAR AND THE TARIFF ON MANUFACTURE.

The WITNESS. Well, in 1861, in a mill in which I was engaged, I bought a large quantity of cotton. That cotton went up afterwards to double and treble in value.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is an abnormal state of things.

The WITNESS. Most of the mills shut down entirely.

Q. How was it with 1870 or 1865?—A. Well, the effects of the war on prices and the extraordinary tariff acts have affected that whole period in a very extraordinary way. The risks have been frightful, and the losses have been frequently tremendous. Profits have been at times very large. Of course no cotton mills could run, hardly—those that ran made money, but there were very few of them that did run—but the woolen mills made money. At the present time, however, if anybody could get 6 per cent. with absolute security he would probably be better off than in 1840 or 1850. I think he would be better off than going into manufacturing. His whole plant in a mill gets used up, in time. There are plenty of machines that are good, but machines lose their utility every once in a while from, perhaps, change of fashion, as for instance, in women's dress goods. Before the war, printed delaines became unsaleable in a night, you might almost say.

EFFECTS OF FASHION ON MANUFACTURE.

Then one mill changed rapidly, and met with heavy loss, to put themselves in condition to make the goods that came into fashion. Another mill in New Hampshire kept on in that business for some time, and came near being ruined by it. That same change of fashion a few years ago almost crushed—certainly paralyzed—a mill for the time being, by a change of fashion from stiff Foster wools to the soft French cashmere wools. That has been going on for some years. To get into the fashion again involves changes, and requires almost the throwing away of certain kinds of machinery.

Q. Had you any matter in your mind specially, which you were desirous of stating to the committee?—A. I might say that there is a company that I represent now at Lowell (I have only been their treasurer two or three years); I looked over the dividends of the last ten years, and they show a trifte under 5 per cent.

METHOD OF ASCERTAINING DIVIDENDS.

Q. Before the declaration of a dividend what is taken out of the sum realized from production?—A. Of course you take out all sums paid for
the production of the product, such as the price of the raw material, wages, general repairs, keeping machinery in running order, &c., and you ought to take out (and very much depends upon whether you take out money enough to do it or not) a considerable sum for depreciation of the machinery beyond the best repairs you may give to it. For instance, you may keep up a cotton mill in perfect order, if you please, but unless you put aside 50 cents a year for each spindle that you have in the mill, and either keep that money on hand for the purpose, or expend it for new machinery, your machinery will be all used up at the end of ten or twenty years. You have simply paid out money which you really did not make. After paying all this, suppose you start at the beginning of the year with nothing on hand (to take a simple case); after paying for the raw material, wages, and the actual interest on the money borrowed (not charging any interest on capital or anything of that kind), that would be simply money paid out. Then you put on the other side of the account what you sold your goods for, and if there are no bad debts, and you have anything left over, that which is left over is what we call profit.

Q. There is no item of interest, as such, allowed for the value of the plant?—A. No.

THE RESERVE FOR RENEWING PLANT.

Q. And your dividends have averaged 5 per cent. for ten years?—A. Yes, sir; and I don't think there has been enough reserved in that time for plant. The plant is increased somewhat, but, if anything, too much has been paid out, because there is a good deal of work to be done on it—new work has got to go in.

Q. What manufacturing work is it, then, that combined with yours and all the rest, makes the average 10 or 16 per cent.

EFFECT OF TARIFF CHANGES ON CARPET MANUFACTURE.

A. The carpet work is not so successful as some of the other cotton industries or cotton branches, or some of the worsted industries. It has been much disturbed this year by the changes in the tariff. The wool we use is foreign, and 4 cents a yard difference in the duty effects it.

Q. Have you any industry that pays 16 percent. profit in this State?—A. No, sir; I am not interested in any that does.

Q. And you are not aware of any that exists on a large scale?—A. No, sir; I should think that that is an excessive figure.

IF PROFITS APPARENTLY 16 PER CENT., UPON WHAT BASIS.

Of course there may be some mills that have kept in the business the profits that they made, say, during the war, and if, during the war, they made large profits—

Q. (Interposing.) But I mean profits at the present time.—A. Well, in that case they might make a profit on their nominal incorporated capital, that would be 16 per cent.; whereas the real profit on the capital invested in goods and money that they have paid out for the plant would not be anything like that.

Q. This deception, if any, is in the statement of the value of the investment, then?—A. In many cases I know it is.
DIFFERENCE IN AMOUNT OF LABOR ON COARSE AND FINE WOOLENS.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. What is the difference in the amount of labor employed in the manufacture of common woolen goods that enter into general use and the finer woolens that are called dress goods? — A. I can't give you any exact answer to that, except simply to say that it is very large. I don't know any definite answer.

DIFFERENCE IN AMOUNT OF LABOR ON COARSE COTTONS AND COARSE WOOLENS.

Q. What is there between the amount of labor employed at making coarser cotton fabrics that go into every-day use, and the coarser woolen fabrics that go into every-day use; is there any difference? — A. Yes, a very great difference.

Q. There is more labor required in the manufacture of wool, as you understand?

The WITNESS. More in the coarse woolens, do you mean, than in fine cottons?

Mr. Pugh. No; but comparing the coarse cottons with the coarse woolens, what is the difference in the amount of labor employed in making the two kinds of cloth.

A. I don't think I have any figures that will enable me to give you a satisfactory answer to that.

MORE HAND LABOR IN WOOLEN THAN COTTON MANUFACTURE.

Q. Does it take any more labor or any finer machinery to make woolen goods than coarse cotton goods? — A. I don't think I am competent to answer that, but coarse cotton machinery is on a large scale, and carries itself through on large scale, while woolen requires more hand work — more manipulation. Of course you may say a cotton mill goes almost by itself relatively to a coarse woolen mill, but I am hardly competent to answer that.

Q. Is there more wool imported to make carpets than woolen cloths? — A. That I don't know. Those figures are all given in the United States statistics, however.

IMPORTATION OF WOOL FOR CARPET MANUFACTURE.

But almost all the wool used in carpets is foreign wool that is imported. That is so cheap that it does not pay anybody in this country to raise it. I don't suppose that a great deal of the wool imported for carpets pays the sheep grower more than 4 or 5 cents a pound.

Q. And that is most of the wool imported? — A. For carpets, yes.

Q. I mean is the wool that goes into the manufacture of carpets the bulk of the wool that is imported altogether? — A. I think it is, but there is a considerable amount of other wool.

Q. But the principal import is for wool to make carpets — that is the fact, I understand?

CARPETS: UNIVERSAL USE IN AMERICA.

A. This country is a great country for carpets, no other people consuming so many carpets as the Americans, and nearly all the wool that
goes into carpets here is foreign wool, because if anybody in this country could raise wool on four legs, he wants more for his services than is wanted for wool raised anywhere else. I don’t know whether the amount imported—35,000,000 pounds, I believe—is any more than enough for carpet purposes or not.

Q. Does the importation of wool for carpets interfere with our wool-growers? I think you have said in substance that it does not, by saying that our wool-growers do not raise wool for carpets?—A. I can’t say that it does. Some coarse wool is imported that goes into blankets, and I suppose the wool that is imported would be imported anyhow.

AMERICAN WOOL FOR CARPETS: WHERE RAISED.

There are certain wools in this country used for carpets, like the wools of the Territories, wool from New Mexico, Colorado, and Texas, but there the sheep exist in a natural state and grow nothing but carpet wool; but those are very rapidly becoming changed by the breeding of sheep that carry a very much larger and finer wool, and a wool of more value.

Q. Outside of carpets, what proportion of the wool used in the manufacture of the finer woollens do you import?—A. I don’t, personally, have anything to do with anything but carpet-wool in importations, but a very large proportion of wool is used in fabrics.

IMPORTATION OF WOOL FOR SOFT FABRICS.

There are certain classes of wool that are required, especially now, for the soft fabrics. The French cashmere fabric, you may say, in general terms, is imported, because there is not a sufficient quantity of that wool in this country, or hardly any. Anything that would make the production of carpets cheaper would of course extend the manufacture. At the present moment, for instance, we cannot export carpets. If the cost of production could be reduced by the reduction of duty on carpet wools, which are all a very low grade of foreign goods, then we could export.

THE TARIFF ON CARPET WOOLS.

Q. What is the duty on the wools you import to make carpets?—A. It varies from 2½ cents to 5 cents per pound.

Q. And you say that that is not needed for the benefit of the wool growers in this country—that they do not make that class of wools?—A. No.

INCREASING SUPPLY OF AMERICAN FINE WOOLS.

Q. Then of the finer wools that you import the supply is increasing?—A. The supply is increasing, and the supply is very largely of American wools, but there must be some to come from abroad to make certain styles of fabrics in the market.

Q. I understand from a manufacturer at Woonsocket that our wool that enters into the manufacture of our common woolen goods is a better wool than that which they get from abroad—that it is stronger, that the fiber is better. What is your opinion on that subject?—A. I don’t deal in that class of goods. I could not give you any information of value on that.
GOOD EFFECT OF INCREASED MANUFACTURE AND EXPORTATION OF CARPETS.

Of course, anything that tends to make the manufacture of carpets cheap, tends, so far, to help us to get a market—to send them to Canada or abroad; and, so far as that goes, that helps the American wool grower, too, to get more carpets made, or more woolen cloths made; for, so far as I employ more carpet weavers, for instance, they will all want clothing; and so far as they use woolen clothing it would be woolen clothing made of American wool.

NEED OF FREE RAW MATERIALS FOR CARPET MANUFACTURE.

The manufacture of carpets is so hampered by duties on dye stuffs and wool that the quantity manufactured is reduced. If I can't export them to Canada, for instance, which I cannot now, the clothes that are made for the operatives will be made of Canada or English wool. The condition of the various industries now—the manufacture of fine cotton cloths, fine cotton yarns, carpets, and similar fabrics, is such that any considerable reduction of the new tariff duties on those classes of goods would make them to be produced only at a loss, and I think there would be no way of producing them here under those circumstances, but by a heavy reduction of wages to something like the European levels. You see, our machinery costs a great deal more than the English machinery, and the cost of plant here is an item.

GREATER COST OF AMERICAN THAN ENGLISH MACHINERY.

Q. How is it that our machinery costs more than the English?—A. I suppose it is owing to the higher wages, partly, and partly to the advantages which the English have in having their coal and iron together, and having large shops in which they have been engaged for a long time.

Q. What is the character, as to skill, of the labor you employ in making carpets and other woolens?—A. I should think that a large part of the labor engaged in manufacturing carpets, weaving, &c., is higher than in some of the woolens. Of course some of the worsteds take the more skilled labor, and the fine worsted mills do a better class of work.

HIGHER SKILL IN CARPET MANUFACTURE THAN IN COMMON WOOLENS.

Q. It takes a better class of labor to make fine carpets than common woolen goods?—A. I should think so—more expensive.

The CHAIRMAN. Any light than can be thrown on the subject about which I questioned you in connection with the statement of Colonel Wright, I would be glad to have from you. If the working people get, on the whole, all that they ought to have, of course that is the end of it.

PROPORTIONS OF EARNINGS WHICH LABOR AND CAPITAL SHOULD RECEIVE.

The WITNESS. Well, there is no positive criterion as to what labor ought to have or what capital ought to have.

The CHAIRMAN. I know it is somewhat a mixed thing—just as you go to a jury with a case at law.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

The Witness. It is to the interest of everybody that they should have all that can justly be paid to them. That they should be in good condition is certainly for the interest of everybody in the Commonwealth, but we can't divide money that we don't make, and we have to keep a large reserve in order to preserve the whole.

RISE OF COTTON MANUFACTURE IN AMERICA.

There is a large cotton corporation located at Waltham. Soon after the war of 1812, I think about 1820, when it was an offense punishable by transportation for life to send any English inventions out of the country, the Merrimac printing machines came to this country. They had to be brought either in a man's mind or else piece by piece. When the Waltham machinery was started no machinery was allowed to be brought out of England. Mr. Lowell brought out designs of machinery, however—bringing a great many of the devices merely in his mind.

Q. Was it he who started the city of Lowell?—A. Yes. At that time there were no manufacturing industries here. The work of New England was commercial—it was the carrying trade generally; but that had been broken up by the embargo, and there were no collections of people on which the cotton mills could draw for operatives. The people were all natives at the time. There were hardly any foreigners to be found. Great care was taken in starting the factories at Waltham, for instance, to get the boarding houses and all the arrangements about the mill in such order that the operatives who came in from the country should be well treated. That system was carried to Lowell, and has had, I am sure, a very powerful effect in influencing the method of treatment and the condition of the operative classes in Waltham, Lowell, Lawrence, Manchester, and all other corporations that have been established in New England.

HOW WAGES ARE DETERMINED.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. The manufacturer decides for himself what rate of wages he can afford to pay, does he not?—A. He may decide that; but that depends on the demand for labor.

Q. If he cannot get labor at one price, he has got the world to supply his demand, has he not?—A. No, sir; not practically, because, although you may say that an operative in Lancashire can cross the ocean, yet he has got to have some amount of money to come here, and he must know that he is going to get something here when he comes.

Q. I know that, but still you have the world to go to to get a supply of the labor that you may need, have you not?—A. I know, but there has hardly ever been a year that there have not been looms stopped because skilled operatives could not be had for them. The operatives go off in the summer of course. At other times there are more than can be employed.

Q. The operative in buying what he wants to consume, is confined to this country, is he not?—A. No.

HOW PRICES OF PRODUCTS ARE FIXED.

Q. You dictate the price of what he himself wants to consume, of the articles he manufactured?—A. No, sir; I don't dictate the prices in anything.
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Q. You fix the price of your fabrics?—A. We ask a certain price for them; sometimes we get it and sometimes we don’t.

Q. I understand that, but when sold they are sold at a price fixed by you, are they not?—A. Often fixed by the buyer.

Q. But what controls the buyer; he is limited in his field of purchase, is he not, and you are not limited in your field of sale; you can buy labor in the markets of the world, and he buys in this market what he wants to consume in this market or else he must pay the difference. I am not talking about the price he actually pays; but whatever it is, is it not the general fact that the price which the operative pays in buying what he consumes of your manufacture or any other American manufacture, is regulated by the American market?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, the price of your labor you can affect by importing laborers from abroad?—A. Well, the effect of that is generally—

Mr. Pugh (interposing). I am not talking about the effect, but about the fact.

The WITNESS. We can import them, of course, but people can import their clothes and articles to compete with the articles we make; carpets are imported to compete with our carpets, and so with other articles.

DIFFICULTY OF ASCERTAINING LABOR’S RIGHT SHARE.

The following letter from this witness was received later:

Office of the Lowell Manufacturing Company,
Boston, November 13, 1883.

DEAR SIR: Excuse me for taking up any more of your time, but I wish to say a few words about the proportion of the price of goods that the working people should receive, or rather to illustrate the difficulty of the problem. Of course, when profits are large wages rise, as a rule, though not always at once, and when profits disappear wages must fall, though often only after a long time, and after heavy losses have been incurred. I attended lately a meeting of directors of one of the best-equipped and best-managed mills in the country, and yet the profit for the six months on the real capital invested, i.e., on the cost of replacing the property, was less than 2 per cent. Now, what I wish to call attention to is that this result had come about without its being in the least in the power of the owners or managers or operatives to help it. The price of raw material was about as it had been; wages had not been reduced at all; the price of the goods had so fallen as to destroy all profit practically.

For the coming season the prospect is that many mills will run without profit or at a loss. We ask a certain price for goods, such a price as we think or hope the buyer will pay; if we put it too high we lose the chance of selling. This year’s (and many other years?) experience shows that the prices and the profits are often utterly beyond control. Of course at other times there is an advance in goods equally resistless.

I think it very desirable that all should share in the results of a business fairly, but the work people cannot bear any share in actual losses, and of course the profits must not only pay a fair rate on the business from time to time, but also compensate for actual losses.

Yours, truly,

ARThUR T. LYMAN.

Hon. H. W. BLAIRe,
Washington, D. C.
By the Chairman:

Question. Where do you live?—Answer. At Fall River.
Q. How long have you lived in this country?—A. Eleven years.
Q. Where were you born?—A. In Ramsbotham, England.
Q. Have you been naturalized here?—A. No, sir.

Life of a Mule-Spinner.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am a mule-spinner by trade. I have worked at it since I have been in this country—eleven years.
Q. Are you a married man?—A. Yes, sir; I am a married man; have a wife and two children. I am not very well educated. I went to work when I was young, and have been working ever since in the cotton business; went to work when I was about eight or nine years old. I was going to state how I live. My children get along very well in summer time, on account of not having to buy fuel or shoes or one thing and another. I earn $1.50 a day and can’t afford to pay a very big house rent. I pay $1.50 a week for rent, which comes to about $6 a month.
Q. That is, you pay this where you are at Fall River?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you have work right along?—A. No, sir; since that strike we had down in Fall River about three years ago I have not worked much more than half the time, and that has brought my circumstances down very much.
Q. Why have you not worked more than half the time since then?—A. Well, at Fall River if a man has not got a boy to act as “back-boy” it is very hard for him to get along. In a great many cases they discharge men in that work and put in men who have boys.
Q. Men who have boys of their own?—A. Men who have boys of their own capable enough to work in a mill, to earn 30 or 40 cents a day.

Child Labor Necessary to the Employment of Parents.

Q. Is the object of that to enable the boy to earn something for himself?—A. Well, no; the object is this: They are doing away with a great deal of mule-spinning there and putting in ring-spinning, and for that reason it takes a good deal of small help to run this ring work, and it throws the men out of work because they are doing away with the mules and putting these ring-frames in to take their places. For that reason they get all the small help they can to run these ring-frames. There are so many men in the city to work, and whoever has a boy can have work, and whoever has no boy stands no chance. Probably he may have a few months of work in the summer time, but will be discharged in the fall. That is what leaves me in poor circumstances. Our children, of course, are very often sickly from one cause or another, on account of not having sufficient clothes, or shoes, or food, or something. And also my woman; she never did work in a mill; she was a housekeeper, and for that reason she can’t help me to anything at present, as many women do help their husbands down there, by working, like themselves. My wife never did work in a mill, and that leaves me to provide for the whole family. I have two children.
HARDSHIP OF UNDERTAKERS’ AND DOCTORS’ BILLS UPON THE POOR.

And another thing that helped to keep me down: A year ago this month I buried the oldest boy we had, and that brings things very expensive on a poor man. For instance, it will cost there, to bury a body, about $100. Now, we could have that done in England for about £5; that would not amount to much more than about $20, or something in that neighborhood. That makes a good deal of difference. Doctors’ bills are very heavy—about $2 a visit; and if a doctor comes once a day for two or three weeks it is quite a pile for a poor man to pay.

Q. Will not the doctor come for a dollar a day?—A. You might get a man sometimes, and you sometimes won’t, but they generally charge $2 a day.

Q. To operatives?—A. Oh, all around. You might get one for $1.50 sometimes.

Q. They charge you as much as they charge people of more means?—A. They charge as much as if I was the richest man in the city, except that some of them might be generous once in a while and put it down a little in the end; but the charge generally is $2. That makes it hard.

ONE DOLLAR AND A HALF A DAY FOR NINE MONTHS TO SUPPORT SIX PEOPLE TWELVE MONTHS.

I have a brother who has four children, besides his wife and himself. All he earns is $1.50 a day. He works in the iron works at Fall River. He only works about nine months out of twelve. There is generally about three months of stoppage, taking the year right through, and his wife and his family all have to be supported for a year out of the wages of nine months—$1.50 a day for nine months out of the twelve, to support six of them. It does not stand to reason that those children and he himself can have natural food or be naturally dressed. His children are often sick, and he has to call in doctors. That is always hanging over him, and is a great expense to him. And then if he does not pay the bill the trustee law comes on him. That is a thing that is not properly looked after. A man told me the other day that he was trustee for $1.75, and I understood that there was a law in this State that a man could not be trustee for less than $10. It seems to me there is something wrong in the Government somewhere; where it is, I can’t tell.

Q. How much money have you got?—A. I have not got a cent in the house; didn’t have when I came out this morning.

Q. How much money have you had within three months?—A. I have had about $16 inside of three months.

Q. Is that all you have had within the last three months to live on?—A. Yes; $16.

SUPPORTING A FAMILY ON $133 A YEAR.

Q. How much have you had within a year?—A. Since Thanksgiving I happened to get work in the Crescent Mill, and worked there exactly thirteen weeks. I got just $1.50 a day, with the exception of a few days that I lost—because in following up mule-spinning you are obliged to lose a day once in a while; you can’t follow it up regularly.

Q. Thirteen weeks would be seventy-eight days, and, at $1.50 a day, that would make $117, less whatever time you lost?—A. Yes. I worked thirteen weeks there and ten days in another place, and then there was a dollar I got this week, Wednesday.


Q. Taking a full year back can you tell how much you have had?—A. That would be about fifteen weeks' work. Last winter, as I told you, I got in, and I worked up to about somewhere around Fast Day, or may be New Year's day; anyway, Mr. Howard has it down on his record, if you wish to have an exact answer to that question; he can answer it better than I can, because we have a sort of union there to keep ourselves together.
Q. Do you think you have had $150 within a year?—A. No, sir.
Q. Have you had $125?—A. Well, I could figure it up if I had time. The thirteen weeks is all I have had.
Q. The thirteen weeks and the $16 you have mentioned?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. That would be somewhere about $133, if you had not lost any time?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. That is all you have had?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. To support yourself and wife and two children?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you had any help from outside?—A. No, sir.
Q. Do you mean that yourself and wife and two children have had nothing but that for all this time?—A. That is all. I got a couple dollars' worth of coal last winter, and the wood I picked up myself. I goes around with a shovel and picks up clams and wood.

DIGGING CLAMS TO EKE OUT AN EXISTENCE.

Q. What do you do with the clams?—A. We eat them. I don't get them to sell, but just to eat, for the family. That is the way my brother lives, too, mostly. He lives close by us.
Q. How many live in that way down there?—A. I could not count them, they are so numerous. I suppose there are one thousand down there.
Q. A thousand that live on $150 a year?—A. They live on less.
Q. Less than that?—A. Yes; they live on less than I do.
Q. How long has that been so?—A. Mostly so since I have been married.
Q. How long is that?—A. Six years this month.
Q. Why do you not go West on a farm?—A. How could I go, walk it?

TOO POOR TO GO WEST.

Q. Well, I want to know why you do not go out West on a $2,000 farm, or take up a homestead and break it and work it up, and then have it for yourself and family?—A. I can't see how I could get out West. I have got nothing to go with.
Q. It would not cost you over $1,500.—A. Well, I never saw over a $20 bill, and that is when I have been getting a month's pay at once. If some one would give me $1,500 I will go.
Q. Is there any prospect that anybody will do that?—A. I don't know of anybody that would.
Q. You say you think there are a thousand men or so with their families that live in that way in Fall River?—A. Yes, sir; and I know many of them. They are around there by the shore. You can see them every day; and I am sure of it because men tell me.
Q. Are you a good workman?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Were you ever turned off because of misconduct or incapacity or unfitness for work?—A. No, sir.
Q. Or because you did bad work?—A. No, sir.
Q. Or because you made trouble among the help?—A. No, sir.
Q. Did you ever have any personal trouble with an employer?—A. No, sir.
Q. You have not anything now you say?—A. No, sir.
Q. How old are you?—A. About thirty.
Q. Is your health good?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. What would you work for if you could get work right along; if you could be sure to have it for five years, staying right where you are?—A. Well, if I was where my family could be with me, and I could have work every day I would take $1.50, and be glad to.
Q. One dollar and fifty cents a day, with three hundred days to the year, would make more than you make now in three or four years, would it not?

**ONLY A DOLLAR’S WORTH OF COAL IN TEN MONTHS.**

A. Well, I would have no opportunity then to pick up clams. I have no coal except one dollar’s worth since last Christmas.
Q. When do the clams give out?—A. They give out in winter.
Q. You spoke of fuel—what do you have for fuel?—A. Wood and coal.
Q. Where does the wood come from?—A. I pick it up around the shore—any old pieces I see around that are not good for anything. There are many more that do the same thing.
Q. Do you get meat to live on much?—A. Very seldom.
Q. What kinds of meat do you get for your family?—A. Well, once in a while we gets a piece of pork and some clams and make a clam-chowder. That makes a very good meal. We sometimes get a piece of corn beef or something like that.
Q. Have you had any fresh beef within a month?—A. Yes; we had a piece of pork steak for four of us yesterday.
Q. Have you had any beef within a month?—A. No, sir. I was invited to a man’s house on Sunday—he wanted me to go up to his house and we had a dinner of roast pork.
Q. That was an invitation out, but I mean have you had any beefsteak in your own family, of your own purchase, within a month?—A. Yes; there was a half a pound, or a pound one Sunday—I think it was.
Q. Have you had only a pound or a half a pound on Sunday?—A. That is all.
Q. A half pound of pork?—A. Yes. About two pounds of pork I guess we have had in the month, to make clam-chowder with, and sometimes to fry a bit.
Q. And there are four of you in the family?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. How many pounds of beefsteak have you had in your family, that you bought for your own home consumption within this year that we have been speaking of?—A. I don’t think there has been five pounds of beefsteak.
Q. You have had a little pork steak?—A. We had a half a pound of pork steak yesterday; I don’t know when we had any before.
Q. What other kinds of meat have you had within a year?—A. Well, we have had corn beef twice I think that I can remember this year—on Sunday, for dinner.
Q. Twice is all that you can remember within a year?—A. Yes—and some cabbage.
Q. What have you eaten?—A. Well, bread mostly, when we could get it; we sometimes couldn’t make out to get that, and have had to go without a meal.
Q. Has there been any day in the year that you have had to go without anything to eat?—A. Yes, sir, several days.
Q. More than one day at a time?—A. No.
Q. How about the children and your wife—did they go without anything to eat too?

THE CHILDREN CRYING FOR FOOD.

A. My wife went out this morning and went to a neighbor's and got a loaf of bread and fetched it home, and when she got home the children were crying for something to eat.
Q. Have the children had anything to eat to-day except that, do you think?—A. They had that loaf of bread—I don't know what they have had since then, if they have had anything.
Q. Did you leave any money at home?—A. No, sir.
Q. If that loaf is gone, is there anything in the house?—A. No, sir; unless my wife goes out and gets something; and I don't know who would mind the children while she goes out.
Q. Has she any money to get anything with?—A. No, sir.
Q. Have the children gone without a meal at any time during the year?—A. They have gone without bread some days, but we sometimes got meal and made porridge of it.
Q. What kind of meal?—A. Sometimes Indian meal, and sometimes oatmeal.
Q. Meal stirred up in hot water?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is it cold weather down there now?—A. It is very cold now.

SCANT CLOTHING IN COLD WEATHER.

Q. What have the children got on in the way of clothing?—A. They have got along very nicely all summer, but now they are beginning to feel quite sickly. One has one shoe on, a very poor one, and a slipper, that was picked up somewhere. The other has two odd shoes on, with the heel out. He has got cold and is sickly now.
Q. Have they any stockings?—A. He had got stockings, but his feet comes through them, for there is a hole in the bottom of the shoe.
Q. What have they got on the rest of their person?—A. Well, they have a little calico shirt—what should be a shirt; it is sewed up in some shape—and one little petticoat, and a kind of little dress.
Q. How many dresses has your wife got?—A. She has got one since she was married, and she hasn't worn that more than half a dozen times; she has worn it ust going to church and coming back. She is very good in going to church, but when she comes back she takes it off, and it is pretty near as good now as when she bought it.
Q. She keeps that dress to go to church in?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. How many dresses aside from that has she?—A. Well, she got one here three months ago.
Q. What did it cost?—A. It cost $1 to make it and I guess about a dollar for the stuff, as near as I can tell.
Q. The dress cost $2?—A. Yes.
Q. What else has she?—A. Well, she has an undershirt that she got given to her, and she has an old wrapper, which is about a mile too big for her; somebody gave it to her.
Q. She did not buy it?—A. No. That is all that I know that she has.
Q. Or because you made trouble among the help!—A. No, sir.
Q. Did you ever have any personal trouble with an employer!—A. No, sir.
Q. You have not anything now you say!—A. No, sir.
Q. How old are you?—A. About thirty.
Q. Is your health good!—A. Yes, sir.
Q. What would you work for if you could get work right along; if you could be sure to have it for five years, staying right where you are?—A. Well, if I was where my family could be with me, and I could have work every day I would take $1.50, and be glad to.
Q. One dollar and fifty cents a day, with three hundred days to the year, would make more than you make now in three or four years, would it not?

ONLY A DOLLAR'S WORTH OF COAL IN TEN MONTHS.

A. Well, I would have no opportunity then to pick up clams. I have had no coal except one dollar's worth since last Christmas.
Q. When do the clams give out?—A. They give out in winter.
Q. You spoke of fuel—what do you have for fuel?—A. Wood and coal.
Q. Where does the wood come from?—A. I pick it up around the shore—any old pieces I see around that are not good for anything. There are many more that do the same thing.
Q. Do you get meat to live on much?—A. Very seldom.
Q. What kinds of meat do you get for your family?—A. Well, once in a while we get a piece of pork and some clams and make a clam-chowder. That makes a very good meal. We sometimes get a piece of corn beef or something like that.
Q. Have you had any fresh beef within a month?—A. Yes; we had a piece of pork steak for four of us yesterday.
Q. Have you had any beef within a month?—A. No, sir. I was invited to a man's house on Sunday—he wanted me to go up to his house and we had a dinner of roast pork.
Q. That was an invitation out, but I mean have you had any beefsteak in your own family, of your own purchase, within a month?—A. Yes; there was a half a pound, or a pound one Sunday—I think it was.
Q. Have you had only a pound or a half a pound on Sunday?—A. That is all.
Q. A half pound of pork?—A. Yes. About two pounds of pork I guess we have had in the month, to make clam-chowder with, and sometimes to fry a bit.
Q. And there are four of you in the family?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. How many pounds of beefsteak have you had in your family, that you bought for your own home consumption within this year that we have been speaking of?—A. I don't think there has been five pounds of beefsteak.
Q. You have had a little pork steak?—A. We had a half a pound of pork steak yesterday; I don't know when we had any before.
Q. What other kinds of meat have you had within a year?—A. Well, we have had corn beef twice I think that I can remember this year—on Sunday, for dinner.
Q. Twice is all that you can remember within a year?—A. Yes—and some cabbage.
Q. What have you eaten?—A. Well, bread mostly, when we could get it; we sometimes couldn't make out to get that, and have had to go without a meal.
Q. Has there been any day in the year that you have had to go without anything to eat?—A. Yes, sir, several days.
Q. More than one day at a time?—A. No.
Q. How about the children and your wife—did they go without anything to eat too?

THE CHILDREN CRYING FOR FOOD.

A. My wife went out this morning and went to a neighbor's and got a loaf of bread and fetched it home, and when she got home the children were crying for something to eat.
Q. Have the children had anything to eat to-day except that, do you think?—A. They had that loaf of bread—I don't know what they have had since then, if they have had anything.
Q. Did you leave any money at home?—A. No, sir.
Q. If that loaf is gone, is there anything in the house?—A. No, sir; unless my wife goes out and gets something; and I don't know who would mind the children while she goes out.
Q. Has she any money to get anything with?—A. No, sir.
Q. Have the children gone without a meal at any time during the year?—A. They have gone without bread some days, but we have sometimes got meal and made porridge of it.
Q. What kind of meal?—A. Sometimes Indian meal, and sometimes oatmeal.
Q. Meal stirred up in hot water?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is it cold weather down there now?—A. It is very cold now.

SCANT CLOTHING IN COLD WEATHER.

Q. What have the children got on in the way of clothing?—A. They have got along very nicely all summer, but now they are beginning to feel quite sickly. One has one shoe on, a very poor one, and a slipper, that was picked up somewhere. The other has two odd shoes on, with the heel out. He has got cold and is sickly now.
Q. Have they any stockings?—A. He had got stockings, but his feet comes through them, for there is a hole in the bottom of the shoe.
Q. What have they got on the rest of their person?—A. Well, they have a little calico shirt—what should be a shirt; it is sewed up in some shape—and one little petticot, and a kind of little dress.
Q. How many dresses has your wife got?—A. She has got one since she was married, and she hasn't worn that more than half a dozen times; she has worn it not going to church and coming back. She is very good in going to church, but when she comes back she takes it off, and it is pretty near as good now as when she bought it.
Q. She keeps that dress to go to church in?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. How many dresses aside from that has she?—A. Well, she got one here three months ago.
Q. What did it cost?—A. It cost $1 to make it and I guess about a dollar for the stuff, as near as I can tell.
Q. The dress cost $2?—A. Yes.
Q. What else has she?—A. Well, she has an undershirt that she got given to her, and she has an old wrapper, which is about a mile too big for her; somebody gave it to her.
Q. She did not buy it?—A. No. That is all that I know that she has.
Q. You have had $1 or $2 worth of coal last winter?—A. I think it was a quarter of a ton, and I believe it was $2.25 worth.
Q. Is that all you have had?—A. That is all I had last winter. All the rest I picked up—wood.
Q. Did you try to get work?—A. I was working last winter.
Q. You say that a good many others are situated just like you are?—A. Yes, sir; I should say as many as a thousand down in Fall River are just in the same shape, if not worse; though they can't be much worse. I have heard many women say they would sooner be dead than living. I don't know what is wrong, but something is wrong. There is an overflow of labor in Fall River.
Q. Why do not these people go out West upon farms and go to farming?—A. They have not got the means. Fall River being a manufacturing place, it brings them in there; and when the mills in other places stop for want of water that brings them into Fall River. I think there are quite a lot of them that have come from Lowell and Lawrence these three or four weeks back—whatever brings them.
Q. Is there anything else that you want to say to the committee?—A. Well, as regards debts; it costs us so much for funeral expenses and doctors' expenses; I wanted to mention that.

The CHAIRMAN. You have stated that. It is clear that nobody can afford either to get sick or to die there.

The WITNESS. Well, there are plenty of them down there that are in very poor health, but I am in good health and my children generally are in fair health, but the children can't pick up anything and only get what I bring to them.
Q. Are you in debt?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. How much?—A. I am in debt for those funeral expenses now $15—since a year ago.
Q. Have you paid the rest?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. You live in a hired tenement?—A. Yes; but of course I can't pay a big rent. My rent is $6 a month. The man I am living under would come and put me right out and give me no notice either if I didn't pay my rent. He is a sheriff and auctioneer man. I don't know whether he has any authority to do it or not, but he does it with people.
Q. Do you see any way out of your troubles—what are you going to do for a living—or do you expect to have to stay right there?—A. Yes. I can't run around with my family.
Q. You have nowhere to go to, and no way of getting there if there was any place to go to?—A. No, sir; I have no means nor anything; so I am obliged to remain there and try to pick up something as I can.
Q. Do the children go to school?—A. No, sir; they are not old enough; the oldest child is only three and a half; the youngest one is one and a half years old.
Q. Is there anything else you wanted to say?—A. Nothing further, except that I would like some remedy to be got to help us poor people down there in some way. Excepting the Government decides to do something with us we have a poor show. We are all, or mostly all, in good health; that is, as far as the men who are at work go.
Q. You do not know anything but mule-spinning, I suppose?—A. That is what I have been doing, but I sometimes do something with pick and shovel. I have worked for a man at that, because I am so put on. I am looking for work in a mill. The way they do there is this: There are about twelve or thirteen men that go into a mill every morning, and they have to stand their chance, looking for work. The man who has a boy with him he stands the best chance, and then, if it is my
turn or a neighbor's turn who has no boy, if another man comes in who has a boy he is taken right in, and we are left out. I said to the boss once it was my turn to go in, and now you have taken on that man; what am I to do; I have got two little boys at home, one of them three years and a half and the other one year and a half old, and how am I to find something for them to eat; I can't get my turn when I come here.

He said he could not do anything for me. I says, "Have I got to starve; ain't I to have any work?" They are forcing these young boys into the mills that should not be in mills at all; forcing them in because they are throwing the mules out and putting on ring-frames. They are doing everything of that kind that they possibly can to crush down the poor people—the poor operatives there.

_——

Boston, Mass., October 18, 1883.

Edward C. Carrigan examined.

By the Chairman:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In Boston.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am principal of the evening high school of Boston, and a member of the Massachusetts State board of education. I am a student of law in the office of Benjamin F. Butler.

The Chairman. Please give the committee a full account of the origin, establishment, and peculiar characteristics and purpose of this evening high school, of which you are the principal?

The Witness. I shall be glad to give the committee any information I have on this question, or any other matter pertaining to the evening schools.

The Boston Evening High School.

This evening high school of Boston was established in 1869. It was an experiment at the time, and on account of its organization, as I have got it from the reports, its attendance was not as large at the beginning as at the end of the term. Its course of study comprised bookkeeping (elementary and advanced), English literature, arithmetic, grammar and composition, French, German, Latin, penmanship, geometry, algebra, physical and political geography, history, natural philosophy, elocution, spelling, geometrical drawing, and architectural and mechanical drawing. Pupils were required to pass an elementary examination for admission to the classes. The school had a prosperous life until 1881, when, on account of a lack of accommodations, the school board discontinued it. It was then re-established in the present building in 1881, and began its new life in the present high and Latin school building of Boston, where it now is. I was put in charge of the school, and have been in charge of it since, and am now principal. That, in brief, is its history to date.

Its Organization.

As to its organization: It is first organized by the admission of pupils under examination, which examination is limited to a fair knowledge of arithmetic, as far as through decimal fractions, and common-school studies of about the same grade. The applicant having passed the examination, is admitted to the school on a certificate, and then classified. Each pupil is allowed to elect his course of study and pursue the same
without change to the end of the term. Our requirements for attendance are that he shall come at least four hours a week. That is, the school is divided into divisions—one division for Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, the other division for Tuesday and Thursday. Each session lasts two hours, beginning at half past 7 and ending at half past 9. Therefore, the least number of hours a person can come there is four hours (or two evenings) a week. We have classes that come five evenings a week, but on account of the occupations of most of the pupils they can only come three evenings a week, and perhaps 25 per cent. of them only come two evenings a week. We have applications, however, from those who would like to come two hours or three hours a week, but we cannot take them.

METHOD OF TEACHING.

The teaching is different from the day schools. We do not use the interrogatory system, because we do not find it advantageous for a person to be called up, not having prepared himself on the lesson. But the instructor teaches the lesson. That is the peculiar difference between this school and the day school; that is, there is more teaching done and less questioning. Considerable blackboard work is done, particularly in those studies requiring that exercise.

ATTENDANCE OF PUPILS.

As to attendance: It may be said that in this school the attendance has been excellent, from the record and from the report of visitors to the school.

CLASS OF PERSONS ATTENDING.

The pupils are earnest and enthusiastic to learn. They come from all vocations. Perhaps I had better give the committee an idea of the class of pupils that we had in the school last winter, having no statistics made up for this term. Last winter we had one hundred and forty-seven clerks and forty-two office boys. Then there were salesmen, bookkeepers, machinists, apprentices, printers, students, messengers, compositors, masons, cabinet-makers, reporters, telegraphers, manufacturers, and canvassers. We had even those who were studying phonography with us, students of law, theology, and of medicine, and teachers in the public schools. Both sexes are admitted, of course. We have clerks, cashiers, librarians, copyists, students, teachers, tailors, and different other occupations.

NUMBERS IN ATTENDANCE.

This year as far as I have made up the percentage, we have admitted now over fourteen hundred pupils.

Q. How many of each sex, and are there any married men or women among them?—A. Yes. We have about fourteen hundred pupils, and about forty per cent. of those are females. We admit none under fourteen years of age, and we try to limit the age to thirty, but where there are seats vacant in a class, and the person coming there is shown to be desirous of studying the subject in which he is interested for some specific purpose rather than for some accomplishment, we make that distinction, and the person is admitted to the school. So that we have some there as old as thirty-five years of age.
Our course of study this year is somewhat different on account of the drawing schools having been organized since 1869. The evening high school has departed from its old curriculum, and the present course includes book-keeping, penmanship, composition, grammar, spelling, reading, arithmetic (elementary, commercial and advanced), algebra, geometry, English literature, phonography, French, and German. I think that is about the list. I may be in error. The larger proportion of the pupils take commercial studies. Those who study French and German are the smaller number. We endeavor to encourage them in more practical rather than classical work.

DISCIPLINE.

As to discipline, our rule is simple—that each one disciplines himself or herself. During my connection with the school, I have had no occasion for what is called “discipline.” The pupils who come there are fairly well behaved. They are as fairly well behaved and decorous a body of people as you will find attending church or any other meeting. They are there for the purpose of study, and they are studious while there. Therefore, they require no discipline. Since I have been there I have had no occasion to use any force or violence, and although I have expelled three or four persons during the two years, yet I have taken them back with one exception—having shown evidence of good faith on their part, they were readmitted to the school.

As to the attendance, it is as regular as it can be under the circumstances.

LECTURES ON PRACTICAL SUBJECTS.

In addition to the course of study last winter (and I shall do the same thing this year, provided the committee allow it, and I think they will), I introduced lectures on practical subjects—subjects pertaining to the course. I had such gentlemen as Dr. Minor, Rev. E. E. Hale, and Henry P. Kidder, of Kidder, Peabody & Co., bankers here, give the pupils practical talks on the importance of early study.

We have a corps of fourteen teachers now in all.

PHONOGRAPHY.

Phonography has been introduced since I have been there on my own recommendation. We do not propose to make short-hand reporters, such as you have here present, but the object is to make amanuenses; as in many business houses I have found, by inquiring, that it is important for the cashier or bookkeeper to know something of short hand, and we endeavor, in the course of the term, to give them all the theory of phonography (using Benn Pitman’s system), so that they can start with profit when they get through, and some of them have graduated and gone through, writing at the rate of eighty words a minute.

Probably the average would be fifty-five or sixty words a minute. The term is twenty weeks. We begin on the first Monday in October, and we close twenty weeks from that time.

TERMS OF TUITION.

The tuition is free to all residents of Boston. Those who come from out of town have to pay a certain tuition, which is commensurate to the
expense of the school; that is, if the school cost us $20,000, and we had two thousand pupils, each out-of-town pupil would have to pay the proportionate amount, but it is free to the inhabitants of Boston.

Q. How many have you from out of town?—A. I have this year, perhaps, twenty; but I discourage it because they have to pay the tuition fee.

Q. That discourages them, I suppose?—A. Yes; very materially. Our school committees have been very generous—indeed, are exceedingly generous toward this and other evening schools. And in concluding this subject, I would like to use a quotation covering the subject of this school, written by one of the best educators of the country, John D. Philbrick, who was superintendent of schools for a long time. In his report of 1874, he said of this school: "I know not one argument for the support of a day high school in this city on a liberal scale that is not equally forcible in favor of a liberal maintenance of this useful institution." And while the management of this school does not believe in going into extravagance, at the same time I feel, and those who have been engaged in teaching in the evenings feel that, if there is a class which desires to study any particular subject taught in the day school, and there is evidence that they need that information or study in their life-work, they ought to have it. As, for instance, in the study of Latin; many come there who are compositors. They say they want to study Latin for use in the compositor's room. An elementary course in Latin would be beneficial to that class—not a higher course. Again, young men come there who, after graduating from the evening high school in Boston, go through higher institutions, as colleges and universities.

I think that is sufficient on the high school of Boston. If you would like to have some information on the evening schools, I should be glad to give it to you.

**By Mr. Pugh:**

Q. How many teachers have you in this evening high school?—A. Fourteen this year. We pay the principal of the school $10 an evening. The assistants, or instructors, with the exception of the teacher of phonography, get $4 an evening. The principal's assistant, who is register of the school, doing the clerical work, gets a salary of $2.50 an evening.

**Elementary Evening Schools.**

The elementary evening schools of Boston number thirteen, according to the report of 1882. The whole registration of those schools is 4,786; the number of teachers employed, including those in the evening high-school service, was ninety-three. In 1857 the legislature passed a law promoting the establishment of schools, other than those already required by law, for persons over fifteen years of age. Before that time there were evening schools established in Boston, and they were supported in an eleemosynary way. Now, these schools remained permissive until last year, when I drafted the present law, the substance of which is this:

**Massachusetts Evening-School Statute.**

Every town and city having 10,000 or more inhabitants shall establish and maintain, in addition to the schools required by law to be main-
tained therein, evening schools for the instruction of persons over twelve years of age in reading, writing, geography, arithmetic, drawing, the history of the United States, and good behavior.

Such other branches of learning shall be taught in such schools as the school committee of the town shall deem expedient.

The school committee of such town shall have the same superinten-
dence over such evening schools as they have over day schools, and may
determine the term or terms of time in each year and the hours of each
evening during which schools may be kept, and may make such regu-
lations as to attendance at such schools as they may deem expedient.

This law was approved May 14, 1883. The reason for the advocacy
of that law is found in the fact that although towns were permitted to
establish evening schools they did not do so, and in looking the matter
over and referring to the report of 1882, I found that the following towns
which now must maintain evening schools did not come within the
statute: The town of Attleborough, which had 11,110 inhabitants; Osborn,
10,938 inhabitants; Quincy, 10,529; Weymouth, 10,571; Chelsea, 21,785;
Oliveope, 11,325; Pittsfield, 13,367; Gloucester, 19,829; Lynn, 38,284;
Somerville, 24,985; Northampton, 12,172. There are twenty-nine towns
in this State having over 10,000 inhabitants. Dr. Minor, of the State
board, Abby W. May, of the same board, the secretary, John W. Dickens-
on, and myself, appeared before the joint board of education (the "Gen-
eral Court") with regard to the bill. I looked the matter up and found
that those towns that I have mentioned did not maintain evening schools.
On the other hand there were thirty-one towns in the State that did
maintain evening schools under the permissive statute.

ILLITERACY IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Our argument was this: Massachusetts had an illiteracy in 1880 of
75,635 persons who could not read and 92,980 who could not write.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. That is over what age?—A. Over ten years of age—including ten
years. Our population is 1,782,085.

Q. This illiteracy is found in manufacturing centers largely, I sup-
pose?—A. It should be said for Massachusetts that during the five
years prior to 1880 she decreased her illiteracy in reading 5 per cent.
and her illiteracy in writing 1.1 per cent. Of these illiterates who are
foreign born there are 83,725 who could not write. As far as I have
looked it up I found this to be the fact, that under our statutes we require
all children under fourteen years of age to attend public schools at least
twenty weeks each year, under penalty, and no manufacturer can em-
ploy any child under ten years of age any way. Therefore, as we have
examined the column of illiteracy, it is found that while Massachusetts
has that number, eliminating those who are physically and mentally
incapacitated, there is not a native-born child in the Commonwealth who
cannot read or write. Illiteracy is due entirely to the foreign popula-
tion. For instance, we have from the Canadas the French population
coming into these large manufacturing centers—hording in here—who
cannot read or write. Again, others are landed here from foreign shores
and stay here. Therefore the immigration to Massachusetts is ignorant
immigration compared with the Scandinavian immigration which goes
West. I want it distinctly understood that while these figures are
given they have an explanation—that it is not the native-born but the
foreign-born population of Massachusetts that makes up the illiteracy.
NECESSITY FOR FREE EVENING SCHOOLS.

These people are working people; they must devote their day-time to labor. If they go to school at all, it must be in the evening. Therefore, in order to cut down this column of illiteracy, we require evening schools. That argument in a great measure carried our committee of education to the point of recommending the passage of this law, which now requires that all towns of over 10,000 inhabitants must maintain evening schools. The permissive statute also is that towns under that number of inhabitants may maintain evening schools.

IRREGULARITY OF ATTENDANCE.

The great trouble with our evening schools here is—and the same trouble is found in other cities, like Saint Louis, Brooklyn, and New York—the irregularity of attendance. What then is the trouble? Five years ago the city of Boston had its evening schools in ward rooms. It gave the pupils second-hand books, broken slates, and more or less broken-down teachers. That is to say, by a rule of our school board existing to-day, the teachers in the day schools are not permitted to teach in the evening schools. Mr. Philbrick in his report advocated that those who taught in the day schools should be allowed to teach in the evening schools so as to let us have as good teachers in the evening schools as in the day schools.

The city of Boston in 1880 took the step of introducing the evening schools into the day desks, and now the pupils, as far as they can be accommodated in day-school buildings, have been removed from the wards and put to the day desks.

LOUISVILLE EVENING SCHOOLS.

I visited the evening schools in Louisville, Ky., with Mr. Davis, the secretary of the board, and I found that they gave their evening schools as good quarters as they did the day schools. That rule, I think, as far as I have observed and can learn, is being followed out.

EXPENSE OF MASSACHUSETTS EVENING SCHOOLS.

Under the present statute, if I have not made an error in adding up the column, I find that the thirty-nine towns in this State which are now required to maintain evening schools have a population of 1,054,545. Those twenty-nine towns must maintain evening schools under the present law of Massachusetts. Under the permissive statute, eleven of these towns did not maintain them, but there were twenty-four of them that did. There were 107 schools with an attendance of 9,207 males, 2,007 females, and engaging the attention of 451 teachers. The total expense was $56,756.12. The per cent. is about 59.5 to 60 per cent. of inhabitants now that can go to evening schools.

NEW YORK EVENING SCHOOLS.

I want to say one word as to the New York system, as far as I have observed it, both from correspondence and personal observation. I think they have there the best evening schools of any city in the country. A provision is there made—a very wise one—for the teaching of English to foreigners. For instance, if Russians come to New York
they teach them English, and if Italians come they teach them English, and so with other foreigners. In a word, they have special schools for special nationalities. They grade there from the junior evening schools to the evening high school. I introduced that grade last year, so that those who came to the elementary evening schools, not being prepared to enter a high school, could go to any one of the fourteen elementary evening schools, and when they had passed through, they could then pass to the evening high school. They get a certificate from the evening school, and are admitted next year to the evening high school. Last year I had an examination of the evening school pupils, and admitted to the evening high school over one hundred and forty boys and girls, and they are now at work in the evening high-school.

QUALIFICATIONS OF PUPILS.

Q. Do you require any qualification whatever—even a knowledge of the alphabet—in order that they may enter the elementary evening schools?—A. No.

Q. How old are the oldest that enter these elementary schools?—A. I had charge of an elementary school two terms, and I had pupils as old as fifty-seven years of age. I think that was the oldest.

Q. Was that a person who began at the alphabet?—A. Yes; and began to learn to write.

Q. A man or a woman?—A. A man.

Q. How did he get along?—A. He struggled through so that he could read and could write his name.

Q. Was he a foreigner?—A. Yes.

Q. What countryman was he?—A. He was an Irishman. I had several colored men in that school. By the way, there is a peculiar feature here different from the South. Although we had one colored evening school in Boston (Anderson street school is mostly a colored school, and is called a colored school), there are some white children in it. I believe. Almost every elementary evening school has some colored children in it. The one I had had about twenty out of one hundred and sixty.

Q. How long did it take this white man to learn the alphabet?—A. He must have been a month at it, because he was taught to read some words before he learned the alphabet.

THE WORD METHOD.

Q. How do you find that system to work? Many consider it best to learn to read without learning the alphabet at all.—A. The difficulty with that system, it seems to me, is that the English language is a peculiar one to spell, and if you don't learn your spelling with your reading, or learn it in school, you are going to have trouble in going to dictionaries all your life. I believe in that system combined with a system of spelling, but a system of spelling should go along in connection with the reader. Exceptions in spelling must be memorized, and the theory that you can learn to spell by reading is a pretty hard theory to support. No reading book will have all the exceptions in it. A spelling book may.

Q. What I want to learn now is, what class of pupils come to learn to read and write at the elementary evening schools? Describe those pupils. If we were to call in and see those schools in operation, what sort of people would we find before us?—A. You would find boys who would be boot-blacks.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

CLASS-ROOMS, TEACHERS, ETC.

Q. How many would there be, for instance?—A. One hundred and fifty to two hundred.

Q. All in one room?—A. No. They used to be in ward rooms, but in 1880 a departure was made, and they were put in regular class-rooms in the day schools.

Q. How many class-rooms would there be for the one hundred and fifty?—A. There are 4 class-rooms, holding each from forty to fifty desks, and I had some seats extra when there was a crowd.

Q. How many teachers had you?—A. We had ten. Our rule here is that for every fifteen pupils there should be one teacher.

Q. All in one room?—A. No; in several rooms.

Q. Was it your custom to have recitations or instructions in the different branches going on all together?—A. No. As far as they can be classified, they are classified; for instance, in arithmetic we find those that can begin with fractions, and we put them in fractions; others who have to begin back at the properties of numbers; others who have to begin the book; so they are made up in divisions. There is more individual instruction carried on there than anything else. My theory, and the theory of Boston is, that after the school is registered and classified and fully organized, the principal should teach one room, and while teaching that room, he can save the time of three or four assistant teachers in one class room. Then have those teachers go into some other class-room and help those doing individual work, and in that way you can go around the school, and hear them read three or four or five times in the evening. If they do not read at least once an evening, they will get discouraged and won't come. That is a great trouble with the schools, that the teachers do not get them to read enough.

Q. Describe the character of pupils more in detail.

AGES, OCCUPATIONS, AND NATIVITY OF PUPILS.

A. The age of pupils in the elementary schools is from twelve years up—as high as fifty or sixty years of age, if necessary. Under the law, twelve years of age is as soon as they can begin in these elementary evening schools. The boys are occupied through the day in such occupations as boot-blacks, office-boys, news-boys, &c., and girls, who are cash girls in stores, as in Jordan, Marsh & Company's, and places like that. I had a large number of girls at my elementary evening school, who worked for this house (the Quincy House), and girls who worked in factories. I also had laboring men, foreigners, who would drift in from the neighborhood into those elementary schools.

Q. Did you have many of American birth?—A. No, in the school that I had perhaps about 15 to 25 per cent. might be of American birth. The rest were mostly Irish, there were some Scotch, some Swedes, some Italians, and other foreign elements of that kind. They began to learn there to read and to write. There is one thing very interesting about it—that those foreigners will come right along for two or three or four winters, until they really have a pretty good education. I have two in the evening high school now who began with me in an elementary evening school some years ago. I have several who are office-boys, news-boys, and clerks, who attended these elementary evening schools, and are with me now in the evening high school taking the higher studies. One young man is fitting himself for the Institute of Technology.

Q. These schools give the opportunity for full work in the day-time, and for spending the evening profitably?—A. Yes, they open at half past 7 and close at half past 9.
NATIONAL AID TO EDUCATION.

Q. I see by the newspapers that you attended as a delegate from this State at the recent meeting of the National Aid Educational Convention at Louisville. We should like to hear from you some information as to that convention, and your views upon the question of national aid to education; and how you found that question standing in that convention! — A. I was a delegate from this State with Dr. Minor, Thomas W. Bicknell, John W. Dickenson, W. T. Harris, and Rev. A. A. Mayo.

Q. Who are these gentlemen? — A. Dr. Minor is a member of the State board of education, as I am myself; John W. Dickenson is the secretary of that board; Thomas W. Bicknell is the editor of the New England Journal of Education, and president of the Teachers’ Council of the United States. William T. Harris is of the Concord School of Philosophy, and was for fifteen years superintendent of the Saint Louis public schools. Rev. A. A. Mayo has been in educational life, and was superintendent of the Springfield school, I believe. He was in the South for several years writing on this question of Federal aid, with Dr. Curry, of Virginia.

Q. The superintendent of the Peabody educational fund? — A. Yes. He was picked out as representing the best thought of the State. As to the convention, I will say that it was universally in favor of Federal aid.

Q. Who were the parties composing the personel of the convention? — A. The convention was composed of delegates appointed, I think, from twenty-one different States; appointed by the governments of those States. Vermont had two delegates, Connecticut one. I think Maine was represented. I know Vermont, Connecticut, and Massachusetts were represented. There was a large body of representatives from the South. Illinois had a large delegation, so had Ohio. The question of Federal aid was discussed.

Q. What class of men went from the other portions of the country? — A. They were the leading educators, I should say, of that part of the country; superintendents of States, heads of normal schools, and gentlemen who appeared to be fully conversant with the subject of education. They represented the educational thought of the different States, and from their discussion I think a person observing the proceedings would understand that they were fully qualified to deal with the subject. The sentiment was universally in favor of national aid, and as to its distribution, the sentiment was that each State should take care of its own distributive part. My own individual opinion is: I am not going to speak for others—that Massachusetts should have her share. I don’t know whether anybody else wants it or not, but we can take care of a part of it for evening schools. We need it for the support of evening schools.

Q. You do not think there is any occasion to cultivate the feeling that whatever State has some of this money is necessarily a pauper State? — A. My point is this, that although Massachusetts can take care of her own schools, yet if any State is to get this money, all should get it. There should be no idea of pauperism conveyed. I think some gentlemen at the convention had something of that feeling—that there might be a sense of pauperism involved. Georgia has, I think, about 500,000 illiterates, and of course they don’t want that State to lead off as a pauper State, nor do they want any other State in the Union to be so classed. If there is to be Federal aid it should be distributed according to the pro rata of illiterates of the different States.

The CHAIRMAN. I should not think there would need to be any special
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sentiment about it when one-half the children of Chicago never go to school at all, and there are 2,000 in one ward in New York who never get into a school-house.

The Witness. Oh, yes; there are some 300,000 persons in the State of New York who cannot read or write.

The Chairman. They let their children grow up in that way and then talk about stigmatizing States as more ignorant than their own States and having more need of the money. I speak of them only as illustrations of many places in the North. There is altogether too much self-righteousness about our ideas of ourselves in an educational way in the North.

The Witness. I agree with you quite heartily in that.

The Chairman. I would rather take the chances of the Southern people fifteen years hence than ours, unless we wake up.

The Witness. Unless Massachusetts takes care of her illiterates, my position is that they are going to increase. Through our evening schools here, we are decreasing the column of illiteracy, but unless we have well maintained evening schools in the factory villages, we are going to increase our illiteracy considerably. If the South attend to their schools as they should, there will be a marked improvement within a few years. Louisville is well provided for, having separate evening schools for white and colored children. The colored schools are just as good as the white schools, and, as I stated in an interview with a representative of the Louisville Courier-Journal, no person in the South need come to Boston to see a good school, because there are good grammar schools and good high schools in Louisville; not perhaps as good as you will find here, but there are elements in them as good as you will find here or in New Hampshire, or in any other State.

With regard to the sentiment of the convention, I would say in a word that it was not in favor of Federal agencies aside from the State. The idea was that each State should distribute its own Federal aid. It should be intrusted to it. There was a sentiment there that there might be perhaps a dual agency, but the majority of feeling there was in favor of each State distributing; as far as it could, its own Federal aid.

Q. The main question is whether it was in favor of any aid at all.—A. Oh, yes, indeed. Your [the chairman's] bill was thoroughly discussed there and thoroughly dissected, and I think that when you go back to Congress you will find this memorial committee in full sympathy with your views in the main on that question. I have not any doubt about it. I don't want to be understood in this matter as intimating that Massachusetts seeks Federal aid; that is not the point; but my point is this, that if there is to be Federal aid, every State should take its part; no part of the Union should be specially selected.

Q. Upon what principle could any State be selected? If you adopt the principle of illiteracy, why should it not be given to all?—A. I don't see why you should do it to one without the other.

**INDUSTRIAL WORK IN SCHOOLS.**

There is one thing I would like to indorse, and that is the sentiment expressed here yesterday by General Walker, of the State board of education in this State, viz., the industrial work in schools. I think that that would be a good feature to add to schools in large manufacturing villages, or in the cities in the evening schools.

I want to add that I was in Cincinnati the other day, and learned from Mr. Cist that they had adopted from us the system of teaching phonography practiced in our evening schools, and I think it ought to be taught in all evening high schools in the country.
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BOSTON, MASS., October 18, 1883.

BENJAMIN B. NEWELL examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You reside in this city?—Answer. Yes.
Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am a printer by trade.
Q. Are you connected with the typographical union?—A. I am president of that organization for the city of Boston.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that you have some matter you wish to lay before the committee. You may proceed to do so now.

ABRITRATION A PREVENTIVE OF STRIKES.

The WITNESS. I felt that I should like to say a word in favor of boards of arbitration to settle labor disputes. It would result in doing away partially, if not wholly, with strikes. I don't think it would obviate the necessity for the existence of trades-unions, but I think it would obviate labor strikes. When that can be accomplished, of course, the good is apparent to every intelligent man.

CAUSES OF STRIKES.

With regard to the causes of strikes, they are many. Oftentimes the cause is a want of candor between the employers and the employés, or haste in action upon the part of one or the other, sometimes upon the part of both; or unfairness—selfishness. Sometimes—it is quite frequently the case—the young men in trades-unions precipitate strikes against the better judgment of the older members. By the establishment of boards of arbitration, I think we could do a great deal to do away with strikes, and we should gain a good deal in the way of establishing a condition of permanent peace between the employer and the employés.

TRADES-UNIONS AND FREE TRADE.

As a trades-unionist, I have been very sorry to see trades-unionists coming before this board and testifying in favor of free trade. For my life I cannot see how a trades-unionist can consistently advocate free trade, which is non-protection to American industries. I think the inconsistency is glaring. It is almost appalling to those who are at heart interested in the cause of labor.

It was shown by statistics here yesterday that the condition of workingmen abroad is not to be compared to the condition of working people in this country, and it seems to me that to establish free trade would simply drag us down to their level. I hold that we should raise the standard and fight to maintain it, and draw others up to it, instead of our giving way to a non-protectional free trade and bringing our people down to the condition of semi-barbarous nations.

DEFINITION OF FREE TRADE.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. What do you mean by free trade?—A. Well, non-protection to labor—doing away with all laws protecting industries.

Q. Do you mean the abolition of all tariff duties upon imports?—A. Yes.
Q. Do you know of anybody who favors that?—A. I do, sir.
Mr. Pugh. They would not make a corporal’s guard anywhere that I have been.

The Witness. Unless the press of the country have glaringly misrepresented the matter, gentlemen have testified before this committee—and trades-unionists at that—in favor of free trade.

Mr. Pugh. There is but a very small portion of the people of this country that favor the raising of revenue for the support of the Government in any other way than by duties on imports and the present internal-revenue tax on whisky and tobacco.

FRENCH CANADIANS AND FREE TRADE.

The Witness. It is in my mind just at this moment that gentlemen have appeared before this committee and have attacked the French Canadians. Now, I don’t blame the French Canadians, but I blame the system that makes the French Canadian what he is—the system of free trade which has kept the French Canadians in ignorance and in bondage.

ABSOLUTE FREE TRADE UNKNOWN IN THIS COUNTRY.

Q. Has there ever been any free trade in this country since the Government was established? Was there ever a time when there was not a tariff duty?—A. I think not. I think there has been a tariff of some description or other. I am not supposed to be so conversant in such matters as yourself, you being older, but so far as I am acquainted with the history of the Government, we have always had a tariff of some kind.

FOREIGN MARKETS UNIMPORTANT.

Now, with regard to foreign markets, there has been quite a complaint from gentlemen who have testified before this committee yesterday and to-day. It seems to me that if labor was properly paid at home, there would not be so much importance attached to foreign markets. If capitalists at home starve their laboring people, they may well look for foreign markets. Everything depends on the question of how much the workingman can spend. I say, put money into the hands of the working people—of the common people of the country.

The manufacturer depends upon the wholesaler, and the wholesaler upon the retailer, and the retailer has to depend upon the people who buy of him. There is not a man in Boston but would double and treble his purchases if he had the means. I am sure I would.

HOME CONSUMPTION STIMULATED BY HIGH WAGES.

And if American labor were properly paid, there would be hardly a limit to the purchasing power of 50,000,000 of people, and we should not have to go abroad for foreign markets—almost begging for them, as some of our manufacturers are now. Home consumption would be immensely increased.

By the Chairman:
Q. You think there are no more goods than the people need if they could get them?—A. No, sir.
ADEQUATE WAGES PREVENT OVERPRODUCTION.

Then there is no such thing as overproduction?—A. Not if labor is adequately paid.

Q. Your point is that if labor were adequately paid, it would purchase and consume this overproduction?—A. Yes, and double and treble what we now produce.

Q. You do not think there is any more manufactured than would be reasonably useful?—A. I do not, in a general way; there might be exceptions, of course, but, as I say, if the country could be brought to such prosperity as that, that prosperity would be very short-lived indeed, unless it could be protected in some way.

PROHIBITION OF IMMIGRATION.

I suppose the idea would seem abhorrent to you gentlemen, but I don't know any other way than to put a duty on immigration which would almost amount to a prohibition, but the question is, would it not be a blessing to the foreigner in the end to force him to stay at home, and force him to fight the battles of freedom on his own soil, rather than to cowardly desert his ship and let those who stay at home fight the battle of liberty and freedom there?—

Q. You think that if they had to stay, being the nerve and pith of their respective countries, as that must necessarily be the rule or they would not be enterprising enough to leave it, they might achieve liberty there after a while?—A. I take that view of it, sir. Of course the labor question is broad, and there are many ramifications in it.

THE EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

As for the eight-hour law, I am in doubt, although I have given the question some considerable thought, whether the thing could be made practicable except in corporations. But I am heartily in favor of the Government taking hold of railroads and telegraphs. I will risk centralization to that extent.

GOVERNMENTAL SUPERVISION OF RAILROADS AND TELEGRAPHS.

Q. You believe in the Government having both the railroads and the telegraphs?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is a big business, you know.—A. I know it is. But as for protection, I know nothing under the sun that you can feel, taste, or measure that does not need some protection. The corn in the field, even, needs protection; if not protected it will be ruined by the weeds.

Q. You look upon the higher development as being the corn, and the less enlightened people as being the weeds?—A. I think I may do so.

FREE TRADE A BACKWARD STEP.

Q. That is the analogy you mean to make?—A. Yes. I am in favor of holding on to what little footing we have in the way of advanced civilization. Let us by all means hold on to it. Let us not take a backward step. "Free trade" is a very neat-sounding phrase, but there is poison in it.

Q. But there is this difference, you know, between the weed and the corn on the one hand, and the American and the foreigner on the other.
You cannot by any possibility convert the weed into corn, but you can take a foreigner and convert him into a good American citizen. We are all human, you know, and all of one blood.—A. Yes; but I am not in favor of the United States being a common cesspool for the drainage of all creation. This ignorance comes in such a flood that it does not assimilate; we can't stand it; we feel the effects of it here in Massachusetts.

Q. But you have evening schools here?—A. That is true, and that is a redeeming feature. Much can be done in that way.

Q. Is not that cheaper than to run the foreign missions?—A. Well, it is an open question; both are beneficial no doubt.

Q. There are 1,500,000,000 people on the earth, and we have to reach them in some way, you know, with our civilization.—A. That is true. As I say, I would have the Government take hold of the railroad as well as the telegraph. Suppose the Government should take hold of and run the railroads and telegraphs, the tariff rates would be reduced 10, 15, or 20 per cent. say as a guess, and somebody will save that money; the merchant will; it will help him in that way to compete with foreign capital.

GOVERNMENTAL SUPERVISION OF RAILROADS IN FRANCE.

Q. Mr. Atkinson has stated that France has just abandoned the system of state superintendence of railroads and turned them over to private corporations, because freight rates had risen, had doubled, I think he said, in seventeen years.—A. That may have been because the Government was too liberal in payment.

The CHAIRMAN. He cited an article of Leon Say, who showed, as Mr. Atkinson says, that this was the result of the incapacity of the Government to manage railroads economically.

The WITNESS. That is an astounding admission.

The CHAIRMAN. He says that the Government of France has recently passed a bill turning the control of railroads over to private corporations. We have had quite a number of witnesses who have claimed to bring up the case of France as an illustration of governmental management of railroads.

TRANSPORTATION RATES IN ENGLAND, FRANCE, AND GERMANY.

By Mr. PUGH:

Q. Do you know, too, that the tariff rates of transportation on English, French, and German railroads are some 25 to 50 per cent. higher than they are or ever have been in this country? They charge that much more than our railroads do; at least, that is what the railroad men swear to down here in New York; and they furnish the rates charged in England and France from one place to another by the different roads at this time.

The WITNESS. We have read in the newspapers statements contradictory of that.

Mr. PUGH. The statement I make to you was the statement of a gentleman in New York who looks after the charges of forty railroads in this country, five of them being trunk lines. Then there was the testimony of Dr. Norvin Green, to the same general effect, with regard to telegraphs. He said the rates over there were higher a great deal than the charge here, and that surprised me.
AMERICAN EXECUTIVE SKILL.

The Witness. The American people are a peculiar people. I question whether we cannot make a success where other Governments might make a failure.

Mr. Pugh. I suppose that as far as we will ever go on that point will be to regulate these railroads as far as we can.

CAPITAL PROSPERS WHEN LABOR PROSPERS.

The Witness. Whatever works in favor of the workingmen must aid capital, and whatever works detrimentally to workingmen will be detrimental to capital. Capital cannot prosper without the prosperity of the workingmen, and I claim as a trades-unionist that the workingmen are indispensable to capital, and the prosperity of labor is the property of capital. The first thing to look out for is that capital shall realize upon its investment.

The Chairman. You are a monopolist!

GOOD WAGES ENFORCED BY TRADES-UNIONS.

The Witness. Well, I want that capital shall prosper in order that it may pay the laborer well—that it may give him good wages. Therefore I say that our labor should be protected. Labor has been obliged to force capital to pay good wages, and they won't get it if they don't. We have to force it upon them, and the chances of success are more sure if the capitalist is making more money under protection than under free trade. My brothers of the free trade, if there are some present, and I think there are, will please note that. We have to force it anyway.

COMBINATIONS OF CAPITALISTS GIVE RISE TO TRADES-UNIONS.

By the Chairman:

Q. You mean you have to force it just as one man in bargaining with another gets the upper hand if he can?—A. Yes. We have to combine. Owing to the tremendous cost of this improved machinery, the capitalists have been forced to combine, and we are compelled to combine to meet them.

The Chairman. Much evidence was given before the committee that where the trades-unions existed, there labor is the best paid as a rule.

BENEFICIAL RESULTS OF TRADES-UNIONS CONCEDED.

The Witness. A few years ago there was a royal commission appointed to look into the matter in England, and I had occasion to look the subject up, and it was there admitted in plain English, without any chance for equivocation, that the trades-union system of England was a blessing to all classes, whereas a few years before it had been fought tooth and nail by the Government.

The Chairman. It has been testified before the committee that in Western Pennsylvania the manufacturers favor the trades-unions. One came before the committee in New York and testified to that effect, and the president of one of the organizations there, Mr. Jarrett, whose name has been mentioned here to-day, is looked upon as a friend of the em-
players as well as of the employees, and has been frequently called upon, in fact generally called upon when labor troubles arise, to aid in their adjustment.

The WITNESS. Certainly. It is becoming a great deal so in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Abuses it has been seen have been connected with the early organization and development of trades-unions, but they are gradually divested of them, as in England, where things have now got to such a pass that the Government looks upon them with great favor, and so do business men.

TRADES-UNIONS IN ENGLAND.

The WITNESS. Yes. Under the English system of trades-unions a hasty strike is impossible. They have a board of investigation whose duty it is, where there is trouble brewing, to visit that locality and look into the matter, and if the facts of the case will warrant a strike is ordered, but no union has any authority to go out foolishly and without warning on strike, unless on their own responsibility, and if they do it, they will have to do it without any advantage from the national organization. In that respect they are far in advance of our system in America. We are slow to adopt ideas coming from abroad, but I have recommended that we pattern after the English system so as to render strikes almost impossible. There is very seldom a strike there, and where there is one you may depend upon it if it is needed, for it is ordered only after deliberate investigation by candid, cool-headed men.

Q. Is there any other point you wish to present?—A. I do not think there is. I thank you, gentlemen for the hearing you have given me.

BOSTON, MASS., October 18, 1883.

ELLIS B. MCKENZIE examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In this city.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am a carpenter.

Q. A working carpenter?—A. A working carpenter, fresh from the bench.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed to state what you desire the committee to know.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF LABOR AND CAPITAL.

The WITNESS. You indicated last night that you are endeavoring to find out something in relation to the question of labor and capital. I desire to treat this question this evening—in what little time you may allow me—in its purely economic aspect, and to show, as it seems to me, from some study of the question in the light of the greater teachers, something about what the trouble is, and the way out of it.

COMPLEXITY PRODUCED BY DIVISION OF LABOR.

Proudhon says: "We produce to consume and we consume to produce." Adam Smith says: "The natural wages of labor are the product
of labor.” Here is a simple movement. In the beginning, before any division of labor has taken place in society, except in the family, this movement is simple and natural. The laborer gets the product of his labor. But as soon as we progress to that point where there is a division of labor, and there is required a medium of exchange, then the problem becomes complex, and it is then that we fail to see. The simplicity of the problem is departed from, and, in our modern civilization, it is so complex that it requires the closest study and a wide range of knowledge in order to follow its complexity.

THE LABOR QUESTION DEPENDENT ON THE MONEY QUESTION.

Now I take the position that Mr. Proudhon, that Herbert Spencer, that John Ruskin, Adam Smith, and other great teachers take, that the solution of the labor problem turns entirely on the circulation—on money—the instrument of association; and that the solution will be found in this direction. We are in a peculiar situation to-day, as Mr. Atkinson showed us last evening. A crisis in respect to banking and the circulation is about to take place. The national bank system is disintegrating, as Mr. Coe showed us before the bankers’ convention in Louisville; and, as Mr. Atkinson said, silver is liable to become the standard instead of gold, in consequence of the movement of things. A revolution in that respect is imminent; it is upon us. A solution of this difficulty is to come through the reconstruction of the circulation.

THE RELATION OF MONEY TO SUPPLY AND DEMAND.

I wish to say a word about the application of money to the effectiveness of supply and demand. Mr. Atkinson showed us before the mechanics’ convention, how small a product it is that we have to depend on. He said: “It may seem appalling to those who are not accustomed to submitting to such narrow measure of comfort, to be assured that the total annual subsistence, shelter, and taxes of each man, woman, and child, together with the entire margin for profit or saving, must come within the measure of what half a dollar a day will buy. Yet this must be so, because that is probably the measure in money, at market prices, of all that is produced. We cannot have more than there is; and this is very surely all there is. Even if it were 70 cents a day, would it not then be true that one-tenth part of the people of the world do not know how the other nine-tenths live.

AVERAGE ANNUAL PRODUCTION OF EACH INHABITANT.

Very well; there is 50 cents a day produced annually for each man, woman, and child in the United States. That is all we have. If Mr. Vanderbilt spends $50,000 on a ball, somebody else must go without that portion of the 50 cents. Whichever one has more of the 50 cents, some other one has less.

Now, the question to be considered, and the problem we must consider, is, what are the relations of supply and demand to this matter of capital?

CAPITAL LARGELY A MATTER OF FICTION.

This matter of capital, I would say, is almost entirely a matter of fiction. For instance, the organization of credit through which business is effected to-day is not capital. Mr. Greeley showed in relation to the
factories at Fall River that the manufacturers there—the employers—could buy their raw material and cotton on sixty or ninety days; that they did not pay their operatives sometimes in sixty days; that they would manufacture that product, get it into the hands of commission merchants, and get a return on the manufactured product in time to pay for the raw material and the wages of labor. So that the selling capitalist there is simply an agent—a business manager; and while he seems to have this capital, it is really advanced out of the wages of operatives and through the organizations of credit—banking and different kinds. So that in nearly all the businesses of the country this thing that is called capital is merely a fiction, and depends in this way upon one thing carrying another. So that if the producers of wealth could get the organization of credit into their hands, they could carry on business by the organization of credits, and through the existing organization of business, very well themselves.

WHAT IS SUPPLY AND WHAT DEMAND?

But with regard to supply and demand. Let me ask what is supply and what demand? There is a general idea, as Ruskin says, that demand comes down from the sky and supply up from the ground. Now, the fact is this, that when I, as a mechanic, finish a product, to me that is a supply, while as to another man who has produced a bushel of potatoes, I have created a demand for his potatoes. To me his production or supply of commodities is demand. That is to say, objectively to me his is demand; objectively to him mine is demand; but as matter of fact mine is supply and his is supply. Now, here are these movements; they are really simultaneous.

MORE ACTUAL THAN "EFFECTIVE" DEMAND.

People get somewhat confused in relation to this idea of supply and demand, as they do in relation to the organization of credit. We know that there is more actual demand than there is of what the economists, Mill and others, term effective demand. The problem is, how can we transform the latent, unexpressed, ineffective demand into the real, actual, tangible demand that exists—how can we render it commercially effective—give it purchasing power and capacity to find expression in the industrial production and commerce of the country? I would like to treat on that, and in order to do it justice I should require more than fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Go on.

MONEY NECESSARY TO "EFFECTIVE" DEMAND.

The Witness. Now, there is no demand of any kind that can be effective to-day in our complex system except through money. For instance, as an illustration, here are the horse-cars of this city. The Metropolitan Company furnishes transportation for the people. There, on the one hand, are the people waiting to be transported; here, on the other, is the supply of transportation. In that case supply and demand, both, are present, actual, and tangible. Now, how can the people ride if they have no medium, no money, no tickets, no instrument of exchange of any kind or description with which to render their demand for transportation effective? They cannot express their demand.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

MONEY THE INSTRUMENT OF ASSOCIATION.

They may have capital, they may have wealth, they may have enough to pay the conductor a thousand times, they may have a carpet bag, an umbrella, or an overcoat, and may be willing to pay either of these articles for a ride, but their demand cannot be made effective unless it can find expression through the instrument of association, that is, the medium of exchange. Very well. Now, this latent demand which exists in the community to-day, and which was expressed here to-night by that poor man [Thomas O'Donnell] from Fall River—this actual demand can only find expression when the circulating medium exists in sufficient quantity to afford it expression. We have nothing of that kind. We did have a touch of it during the war, and I will give you Robert G. Ingersoll's description of the consequences of having something that approximated a sufficient supply of the circulating medium.

CONSEQUENCE OF INFLATION OF THE GREENBACK SYSTEM.

Speaking of the consequences of inflation of the greenback system of currency, Mr. Ingersoll says:

As a consequence the men who had been toiling upon the farms became tired; it was too slow a way to get rich. They heard of their neighbor, of their brother, who had gone to the city and suddenly became a millionaire. They became tired with the slow methods of agriculture. The young men of intelligence, of vim, of nerve, became disgusted with the farms. On every hand fortunes were being made; a wave of wealth swept over the United States; huts became houses; houses became palaces; tatters became garments and rags became robes; walls were covered with pictures, floors with carpets, and for the first time in the history of the world the poor tasted all the luxuries of wealth. We began to wonder how our fathers endured life.

Here is an extract from Henry C. Carey which I found in the New York Tribune. The Tribune says: "'Here,' wrote Mr. Henry C. Carey in February, 1865, 'for the first time in the history of the world, there has been presented a community in which nearly all business was done for cash and in which debt had scarcely an existence.'"

APPROXIMATION TOWARDS A SUFFICIENT CIRCULATING MEDIUM.

That was the state of things produced by what was termed the "inflation of the currency" by the greenback and national-bank system. Very well. Now it was not an inflation, but only an approximation toward a sufficient circulating medium. As you [the chairman] said last night to Mr. Atkinson, the laboring people of this country, many of them called Greenbackers, said that that was the golden period of our prosperity. It was. Mr. Alanson Beard, before the Middlesex Club of this city, in 1865, after Lee's surrender, when there had come a lull in business and real depression, and when goods had fallen in price, said: "What saved us from the depression then! We could not have had a panic, because nobody owed anything."

NO PANIC POSSIBLE WHERE NO DEBTS EXIST.

That is in confirmation of Mr. Carey.

Mr. Beard continued:

The merchant did not owe anything; the farmer did not owe anything. When Lee surrendered there was no private indebtedness in the land. Every business man will acknowledge that thirty days was the limit of credit. The retailers owned their stocks and the manufacturers their mills.
That was the state of things then. That followed in consequence of there being a supply of something that approximated to a sufficient circulating medium. Very well.

NECESSITY FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM.

Now, my point is this: that the solution of this question between labor and capital is to be looked for in the direction of circulation only. I saw that you were very much interested in that line last night, and pushed Mr. Atkinson to answer, but he evaded the point. He goes for a gold standard, and, as you pointed out, there is not even enough gold to do it with. The national-bank system is practically dead. That is admitted even by the president of the New York Exchange. In that state of things, what are we to have? How are we to reconstruct our circulating system? Everybody admits—Greenbackers, gold men, silver men, and all admit that it must be reconstructed, that there must be something to take the place of the present chaotic system.

BUSINESS SHOULD FURNISH ITS OWN CIRCULATING MEDIUM.

Individually I am a believer in and represent the school of political economy of Proudhon, of Ruskin, of Herbert Spencer, and of Adam Smith. I say that this reconstruction must come by the institution of a currency system different from what we have had anywhere before—something resembling what they have in Scotland, but better than that. Business is to furnish its own circulating medium in the form of warehouse receipts, banking credits (the discounting of notes through the ordinary banks), as at present. The commercial paper, upon which 95 per cent. of the business of the world is conducted to-day, will ultimately furnish it all, and the Government will retire from that field; the national banks will be abolished, and we will not have even a gold or silver money except as subsidiary coin.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT INTERFERE WITH MONEY.

Q. Will State banks exist?—A. Well, I would not like to say that they will. I think that before we get through with the conflict there will be, of course, experiments made, but ultimately in the transition State banks will be tried. For instance, in Maine there were thirty applications to renew State banks.

Q. But your system is one which removes all governmental function, State or national, from the circulation?—A. Yes; though in the mean time, in the transition period, all those systems may be resorted to. But I say the ultimate result will be that business will furnish all the circulation.

Q. How about the legal tender?—A. The Government should determine what should in the last resort in court be tendered in satisfaction of a debt. But I hold that there is no necessity of having any legal tender—that it will be stated in the contract what will be payable and what acceptable.

Q. In other words, every contract should determine that?—A. Yes; or we can determine it as we have been doing in respect of the dollar. When contracts were made under the Greenback régime the word used was “dollar”; not “gold dollar,” or any other sort of dollar; it was a promise to pay.

Q. But it was a promise to pay property?—A. It was a promise to pay. All documents promising to pay money are ultimately certificates requiring payment in labor—in the language of Bastiat.
LEADING ECONOMIC AUTHORITIES CONSIDER WHEAT THE BEST STANDARD OF VALUE.

Q. A warehouse receipt is a promise to pay in something, is it not!—
A. A promise to pay in some specific thing. It is agreed by Adam Smith, Stanley Jevons, and nearly all the leading economists that wheat would be the best—the least fluctuating standard.

The CHAIRMAN. Iron was used in Sparta.

The WITNESS. Wheat would be the best standard in terms of which to make all contracts.

Q. Would it be convenient always to offer wheat as a legal tender? It only exists in New Hampshire in the form of flour.—A. Wheat will not be tendered. For instance, if you have read Mr. Stanley Jevons’s mechanism of exchange, you will remember that he takes one hundred of the leading products and strikes what he terms a tabular standard of value, and thus strikes an average. Instead of having one that may fluctuate up and down, absolute equity is secured by striking an average from the leading products.

Q. Suppose that the crops are short, and I insist upon payment in wheat, and my creditor insists on payment in corn, both being included in the 100! I may insist on payment in one of 50, while he insists on payment in one of 25. It may be at his option. He may pay me in a currency within 50 per cent. of just what I demand!—A. Well, in the staple products—wheat, corn, iron, and such—there are not those great fluctuations.

Q. But more than in gold or silver, is there not!—A. It is optional with the Treasurer of the United States now to supply gold or silver.

NO TRANSFERS OF STANDARD OF VALUE NECESSARY.

Q. But no promise to pay can be a promise to pay unless it is a promise to pay something!—A. It must be a promise to pay some specific thing.

Q. It is not a promise to pay in another promise, but in property, and that property is a piece of gold or silver dug out of the bowels of the earth, and which can be turned into a gold watch or other article of intrinsic value in human affairs. Gold and silver were selected because they have the most uniform, unfluctuating value—at least, that was supposed to be the reason—and they were stamped with the stamp of the Government, to identify them as official articles. They were therefore promises to pay that particular thing. Your system substitutes a promise, but a promise to pay some particular thing; it may be wheat, cattle, corn, or any one of the many things which in early times constituted the bumbling media for the transaction of business, as in barter or direct exchange. Do you think that would be any improvement!—A. I do not see that it is necessary in actual business transactions to have any transfers of the standard.

The CHAIRMAN. No, not in ordinary business transactions; but you must have power, in the ultimate, to enforce your promise; that is the significance of the legal tender; there must be something back of the thousand steps—the ultimate power of the individual to demand the particular thing, and that is the basis of legal tender. And if it is not there, there is nothing for the system to rest upon. I suggest that view; I do not put it as a natural proposition, but raise it in the form of a suggestion.

The WITNESS. Well, you will perhaps agree that the United States had no gold or silver when they issued the greenback.

The CHAIRMAN. No, but they agreed to redeem it.
CONSIDERATIONS AS TO RESUMPTION OF SPECIE PAYMENTS.

The Witness. They had nothing when they issued the greenback. It agreed to pay the greenback in coin of a standard fineness. We operated our business on that basis for about fifteen years. That is agreed. Now, the Government could have agreed, equitably, and without touching a single gold or silver coin, to have retired every one of those greenbacks, through the custom-house and post-office, without any person who ever had one of those receiving in exchange for them either gold or silver coin; and there would be no injustice. When I tender the United States Government one dollar at the post-office the United States Government redeems that note with postage-stamps; it has given an equivalent against which it was issued. It was given in payment for services performed by a soldier or some army contractor. It is retired and redeemed by the United States Government by the issuance of these post-office certificates—postage-stamps.

HOW THE GOVERNMENT COULD REDEEM WITHOUT SPECIE.

Q. If you choose to present it to be thus redeemed?—A. Yes.
Q. That depends upon your wanting the postage-stamps, does it not?—A. They are always wanted. Then, when it has carried the letter or newspaper, say, to San Francisco, it has redeemed that promise.
Q. But suppose that process goes on and no other currency goes into existence, and the postage-stamps are issued to those who want them. In due time as many postage-stamps are issued as there are greenbacks, and the promise of the United States to pay has disappeared; then there will be no circulation.—A. Yes; it could have retired the whole circulation through the post-office.

The Chairman. That would be a redemption of the promise of the United States in the sense of keeping its promise to pay a particular thing; but, waiving that promise, the man has taken his postage-stamps, and the currency has disappeared, or it might have been presented for gold and silver, taken up, and canceled, and the gold and silver would have reappeared as a currency that the world would have confidence in; but this other process would leave us with no legal-tender currency system whatever.

THE CLEARING-HOUSE SYSTEM.

The Witness. You of course understand the clearing-house system?—The Chairman. Yes.

The Witness. That was established for the purpose of settling balances.

Q. But do you suppose that that could exist if everybody did not understand that they could demand, if they chose, gold or silver, and one of these forms would be the only form in which they would make the demand?—A. They can under the present system.
Q. And it is because they can that the clearing house exists, is it not?—A. Well, it existed when they could not get it.

The Chairman. Only in this way; it existed and was confided in because they had faith that they could get the gold or silver, so that they walked by faith, though not by sight, just then.

THE GUERNSEY MARKET NOTES.

The Witness. Take the case of the Guernsey market notes. A market was erected in Guernsey by Daniel Ablat. The people had no
money, and nothing by which to erect a market. They seemed to understand the system of issuing circulating notes, and they commenced to erect their market and issue notes to pay the laborers and to pay for the material. The market was built. These notes were drawn in terms of pounds sterling, the currency of the country. They had nothing else to build a market with. They paid the notes out, and those notes went into circulation and formed a currency for the population, and they came in finally and were redeemed and canceled.

Q. Your point is that the currency may be made payable in any one of, say, one hundred products, instead of in gold and silver?—A. Yes.

Q. I admit that; but, admitting it, will that sort of currency, payable in miscellaneous merchandise, be as good and as unfluctuating as gold or silver, or as gold and silver combined, as a standard of currency? That is the question.

GOLD AND SILVER THE POOREST STANDARDS.

A. Yes. I claim that gold and silver are the poorest standards that can be chosen.

Q. Why are they the poorest?—A. To illustrate specifically why: It is agreed, in the language of Henry Thornton, that money is a kind of an order for goods. It is agreed by John Stuart Mill that the pounds and shillings which a person receives weekly or yearly are not the constituents of his income; they are a sort of check or order which he can present for payment at any shop he pleases. The nature of money is that it is an order, and represents something performed.

Q. Not necessarily, does it; it may represent any other thing of value?—A. It represents, when properly issued, services performed, and is redeemed when the service is performed.

MONEY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF LABOR PERFORMED.

Q. Why does any kind of money, or, least of all, why do gold and silver, represent services performed; do you mean in the sense that they represent the labor expended in digging them out of the earth?—A. It is agreed by all political economists that a dollar stands for a dollar's worth of labor. It stands commercially for the amount of labor that it would cost to dig it and put it in the markets of the world.

Q. That is what you mean by service performed?—A. Yes. Now, when Ruskin was found fault with by the English people for saying that the guinea was a document, he told them it was a document in the same way that a paper was a document.

Q. And in the same way that a horse is a document?—A. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly. If I buy a horse and present an order for his delivery, the order is the equivalent of the horse and the horse of the order.

The WITNESS. It would be in a sense true if, as in the ancient economies, cattle were used as money.

The CHAIRMAN. Whoever wants the cattle must give an equivalent for them, and the order is for an equivalent in value?—A. Yes; but the horse is distinguishable from money; he may be the equivalent of money, but he is not a document.

Q. But he is the equivalent of another horse?—A. Certainly.

Q. And if horses were to-day a circulating medium, as they once were, he would be an equivalent to another horse in the circulating medium?—A. Yes.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Q. Money is money because it is property, and because it is the most convenient form of effecting exchanges.—A. Well, that dictum is at variance with the deliverances of the best authorities on the subject. Mr. Ruskin has given the best definition of money of any man living.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ruskin is a fine painter.

The WITNESS. Yes; but he says his forte is political economy, and that the relation of money to the laboring question is such as I have tried to show.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed with the presentation of your views. I was simply arguing with you a little as you went along, because I think you are wrong, if you think paper money can be redeemed without any property, or that it can be better redeemed in these miscellaneous articles. However, you represent a very numerous and highly intelligent school of thinkers on that subject.

SILVER AS A TEMPORARY EXPEDIENT.

The WITNESS. For a temporary expedient, in a transitional period between what we have now and what is ultimately to be reached when the commercial system is constituted, I would choose silver, and it is undoubtedly the boding of our friend [Mr. Edward Atkinson] last evening that silver would become the single standard of this country; it is inevitable; and there will be no evil resulting from it any more than an evil resulted from the remonetization of silver. In confirmation of the belief that silver will become the standard, and to explain why in the transition we are perfectly willing to accept the silver dollar as the standard, because it is just as well to conform to custom in some degree—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). And it helps to liquidate contracts at 15 per cent. less than gold!

The WITNESS (continuing). It will be agreed that France is the one country that is accumulating gold, and it is a silver country.

PROSPERITY OF FRANCE DUE TO HER CIRCULATING MEDIUM.

England is losing gold, Germany is losing gold, but France is gaining it immensely. There must be some explanation for that, there must be an explanation why France should be prosperous when she was a conquered and devastated country, and had sustained all the shock not only of the Franco-Prussian war, but all the shock of the civil war that followed. The explanation is to be found in the difference in the finances of the two countries. Germany demonetized silver; France issued paper to fill the circulation. The result was that France has had prosperous times, while Bismarck, in Germany, was obliged to adopt the philosophy of La Salle—the philosophy of socialism. The difference is that France is prosperous and Germany has not been. And the reason why France is so prosperous is because it has had silver. That can be shown today; the facts will sustain it. Silver will ultimately become the real standard.

NINETY-FIVE PER CENT. OF THE WORLD'S EXCHANGES ARE COMMERCIAL PAPER.

Q. Of the world?—A. It will ultimately become the standard of this country, but before we can get silver for a standard of the world we shall have to overthrow the existing financial patchwork and establish
commercial banking, and the business of furnishing warehouse receipts and things of that kind to fill the circulation, and give the retail trade a commercial paper with which to do its business, just as the wholesale trade has its paper with which to effect its business through the clearing house, because 95 per cent. of all the exchanges in the world are commercial paper.

Now, commerce—such business as the telegraph business, the postal business, the express business, and other things of that kind, organized as they are—might furnish a currency for the retail business of the country, and then all the business of the country will be done with commercial paper.

Q. Suppose this were all so, and we had this new commercial currency, what would you call the currency?

OPERATION OF A CURRENCY FOUNDED ON COMMERCE.

A. I would call it commercial paper. It would be money issued by the express and telegraph companies similar to our fractional currency.

Q. Redeemable in any one of these many products?—A. The telegraph money would be redeemable by the performance of telegraph service, and the express money would be redeemable by the performance of express service to the equivalent of what it says it is the equivalent of.

ITS COMPLICATIONS DISCUSSED.

Q. What if the company should fail?—A. The company is a corporation and has no death; it never dies.

Q. But it may be dissolved?—A. It may be dissolved, and its paper liquidated, like a national bank or any other corporation, in an entirely equitable manner.

Q. Whenever it is liquidated the promise goes for nothing?—A. No; there is another express or telegraph company.

Q. Who can make the other express or telegraph company agree to assume these forfeited obligations?—A. The company cannot go out of business legally until it has taken care of its obligations.

Q. But it is a ruined company, and can get out of business if it fails?—A. It will go into bankruptcy and fail like a bankrupt bank.

Q. Suppose the Western Union Company should issue certificates payable in Western Union telegraph service, and Mr. Gould should conclude to sell out or go out of that company, and some person incompetent to manage the company should take his place, and suppose that in ten years the company should fail; in other words, should cease to do telegraph service, and should leave its circulation out, unredeemed, in the hands of the people at large! Neither the Government nor any other company could be compelled to redeem all those outstanding obligations, because they might exist to the extent of half the value of the property of the entire country, and it would be impossible to redeem them; the company might have become bankrupt perhaps because of the very issue. Or suppose some new force in nature were discovered which should supersede the telegraph, and of necessity put an end instantaneously to the telegraph companies and their business! Nobody could be called upon to redeem that, because the telegraph service would not be necessary to the world. Or suppose, what is not impossible, that some improvement in the application of electricity, greatly superior to anything now in the control of the Western Union Telegraph Company, should be discovered, and an independent company should come into
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existence and do business in opposition to the Western Union, and bank-
rupt it, without any bad faith on the part of the Western Union; what
power exists anywhere to compel redemption of these Western Union
obligations in any way? And if not redeemable they command nothing
and their value is gone.

ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS.

A. There is no power to compel the banks to redeem. When they
were bankrupted they were bankrupted. Now, if the telegraphers, for
instance, who had a strike lately, should conclude to build a line of
telegraph from New York to Chicago and should issue certificates in the
construction of that line, and as fast as it was constructed they should
pay out these certificates for services performed in the construction, as
soon as they got the line running they would redeem these certificates,
and they would cancel say 10 per cent. a year, and in the mean time the
certificates would be received as currency all over the United States,
and received in payment of messages by the company, then in ten years
the entire issue would be canceled. In the meantime their telegraph is
there and is good for the notes that are issued, and there is no unre-
deeded security.

Q. Suppose you owned a farm with $1,500 worth of stock on it, and
it was all you had in the world, and these Western Union certificates
were in circulation, and you should have a chance to sell your farm to
one person for what it is worth in gold, and to another person for a like
amount in Western Union promises to perform telegraph service, with
the possibility existing that next winter Congress might conclude to
take the telegraph service into its own hands—with all the contingen-
cies surrounding even so powerful a corporation as that, of discontinu-
ing service in the transmission of intelligence—which would you take—
the gold or the promises of the Western Union Telegraph Company
that it would do $1,500 worth of telegraph service for you in time to
come, when you consider that the country was flooded with just such
promises?

THE NECESSARY LEGAL SAFEGUARDS.

A. If these certificates were issued under such safeguards as would,
of course, surround their issue, they would be as good as anything else.

Q. What would those safeguards be?—A. That is simple enough to
decide; and in respect, even, to there not being any bona fide security
behind the notes. In Scotland they have an individual or private
banking method. Banks are not associated there; they are individual.

SCOTCH BANKING METHODS.

If a bank fails there that of course injures the prestige of the remain-
ing banks. Now, the remaining Scotch banks, without being obliged
to do so by any moral obligation, but in order not to shake confidence
in the system of Scotch banking, voluntarily agree to redeem every bill
of the failed bank, so that no bill-holder loses a cent.

Q. Let us see what you would do in that case. You would have the
promise of all the private banking institutions of Scotland?—A. No; I
should have the promise of only one banking-house originally, and that
would now be entirely bankrupt.

Q. Very well; then the others step in?—A. The others step in to
save their prestige.
Q. The fact that they did so is the strongest assertion that unless you could enforce the backing-up of this circulation by the promises of the others to take it, it would be worthless. Could you get Mr. Huntington and the other great banking and railroad men of the country, and all the strongest private individuals whose promises are worth something, to agree to guarantee the payment of the Western Union promises and make them good, if the company should fail?—A. The system contemplated by me does not contemplate the possibility of Mr. Huntington or Mr. Jay Gould coming in. Before it comes—before it is possible for it to come—all those people will be gone to the wall.

Q. What is this to be; it will be somebody’s promise, will it not?—A. It will be the promise of those business concerns that come up under free trade and freedom of contract between citizens.

FREE BANKING ADVOCATED.

For instance, I believe in perfect freedom of banking without any restraint from the Government. I don’t believe that the State of Massachusetts has any right to imprison me for six months if I issue my dollar.

Q. Do you mean that you have a right to issue your promise, and that every person is to be bound to accept it?—A. Every person has a right to issue such at their own cost.

Q. What if sharper and fool meet? How can they bind everybody else to guarantee that contract?—A. It is to be perfectly free and uninterfered with.

Q. Contracts in Scotland do not take into cognizance the contracts of every person, but simply of some great persons.—A. Mr. Herbert Spencer says that there is no other way than for each person to do it for himself; that there is no other way than under perfectly free conditions, unhampered by the Government, except to protect persons and property, which is a negative function.

Q. How can you enforce any contract except by the Government, through the judicial power?—A. That is attended to when it comes to the Government.

Q. Must it not come there? What is there in a contract that makes it of any worth (except as matter of honor) unless it has at its back the power of the courts, that great third co-ordinate power of the Government, to enforce it?

THE POWER OF COURTS TO ENFORCE THE CONTRACT.

A. Suppose I owe you $1,000 and you refuse to take bank-notes because they are not legal tender, then if I get legal tender and you accept it that is the end of it; but if there is a quarrel about it and we go into court the judge says, “This gentleman tenders you $1,000 in legal tender, if you accept that that ends it. If you do not accept it, why that ends it.”

Q. But it is not ended in a way which allows you to retake your money; it is at my option?—A. Yes.

Q. I take it when I get ready or I go without; you part with it, at all events!—A. Yes. Very well. That is a simple way to bring the matter to an end. Now, that is the only use that is made of legal tender. Very few people take advantage of it; for instance, in an auction sale if one person should bid for an article and should not have legal tender and another person should come in and bid for it and offer legal tender
the auctioneer would take it; that would settle that matter, but that
would be sharp practice. The position taken by the great teachers in
this line is that the only way to get those questions settled is to leave
them to their natural interaction.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not understand what you mean.

THE SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST FORM OF CURRENCY.

The WITNESS. There would be a survival of the fitter form of credit,
whatever it was.

The CHAIRMAN. That might happen to be a promise to pay by the
Government.

The WITNESS. No, it would be the best form.

Q. Have we not arrived at that?—A. No, it was not determined, ex-
cept by arbitrary decision.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know about that. The war was a natural
state of things. It grew out of human nature.

THE PRESENT MONEY SYSTEM IMPOSED BY THE WAR.

The WITNESS. It was a state of things precipitated upon us for which
we were not prepared; we were obliged to do something, and we did
that, but it was not a natural growth. It did not evolve from the busi-
ness condition of the country. It was a revolution, and, as a result of
that, our money system was imposed upon us, and it had its defects.

Q. If by one leap we arrived at the highest form of credit—the credit
of the nation—and we have that still in an actual piece of property, it
seems to me that we have arrived at a result which you would go over
again through the revolutions of centuries.

THE BEST CURRENCY THE RESULT OF NATURAL EVOLUTION.

A. There is no doubt that that would be the highest form if it came
by natural evolution.

Q. Why wait, then, if we have it now—whether by evolution or revo-
lution—why is it not as well to get it that way as to take it after further
centuries have passed?—A. The trouble is we haven’t arrived naturally
at it. The nation is about equally divided upon the question of the
greenback and the hard-money system.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is settled. There is no such practical
question in the minds of the American people.

The WITNESS. It is not permanently settled.

The CHAIRMAN. There are not one hundred men in the United States
who will do business on the greenback theory to-day; there are not one
hundred business men who will ask to have the greenback theory re-
established.

THE GREENBACK THEORY PRACTICALLY IN FORCE TO-DAY.

The WITNESS. Well, the greenback theory is practically in force to-
day. As a commercial country we have not resumed specie payments.
I challenge any man to show any institution in the United States that
is obliged to pay specie on demand.

The CHAIRMAN. That is obliged to?

The WITNESS. Yes, that is absolutely obliged, in the last resort, to
pay specie on demand.
Q. Why not?—A. Because he can tender a legal tender.
Q. A greenback?—A. Yes

The CHAIRMAN. And that can be taken to the Government and the
Government is obliged to redeem it, and will do so.
The WITNESS. Well, there is a fiction abroad that we have resumed
specie payment, but we have not done so.
Q. Is it not an equivalent?

SPECIE RESUMPTION A FICTION.

A. We have not resumed.
The CHAIRMAN. No human being wants specie. I should not demand
it of the bank if it had ever so much.
The WITNESS. You could not get it if you did.
The CHAIRMAN. Well, suppose I do take the greenback and I want
specie. I can get it at Washington or at some one of the numerous
places where they pay it out if I want the coin.
The WITNESS. You can get it to 50 per cent., perhaps, of the green-
back circulation—perhaps 75 per cent., but you cannot get dollar for
dollar of the three hundred and fifty millions of circulation.
The CHAIRMAN. If you had the whole circulation in your pocket at
once, it might be so, but any man, unless he has a hundred millions or
two hundred millions, could get all the coin he wants.

THE GOVERNMENT NOT OBLIGED TO PAY SPECIE.

The WITNESS. No doubt the chairman understands that the United
States Government is not obliged to pay specie.
The CHAIRMAN. It is not obliged to pay specie, but you have the
honour of the Government involved. Every individual in the United
States was obliged to pay specie, if his creditor demanded it, before the
war, and he could collect it in the court by law.
The WITNESS. The financial institutions of this country would not
stand forty-eight hours if they were obliged to pay specie on demand.
The CHAIRMAN. They are not required to pay specie; nobody wants
them to do it.

THE LEGAL TENDER A BULWARK AGAINST SPECIE PAYMENT.

The WITNESS. No; but if it was understood—if there was any con-
siderable exercise of the right, the specie could not be got. If the finan-
cial institutions of this country were to resume specie payment, there
would be a panic. They are saved now by the bulwark of the legal-ten-
der device. An act compelling specie payment would bankrupt every
savings institution in the United States, all the way from the private
banker up to the United States Treasurer. If you should make them, in
a court of last resort, pay specie, the financial system of the country
could not stand it.
The CHAIRMAN. If it were all to be done in forty-eight hours, that
might be.
The WITNESS. If it were required in the course of business, that
would be the result.
The CHAIRMAN. This theory of the circulation has been brought up
several times, and we have not heard anybody but you upon it, because,
although many people seem to think it is a panacea, yet it has not
seemed to us that we could have any better circulation, in most re-
spects, than we have. But I was glad to hear your views, because you presented them in an intellectual and intelligent way. You may be right in your views, and I may be wrong; and I have only interrupted you when I have wanted to see how your theory would develop itself into practice.

The WITNESS. Of course, going into the political branches of the subject, I was diverted from the economic argument. But I do not wish to take up your time any longer.

The CHAIRMAN. I want you to complete your statement, and I shall not interrupt you again. I only did it because it may be as well that some of the difficulties in the way may be suggested as we go along. Whatever else you wish to state, we should be glad now to listen to.

PRESENT CURRENCY SYSTEM UNABLE TO FILL CIRCULATION.

The WITNESS. Well, I claim that this latent and ineffective demand under the currency system could be made effective if the vacancy in that system were filled. We have a cast-iron system, and under that system the circulation can never be filled, but under the operations of business the circulation would always be full—never overfull and never under the point of fullness, because the method is elastic.

WITH FULL-CIRCULATION INTEREST DISAPPEARS.

When the circulation is full interest will disappear. Then, when it does disappear to the point of zero, that is the evidence that circulation is full. Rusk in takes the position that interest must disappear. Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his Social Statistics, you will remember, says that even in the matter of the issuance of coin, any great metal-house in Birmingham should be free to issue the coins of the British Empire—the circulating medium of the people—in competition with the Government and with each other. He takes that position, and in taking that position he is right; and, of course, if it applies in the matter of specie, it applies in a greater degree to freedom of issue in the matter of circulating documents.

LABOR DIFFICULTIES WOULD DISAPPEAR WITH FULL CIRCULATION.

Now, the circulation being full, all these special difficulties that we encounter to-day in this conflict between labor and capital will disappear, just the same as the tramp nuisance disappeared when business revived. All these special manifestations of distress and glut in the hands of the few will disappear in the presence of this full circulating medium and the cash payments that would result. There would be no credit if all payments were cash, as Mr. Carey said they practically were in 1866. Therefore all this interest is avoided, and the amount of it is saved to the producer and consumer. Therefore it seems to me that the final resolution of the entire problem depends solely on the construction and institution of a new financial system.

Q. Assuming that; you are, I suppose, of the opinion that the remedy must be postponed for a long period of time?

COMMERCIAL CURRENCY TO BE REACHED BY A CRISIS.

A. No; it will come by a crisis, just as Mr. Edward Atkinson indicated when before this committee, there is to be a crisis, and he fears
the result. In this crisis there will be the new issue, as the result of shock. For instance, the New York Tribune said, in 1879, that had there been a great storm in the great wheat belts the political history of the United States would have been written differently, because if that crop had been destroyed which the famine in Europe called for, bringing three hundred and fifty millions of gold to this country and reviving industry to that extent—if that had been prevented, the greenback system and the existing system would have been overthrown by a crisis, and we should have gone through many crises and much trouble, confusion, and anarchy, but we would finally have emerged all right. That is the way it will be in this respect. A crisis is to come in time. Any accident might have done it at any time. When it was threatened to break Mr. Jay Gould, he threatened back that if he were broken he would break the country; and he was powerful enough to do it. Look at the panic of 1873. After the shock it may be years before we get out of it; but before we get out of it there will be much suffering.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a danger that comes from the credit system rather than the currency system, it seems to me. When the country is called on to liquidate at once everybody’s promises will be broken; and that is ruinous, of course, but that comes from the credit system.

Adjourned.

The committee met at 9 a.m.

JOHN KEOGH examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In Fall River.
Q. Are you an operative there?—A. No, sir; I am a job printer.
Q. Conducting business for yourself?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Are you a capitalist?—A. No, sir. I was an operative for eleven years in the mills in Fall River.
Q. But you have a little establishment of your own now?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. You are a capitalist, then, to that extent you control yourself and your own money, and do your own business as you please!—A. Yes; but I do not consider myself a capitalist.
Q. I did not mean in the large and perhaps offensive sense; but you have an establishment of your own!—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You may state to the committee whatever you think is pertinent to the subjects upon which it is inquiring.

GRANITE MILL OPERATIVES.

The WITNESS. I would like to corroborate what Dr. Stow said yesterday in relation to the dwarfing of the operatives in the mills. Some years ago when I first went into the mills, card-strippers in the carding-room took care of twenty-six cards—in Granite Mill No. 1—the one that I worked in. To-day they have to look after forty cards or more. At that time they were getting $10 a week, and now they get only $1.20 a day, or $7.20 a week.

POOR VENTILATION.

The atmosphere in the mills is very close, especially in the weaver-room. In the weaver-room I worked in the atmosphere was as high
as 86° on an average, both winter and summer, and in the Granite Mills—I worked for that corporation about eleven years—they had pipes overhead running along the ceiling and the water is forced through atomizers that throw a stream or cloud of spray, which is used to dampen the work to make it stronger, so that it will work better for the weavers; but instead of that it hurts their health. The atmosphere is so heavy that the lint which drops from the loom or from the cotton drops on the floor just like a covering of frost on a frosty morning. I have known men to be troubled in years past with rheumatism who complained very much; and some of them have had to give up working in the mill on account of that.

DISCOURAGEMENT TO MARRIAGE.

I have heard a good deal of talk about the operatives in cities having homes of their own. Now a young man and woman, just after getting married, have a pretty hard time of it. I have noticed young men that before they were married have been doing very well indeed; but after they got married, even when their wives have gone to work in a mill for a short period, they have seemed to go down-hill entirely, wear poor clothes, and have to stint themselves in many things. In relation to people owning their own houses, it is almost impossible for a young man or young woman alone to acquire much property, or to save much money. Where the people own their own houses you will generally find that it is a large family all working together. They are enabled to live cheap, and can save money that way. I have noticed that a great many people who have acquired property this way have ruined their children’s health. They have compelled them to work, and the children in a great many cases have died premature deaths. There are hundreds of young people in Fall River at the present day—young men and young women who when they worked in a mill helping their parents to acquire homes ruined their health, and will never be good for anything.

CAUSES OF ILL HEALTH AMONG MILL OPERATIVES.

Q. You speak of this condition of the room by reason of the fragments of cotton getting around, are there any pains taken from time to time during the day to remove that litter?—A. Yes.

Q. How frequently?—A. That is left to the discretion of the operatives themselves. They are supposed to sweep the floors once a day at least.

Q. Not oftener than once a day at least?—A. No.

The Chairman. I do not know that I get an idea of just what the difficulty is.

The Witness. This lint drops from the cotton as it is in the process of manufacture, and going through the loom it drops right off to the ground. It is very fine, so that you can hardly notice it; but sometimes it is very thick. If the atmosphere were not so damp, it would hardly be noticed. It will be in the form of light lint, which could hardly be noticed without leaving a mark on the floor; whereas now, after you take a brush and sweep the floor, you can hardly take it off.

Q. What is the injury that it does?—A. It gets in the lungs of the operatives.

Q. Before it reaches the floor it is inhaled?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it common to all mills?—A. No; this has been introduced in the last few years in Fall River.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Q. What is the advantage of it in a business way—why is it introduced?—A. It makes the west or the cotton as it comes off the warps stronger; it makes the cloth better.

Q. Is there any way that the operative can be protected, as by wearing something over the mouth or nose, without great inconvenience?—A. I don't know but what a person wearing a mustache might not be so much in danger.

Q. And a woman cannot protect herself?—A. No.

Q. Would it be practicable to wear something like a sponge, with which to protect themselves?—A. Not by weavers, because they have to suck the shuttles sometimes.

Q. It is a dangerous thing, lately introduced!—A. This atomizing concern is. I would like, also, to speak of the way they have in the mills of the weavers sucking shuttles. I think that something could be invented by which the weavers could draw the shuttles through instead of sucking. When in Lowell some time ago I noticed that they have a patent on the shuttles, so that the weavers do not have to suck the thread through, as they do in Fall River.

NECESSITY FOR GOOD FOOD.

Now, on account of the operatives being confined in the mills, they ought to eat the best kind of food, because they are not strong and healthy. They do not have the open-air exercise that other people have that work outside. They cannot eat good, strong, healthy food; they must have something fine, and by that means the cost of living is increased.

OPERATIVES TOO WEAK TO BECOME FARMERS.

I noticed yesterday that you asked an operative how it was he did not go out West. I tried that plan myself in 1873, and found that it did not work. An operative is not physically strong enough to go out West and go on a farm, even if he had capital. If he had capital enough to go there and become acclimated it might be different; but to take an operative from the card-room, or the weaving-room, or the spinning-room, and let him go out West, he would not be strong enough to do the work of a farm.

CHILD OPERATIVES.

There are quite a number of young people in Fall River—little boys and girls between ten and twelve—working in the mills; and, if I am not mistaken, there is a law on the statute books of this State which says that no children under twelve years of age shall work in the mills during school hours. There are quite a number in Fall River. There is great danger of young people going to work at such an early age in the mills there, on account of the confinement. They are injured in health, and their constitutions are endangered.

MILL HANDS COMPARED WITH OTHER LABORERS.

If you would take two small boys out of the public schools who had never done any work before, and put one of them to the blacksmith's trade, and another in a mill, the difference between the physical constitutions of those two boys inside a few years would be remarkable. The
boy that would be sent to the blacksmith shop would perhaps work just as hard, and perhaps even harder than the boy that goes to the mill, but his work is so much healthier that he can sleep better and eat better, and have more work in the open air; and, even if his stature were stunted he would grow strong, while the boy at the mill would grow but poorly, and would not be strong at all. It is rarely, if ever, that you will meet with a man who has worked in a mill a number of years who is very strong or rugged. Such men are generally very poor both in physical strength and every other way.

OPERATIVES' APPRECIATION OF EDUCATION.

The children between the ages of twelve and fifteen who work in the mills in Fall River are compelled to go to school three months in the year. I hardly think that does them much good, for when a boy goes to school after coming out of a mill, he has no ambition to learn. When he goes there it is entirely new to him, and the ambition is wanting. But the night-school system is very good, though it is not patronized by small children; young men and young women principally go to the night-schools. After they have worked in the mills for a while they are very ambitious to get out of it, and when they come to be about eighteen or nineteen years old they see the advantages of education; and when they have an opportunity they go to night-schools. I have come in contact with a good many children who have been very anxious to leave school and go into the mills, and after they have worked in a mill a short time they have been very anxious to get out of it again.

HIGH RENTS.

There is one great evil in Fall River which is growing worse every day, and that is high rents, although the tenements that are now being constructed are much better than they were some years ago. The English people, especially in Fall River, who work in the mills are what might be termed "house-proud." They like to live in a good house and have nice furniture, and will pay high rents. Take a young man after he has got married. Generally a young man after getting married settles down and sets up house and he and his wife go to work in the mills for a while; but they never seem to get along. If they have a family, the children are completely tied down for at least twelve years. The young man and young woman who get married have to live in almost abject poverty for twelve years at least until their children are strong enough to go to work in the mills. That is about all I had in my mind to say; but I would be glad to answer questions which the committee may see fit to ask.

Q. How long have you been in Fall River?—A. Over twenty years.

TENEMENTS IMPROVING.

Q. I think you dropped an impression that the tenement houses were improving?—A. Yes; I think they are.

Q. What is their general condition in Fall River?—A. Well, Dr. Stow gave a good statement of that question.

Q. I mean as to whether it is growing better or worse?—A. Yes; they are growing better. I think the plans of the buildings are much improved.
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NATURAL ADVANTAGES OF FALL RIVER.

Q. The location of Fall River gives it many natural advantages as a manufacturing place, does it not? — A. Yes.

Q. It has seemed to me that hardly any place in the country had any superiority over Fall River in that regard. Do you know what the impression or opinion of men competent to judge of that is with reference to the location of the city as a manufacturing city? — A. The general impression is that it is the best in New England, or in the East.

DECREASED WATER SUPPLY AT FALL RIVER.

Q. Do you know for what reasons it is so considered? — A. Because it has a natural fall of water of about 140 feet, I believe, although that is not of great use now. The stream which was very broad some years ago has narrowed considerably within the last three or four years.

Q. Why? — A. I cannot say unless it be that the water is in such demand. Some years ago they constructed a water works in Fall River. There is what is called the north and the south pond or the lake, and there is also a stream, and a great deal of water which was used by the mills a few years ago is now pumped into the mills through the water works department, and the water works department being so far away from this narrow stream the flow of water is turned towards the water works, which is an entirely different direction from the stream, so that now the stream in warm weather is almost dried up. It has been very bare the last few months.

Q. And steam is relied upon more! — A. Yes. Some years ago when steam was not used the mills in Fall River were run entirely by water.

Q. It is a sea-port or near one; how near? — A. It is 18 miles from the sea.

BOSTON, MASS., October 19, 1883.

ROBERT HOWARD recalled and further examined.

The WITNESS. I merely wanted to answer a few questions which were put to me when I was giving my testimony in the city of New York.

COST OF MANUFACTURE OF A YARD OF CLOTH.

One was by Senator George in relation to the cost of the manufacture of a yard of cloth. There is a difference of opinion on that subject, but taking it from our statistics, I find that, as Colonel Carroll D. Wright works it out, it is 26.07 per cent. for the manufacture of it.

VALUE GIVEN TO RAW MATERIAL BY LABOR.

There was another question put to me by Senator Pugh in regard to what addition labor made to the raw material. I took the figures out of the statistics which Colonel Wright has furnished me, and I find that out of one hundred and ninety mills in the State he has tabulated one hundred and fifty. The value of the products of the one hundred and fifty mills in one year was $66,471,313, and the value of the raw material $35,009,108. This amount, deducted from the value of the products, would leave $31,462,205, or it would make raw material 53 cents and labor 47 cents in
every dollar, or, worked out into percentages, it would give 90 per cent,
added to the value of raw material by labor; that is, working out the
53 and 47 into percentages. The amount paid for wages of labor I find
was $15,451,347. This was the report of Mr. Wright in 1883. I suppose
it represents 1882’s production. This sum, deducted from labor’s incre-
ment ($31,462,205), would leave a remainder of $16,010,838 for the em-
ployers of the above establishments; or, working it out by division, it
would give for the one hundred and fifty establishments $106,739 apiece.
Taxes, insurance, &c., would have to be deducted from that.

AVERAGE ANNUAL AND DAILY INCOME OF OPERATIVES.

Fifteen million four hundred and fifty-one thousand three hundred and
forty-seven dollars paid out in wages, divided by 59,684 operatives, the
number stated in the report as employed in one hundred and fifty mills,
would give $253.80 to each operative on an average per annum—that is,
taking big and little. Or, divided by 313 days (the number of working days
in a year), it would average 82 cents per day for each operative. The
reason I worked these figures out so fully is that the reports of several gentle-
men who have testified here have gone forth to the country, and left the
impression that $9 a week has been the average wages; and many laboring
people are crying out from Massachusetts saying that false impres-
sions should be corrected. They employ considerable child-help, and
the average for all, big and little taken together, is 82 cents per day.

I also made some allusions in New York City to the cost of manufact-
uring in England, comparatively with the cost in New England; but I had
not the figures with me at the time, and I did not wish the state-
ment, which I might make to go into print. But here is a return from
Albert D. Shaw, United States consul at Manchester, England. I think
his report is based on what Mr. Thornly said, who made a report before.
He gives the cost of manufacturing cloth as follows:

IN ENGLAND.

At Ashton-under-Lyne, Blackburn, Stockport, and Hyde:
For 28-inch cloth, 56 reed, 14 picks, 60 by 64, 58 yards long (that is,
the cut), 25 cents for manufacturing a cut of that description.
For 28-inch cloth, 60 reed, 16 picks, 64 by 64, 58 yards long, he gives
the average for the places named as 28.88 cents a cut. He also works
it out in English money; but that is useless here.

IN AMERICA.

At Providence, Fall River, and Lowell:
For 28-inch cloth, 56 reed, 14 picks, 60 by 56, 58 yards to the cut.
For Providence he gives 17.26 cents as the cost of manufacturing a
cut of that cloth similar to the English cloth.
For the whole State of Rhode Island brought to an average, 16.82 cents
per cut.
For Fall River, 19.96 cents per cut;
For Lowell, 19.96.
Average 18.50 cents a cut.
You see that is far away behind the prices in England.
For 28-inch cloth, 60 reed, 15 picks, 64 by 64, 58 yards long—
Providence, 22.30 cents per cut;
Fall River, 23.30 cents per cut;
Lowell, 23.20 cents per cut.
Average, 22.90 cents per cut.
You will see that on the first description of goods they pay in England 25 cents a cut, while here we only pay 18.50 cents; and on the second, where they pay 28.88 cents in England, we pay only 22.90 cents here—that is, for manufacturing cloth. The difference is explained, I suppose, by the fact that the operatives here have to tend so many more machines.

THE AMERICAN OPERATIVE TENDS MORE LOOMS THAN THE ENGLISH.

He says it would be an absurdity to ask a weaver there to look after eight looms, and sometimes they do that in our print-cloth works. The most they will tend in England is four looms. Of course they supply a better class of work. A spinner will have two tenders to a long pair of spinning-mules. Our mules go fully as quick here, and our conditions are not so favorable. That accounts for the complaint of hard work here. They pay far more in England for the production of a pair of mules of a similar size to those here, only a spinner there has to pay more out for tenders, and would approximate closely to about what our highest wages are in Massachusetts.

RELATIVE COST OF MANUFACTURE HERE AND ABROAD.

I have a few figures in relation to the cost of manufacturing in the different countries; that is, taking it in the whole, and including insurance, coal, storage, oil, stores, repairs, taxes, &c. I find these to be rather in favor of the English manufacturer; they do not cost him so much. Coal is to him a much lighter expense than to the American manufacturer; therefore it offsets to some extent, and perhaps balances the high rates which the English manufacturer pays for manufacturing.

But I do believe that if our manufacturers would act wisely in this country they would try to lighten the burden by taking some of the work off their operatives.

In Oldham, in England, which is quoted extensively in Mr. Shaw's report, they clear the mills out once in ten years and put fresh machinery in, and that, I think, accounts to a great extent for the extraordinary growth of that place. At present they have 5,000,000 spindles in that place alone—nearly one-half of what we have in the whole United States. We have 11,000,000 spindles in the United States. The number of spindles worked on this principle of co-operation, taking Oldham as a center, is 5,000,000, and in that city they always give extra help to spinners where they introduce the larger mule.

QUANTITY, NOT QUALITY, DEMANDED OF OPERATIVES.

There is one thing which our manufacturers lose sight of, and that is, the quality of the work produced. They do not seem to care about quality; especially in the matter of print-cloth, quantity is all they care for. Put two men beside one another, and one man who makes goods 20 per cent. better than another may give a little less work at the week's end, and on that account he is rated as inferior to the man whose superior he is, though they can obtain 25 per cent. more quality out of his work than out of the other man's. They do not seem to care about waste, they do not consider it at all.
I would say myself that there is more waste made in two of our mills in Fall River—more stuff destroyed and goods lost on account of this extraordinary rush—than there would be in a whole city full of factories in England. It would drive a manufacturer in England wild to see so much loss. If there is the slightest thing wrong with the machinery, or the thread, in England, the man is assisted, and if he does not do better he is changed or removed. But here there is no notice taken of parts that are loose. The weaver has not time to try to straighten things out and make it so that it will work. Sometimes what will take the spinner half an hour to work is thrown into the waste box and no notice taken of it. That waste ought not to be permitted, but I suppose the overseers are glad to get it out of their hands anyway. It is trodden upon and soiled, upon the floor, and it becomes so black and dirty that it is not good for anything.

A POUND OF COTTON PRODUCES LESS CLOTH HERE THAN IN ENGLAND.

They cannot produce more than 5¼ yards of cloth out of a pound of cotton here, while in England their stuff is supposed to measure 7 yards to the pound. We can judge for ourselves what an enormous loss that must be in the manufacture of cotton cloth, and I attribute that loss, myself, more than to anything else, to the extra amount of work they put upon the operative. They do not seem to consider at all whether there is any saving to be made out of it.

MANUFACTURE MOST PROSPEROUS WHERE LABOR IS SATISFIED.

We see works in the State where the welfare of the operatives seem to be really a matter of thought to the managers, where the operatives have no complaints, no grumbling, but all seem to be doing well. Wherever in the United States we find the operatives having the easiest work we find that they do not have nearly so much to do as they have in Fall River, and we find such mills the most prosperous, notwithstanding. I could relate many instances, but it would be only taking up time. I think it would be the highest wisdom in manufacturers to take into consideration the welfare of the poor boys and girls that drive their looms from morning to night.

EXCESSIVE LABOR LEADS TO INTEMPERANCE.

I think that is driving our people to intemperance, because their work is a continual race from morning until night, day in and day out, all the year round. They go in and come out again, and there is a continual running after them to keep them up to the work. If a man had nothing to do but run after them from morning until night he would be tired. This racing and running are driving our people to intemperance more than any other thing. I have often talked the matter over with good, steady men, and I know that that is a fact. It is the same in the South. They have told me that they could not eat their suppers without having something to stimulate their stomachs after all that close atmosphere that they are in all day. They seldom come out to dinner because they have not time. There is no time allowed to clean up.
TREATMENT OF LABOR MORE CONSIDERATE IN ENGLAND.

Now, in England, they allow them an hour and a half for cleaning up, and consequently in that hour and a half they could do the work which the spinner has to do in meal-hours in America. That allows for time to oil the mules, &c., while here it has to be done in the dinner-hour.

THE BEST MEASURE OF REFORM—"MAKING LIFE WORTH LIVING."

I have often said that, in order to bring contentment to the people and make their work easy for them, it would do more good than all the temperance preaching in the world, and the action of all the jails in the State, if an effort were made to show men that there is something worth living for; to give them a fair share of the profits of their labor; and show them that there is a bright road before them. I think that then we should have a better class of citizens; but at present there is such a keen rivalry between mill and mill that it is disheartening.

COMPETITION BETWEEN MILL-OWNERS CAUSING DISTRESS.

We have fifty-three mills in our city, and they have to figure out monthly and weekly what per cent. it costs to run these mills. These manufacturers see each other's returns on the board of trade, and if the percentage is one hundredth part more in one mill than in another, as they are of course competing with each other, it often results in the discharge of one small boy, or somebody else.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You have just stated, as other witnesses have, that when the help is rightly treated the production is greater. If that be the fact, how is it that these mills fail to compete with each other to the best advantage by the removal of the grievances you complain of?—A. I said that I find in the States where the help is better treated the mills are prosperous.

Q. In other parts of the State?—A. Yes.

Q. Are there not some mills in Fall River where the help is treated as they ought to be, and where there is a greater production in consequence of the better treatment of the hands?—A. I do not know that there is any greater production; there is an odd mill or two, and I think they do as well as the others.

Q. Do they do any better?—A. I do not know that they do. It is drive, drive, drive, from morning to night.

Q. Is Fall River, as a whole, different from other cities in its method of following manufacturing work?—A. I think so.

Q. Different from the entire country, or nearly so?—A. Well, Lowell is similar, but not so bad.

APPLICATIONS FOR "SICK WORK."

It involves having a certain amount of half-idle help around. You will find a number of spinners and weavers standing around the mills in the mornings looking for work, and they all expect to get as much "sick work" as will pay board.

Q. What do you mean by "sick work"?—A. When men are exhausted or tired they have to stop work a little while. Men cannot work all the time at this work, and when a man comes to be off a little in order to recruit, somebody else is put in his place. In fact, when a man is hired to take the place of sick help he calls it being "hired."
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AVERAGE WEEK'S WORK OF COTTON OPERATIVES, FOUR AND A HALF DAYS.

Four and a half days a week is the average work of a man in cotton mills, taking all the week through—especially where the long mules are in operation.

Q. You mean the physical strength of the operatives is not sufficient to keep them at work all the time?—A. It is not sufficient.

ACCESSIBILITY OF FALL RIVER A CAUSE OF SURPLUS HELP.

We are more favorably situated for getting help than any other town or city in the United States. The boat leaves New York every evening, and is in our city in the morning, and there is scarcely a day but what it brings people from England; and it has come to be a common saying that when they reach Newfoundland, or about there, the first question they ask is, "Where is Fall River?"

Q. Why do they ask for it, as a heaven, if it is such a hell?—A. Well, they won't believe it is such a place as it is. I have written hundreds of letters to secretaries of operative associations in England, and have told them that England is better than Fall River; but they have said in answer that it is no use telling the operatives; they will insist on coming to see for themselves.

FOUR HUNDRED SURPLUS IN FALL RIVER.

We have four hundred more spinners in Fall River now than we can employ. After they have been there awhile they gradually work their way down to Rhode Island, and along to Boston and Lowell and get around the country. But that is the first place they strike when they come from the New York boat.

Q. The first, and the worst?—A. Yes, and they make it worse by doing so. This surplus labor is a standing menace. If we had not such surplus labor, we could do something, I think, to improve things.

ADDITIONAL MILLS BUILT FROM SURPLUS EARNINGS.

In regard to the question that Mr. Wright spoke of yesterday, it is true that many of our corporations have made far more profit than they have shown to the public. The profits that have not been divided have gone to enlarging the mills. The mills have grown out of nothing, you may say. The Granite Mills stock is $3,000 a share, par value. I have often talked with stockholders, and I have said, The Granite has paid 16 per cent," but they said "You don't look at it right; the stock is worth $3,000," and when I have said "There has never been a call on you," they have answered, "But some of us have had to buy that stock and pay the price of it." The original stockholders, however, have trebled their investment.

DIVIDENDS, TWENTY PER CENT. PER ANNUM.

The Union Mills made 20 per cent. last year. They make 20 per cent. again this year, I know. Every quarter they pay 5 per cent., and they pay no more wages than others, and less, if anything. Mr. Chase was agent for a mill and built new machinery, and although it did him no good, it has done good to those for whom he built it. They can make
good dividends. The par value of the stock is $100 a share and it is selling for $200. In such conditions as these, people might say that the stockholders ought to pay the operatives better; but they won’t do it, because there is a regular rate.

COMPETITION FIXES THE RATE OF WAGES.

The company running the mills go according to the rates of the board of trade. They go by that wherever you travel. As to the heads of corporations making a fair division of profits with the laborers, it will be a long time before it will come; they will only pay the same as others.

Q. What is there in your mind that would tend to secure proper wages?

HOW TO GIVE EMPLOYMENT TO ALL.

A. I have got bothered sometimes as to what would be best, and I have thought that less hours of labor would be the best thing; so as to give employment to the help that is around. We are crowded with surplus labor, and people should learn that fact. And we should open new lands to which we might send the surplus labor. Our manufactures in New England are not enough to give employment to all that come to us. In Lancashire manufactures are extended, but cannot give employment to the whole of the people. Population increases rapidly; and the only outlet found is by coming to the United States; and I cannot see anything else for them, myself, weighing it all over.

REDUCED HOURS OF LABOR: WHAT WOULD BE GAINED.

But it would bring about the millennium if we could reduce the hours of labor and give employment to the unemployed, and so avoid working the people more hours than their health and strength would properly enable them to work. Instead of that, I am sorry to say that in Rhode Island, although there are large numbers of people out of work, other people are working night and day, and more than human nature should work.

Q. Do you think you could reduce the hours of labor by law, so that they would be reduced in practice, any easier than you could increase wages by law?

LEGISLATION AS TO HOURS OF LABOR.

A. I think it is the most practical way to have the hours reduced by legal enactment. If we wait until the operatives educate themselves up to that, as Mr. Atkinson said, we shall have to wait a long time. Because, in the New England States, if you were to call a meeting of the operatives they would not come to it. You will not see an operative here from Lowell to testify before this committee. It was only yesterday that two refused to come before this committee. You can’t get an operative from there to come before you, or before any State committee. They will flock around me in the streets and in dark corners, but you can’t get a man to go on the platform at a meeting.

I went to Waltham yesterday morning and asked some of them to come here to testify; but they said they did not dare to do so, but they could come and see me after dark. I said, “Why are you afraid?”
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WHY OWNING A HOME IS CONSIDERED A CURSE.

One man said to me, "Well, we believed at one time that if a man built a little home for himself it would be an advantage to him, so we have a building club here, and several of the men have built little homes for themselves. There are mortgages on those homes, and if we were to speak above our breath we would be fired out faster than the man that never tried to build; so that it has been a greater curse than a blessing that we built at all." It is the same up in Lewiston. After a man has built a little place for himself he has got to stay and submit to any reduction they choose to make.

FEAR PREVENTS LABOR TELLING ITS WRONGS.

I was in Rhode Island, and talked with the operatives about lessening the hours of labor, but you can't get one of them to open his mouth. Mr. Livermore, in Manchester, said that there was no trades union in Manchester. There is a very good reason for that. The moment a man joined a trades union he would be discharged. I was in Manchester a while to form a spinner's union, and, shortly afterward, I visited Manchester again, and I found that six of the men that went into it had had their machinery stopped on the pretext that it was "not busy times." I went up some time afterwards, and the machinery was stopped still. I asked the overseer about it, but he gave me no satisfaction, only saying, "I hear you fellows have formed a union."

SHORT HOURS DEPENDENT ON HUMANITARIAN AGITATION.

That is one reason why I do not think the people will ever be educated up to a point where they will insist on shorter hours for themselves, unless our humanitarians take hold of the matter. I think if that were done, and the people had more time to think, and read, and improve themselves, they would no doubt study the subject up for themselves, and would see some way out of it.

Q. You have trades unions in Fall River?—A. Yes.

Q. Are they strong here?—A. Yes.

LABOR UNIONS IN FALL RIVER: CAUSES AND RESULTS.

Q. How does it happen, then, that Fall River is the worst, in abuses, of any place in New England?—A. Well, we were driven to organization by those abuses.

Q. Is the condition better or worse since the organization of your unions?—A. I think it is better.

Q. Do you attribute the change at all to the operation of the unions?—A. Yes.

Q. Show us how it comes about.—A. In wages, I think, we are ahead, if anything; but I think our labor is harder. I used to spin at the mules myself, and, like the rest, I was disgusted with the condition of things. Some four years ago the spinners asked me to leave the mill altogether, and they would pay me as much as I was getting at spinning if I would become secretary of their organization. I was an extraordinary good spinner—if I do say it myself—and I left with some reluctance; but something seemed to be necessary. Men could not get any satisfactory settlement of their differences, and I left and undertook the position of secretary of the organization.
LABOR UNIONS BEING EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYÉ TOGETHER.

Year by year, I think more and more, I am sent for by the manufacturers, and we talk things over together. If I can show the manufacturers, for instance, that there is some difficulty with the men by reason of somebody interfering; if I can show that it is a disadvantage to the men, they try to remove the difficulty. They are disposed to do things, unless it be to give a direct advance in wages. I have never failed yet in any attempt I have made to interview a manufacturer, and they have always met me very civilly, and have done all they could to remove little grievances. I was at Lowell once, and when I got back to Fall River I found that some of the men had struck. Some of them that did not feel that they could trust themselves to argue the matter with the manufacturers talked the matter over with me—they had been waiting for me. I talked the matter over with them, and then with the manufacturers, and the result was that the men started to work the next day. If a man is intelligent and patient, I think the manufacturers will try to discuss with him. We have removed many grievances there.

WEEKLY PAYMENTS IN FALL RIVER A RESULT OF TRADES UNION.

We have weekly payments at Fall River. Some of the mill people occasionally think their operatives try to beat them out of something, and so they do not try to make concessions until the matter is laid before them. Forty-nine out of the fifty-three mills at Fall River now pay weekly.

At Oldham they have a “list” to pay by, with conditions drawn up between the manufacturers and the men. The secretary of the spinners’ association goes to the manufacturer and talks to him about it. If the manufacturer complains he communicates his complaint to the secretary and the secretary replies to him. In that way they have no trouble now. The secretary is bound to reply under fine.

EVILS OF BLACK-LISTING.

I think there has been a great deal of “black-listing” going on in New England. If a man speaks above his breath, or speaks a word at a meeting, nothing is said to him, but his services are dispensed with. I think that is what has brought so many rebellious spirits to Fall River; because, when they have been discharged, or cannot get employment in their own places, they come to our mills. I have seen an excellent man and an excellent woman who could not get employment. They were pulled into the organization when the organization took place because of their intelligence; but they were black-listed, and lost their places. Black-listing should be stopped, because nothing can deter a man so much from taking steps to remedy his condition, especially if he is a man of family. Of course a man who has a family cannot move anywhere, and his condition is a very hard one.

DOCTORS’ AND UNDERTAKERS’ FEES TOO HEAVY FOR THE WAGE-WORKER.

There is one thing that I wanted to mention in New York, but I forgot it; that is, in relation to the high expense of doctors’ bills, drugs, &c. The lot through life of a man who has a little family, if sickness overtakes him or them, is going to be a hard one, because the doctors’
charges are so enormously high. They charge you $2 a visit in our city if you can't pay cash down. Many of them will take $1.50 if you can pay cash at once. They have special places where they send you for drugs, and these places will charge you 90 cents for a little medicine, while if you knew the name of that drug you could probably get it for 10 cents. That sort of thing gets a man sunk down, and he can't extricate himself until his children grow large enough to work in the mills, and he incurs debts more than he is able to pay.

If an undertaker buries a member of a man's family, he will charge from $80 to $100. That is an enormous sum in the eyes of a poor man.

**BETTER ARRANGEMENTS IN ENGLAND.**

Now, in England, if such a man is sick, the doctor will come and attend him and give him medicine for about half the amount. He will bring his medicine with him, and won't send to the apothecary. That is a great saving to a workingman.

In England, if a man working in a manufacturing city like Lowell is caught in the machinery and gets hurt, he is taken care of. There is an infirmary in such places, and the doctor goes and sees this man and attends to him. He goes to the mill and sees whether the machinery is all right or not—the machinery that caused the accident—and it is removed or changed if fault be found with it.

By Mr. Pugh:

Q. That is in England?—A. Yes. They seem to exercise there more protection over the people than they do here.

**CLOTHING OF THE POOR IN ENGLAND.**

Their clothing here, also, is not to be compared to the clothing in England. In England a pair of shoes will last a man a couple of years. The climate is humid, and you do not need to change your shoes so often. Here the summer and winter are so different that that would not do. Of course a man coming from England here has to wear the same kind of clothing that people already here do.

**THE ENGLISH SCHOOL SYSTEM BETTER THAN THE AMERICAN.**

The school system here I do not believe in at all. The half-time system in England is far preferable to the way we have here. Our boys are not getting schooling here, even in enlightened Massachusetts. Boys that work seven months out of twelve know nothing about schooling when they grow up. They do not seem to have any understanding about education at all. The greatest benefit derived from our common schools in Massachusetts is by the children of the middle class man, who can keep his children there all through. It is an unequal tax in that respect, because the poor man cannot keep his children there. He will keep them there until they are ten years old, and he will then send them to the mill, while business men send them there all the year round.

**FIVE MONTHS' EDUCATION FORGOTTEN IN SEVEN MONTHS' LABOR.**

What is learned in the five months that mill children go to school is all forgotten in the seven months that follow. I had occasion to take.
a lady to Rhode Island the other day (a daughter of Mrs. Chase, the chairman of the Woman's Suffrage Association of Rhode Island), a Quaker lady. She came to me and asked me to take her about the mill. I did so. We came to a little boy about fourteen years of age, who said he had no mother, and his sisters were at home. His father was a ship carpenter. This lady put her hand on his head and said, "Can you read?" He said, "No," "What," she said, "in Massachusetts?" I said, "Haven't you gone to school five months out of the twelve?" "Oh, yes," he says, "but I have forgotten it all." It is so in many instances.

HALF A DAY AT SCHOOL AND HALF A DAY AT WORK THE BETTER PLAN.

Now, in England it is different. They go to school there either in the forenoon or the afternoon of each day all the year round, except during vacation time, and the boy is not worked so hard quite as not to remember what he learns. Many of the men in our city do not see this at all; but Mrs. Chase has traveled a good deal in Europe, and she believes in that English plan by which they give a half day's work and a half day's schooling to children.

Q. You would make that suggestion as applied to the whole school system?—A. I would, sir; I think it would be an improvement.

Q. For all classes of children who attend the schools?—A. Well, I think it would be an improvement to the factory operatives. The factory operatives' lot is becoming a very hard one in this country.

EFFECT ON OPERATIVES OF COMPETITION AMONG MANUFACTURERS.

The keen grind of competition that is going on against each other by the manufacturers is having a bad effect, very bad. It is not a competition against the foreigner at all; it is manufacturer against manufacturer, each trying to undersell the other, that is creating the trouble. I can see it going on in our city, this intense rivalry; each has to manufacature his cloth at least a cost as any one else.

Q. I should think this competition would reduce these large surplus profits you speak of.—A. Well, some mills are exceptionally situated. For instance, the Granite Mills I speak of.

Q. You do not mean that these heavy profits are universal?—A. Oh, no. It is where one mill has built another on the original capital stock; they can afford to divide three times as much as the others.

BOSTON, MASS., October 19, 1883.

The chairman presented the following copy of letter written by him:

[Rooms of the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate.]

QUINCY HOUSE, BOSTON, MASS.,
October 19, 1883.

MY DEAR SIR: This committee is now engaged in taking testimony under a resolution of the United States Senate directing an inquiry into the relations between labor and capital and the economic conditions connected therewith, a copy of which resolution I have the honor to enclose herewith. It would be a source of great pleasure to the committee, and, I am sure of much benefit to our people, if you would kindly consent to favor us with such suggestions
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and information as, in reply to questions which we desire to ask you, may seem to
you to be pertinent and proper to give. We will gladly suspend any work in which
we may chance to be engaged in order to hear you, so that you will be welcome at
any hour which may be most convenient to yourself during to-day, which will be
the last day of our session here.

Very truly and respectfully, your obedient servant,

H. W. BLAIRE,
Chairman Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate.

To Mr. WILLIAM MATHER,
Representative to the United States and Canada
in behalf of the English Royal Commission on Technical Education.

The CHAIRMAN. In response to this invitation Mr. Mather has kindly
appeared before the committee.

WILLIAM MATHER examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You reside in what part of England?—Answer. In Man-
chester.

Q. What is the purpose of your visit to this country?

THE ROYAL COMMISSION OF ENGLAND ON TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

A. It is to ascertain, on behalf of the Royal Commission on Technical
Education, what are the opportunities offered to the people of this
country and Canada, to acquire industrial training and technical knowl-
dge of the various occupations and industries that are followed here,
and generally, what opportunities are afforded for science teaching, the
teaching of the elements of the sciences that underlie all the industry of
your country, as they do of all countries.

Q. Will you state to the committee your occupation and pursuit in
life.—A. I am proprietor of a large engineering establishment in Man-
chester—machine shops.

Q. And have been an employer of labor?—A. Have been an em-
ployer of labor all my life.

The CHAIRMAN. I presume you see the purport of the inquiry that
we are engaged in. We thought that from your stand point, as an ob-
server among us from another country, a country with which we are
ourselves most intimately connected, both industrially and otherwise,
you might be able to give us valuable suggestions from your experience
in your own country, and perhaps from your observation since you
have been here. We shall be obliged if you will be kind enough, in
the first instance, to state to us something of the relation of the system
of technical or industrial training to the industries of England, and
possibly the continent of Europe, their importance absolutely, and their
importance relatively, with a view to the industrial conditions that
must exist hereafter.

OBJECTS SOUGHT BY THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

The WITNESS. I may say that the appointment of this royal com-
misson to inquire into the technical education of all the countries in
the world arose out of the fact that in England we have not many op-
portunities nor institutions which afford to our working population, or
even to our middle classes, the means of acquiring a knowledge of the
sciences before they enter the usual occupations of industrial life.

We have felt for the last ten years very acutely, as you know, the
competition which has sprung up in all parts of the world with English industries, and it has been supposed by some public men, and by large numbers of the community generally, that our manufactures of the simplest kind would for the future have to yield to a higher class of production if we are to hold our place in the world as purveyors of clothing and the various articles which we have hitherto shipped from England.

The countries of Europe have, of course, ceased to take from us gray cloth and have ceased to take from us the simplest form of machinery, and have in a hundred ways ceased to need our services in matters for which, twenty years ago, they were absolutely dependent upon us.

ENGLAND COMPULLED TO RAISE THE STANDARD OF HER MANUFACTURES.

In consequence of this we find it necessary to improve the taste in all articles we manufacture, and to bring to bear a higher knowledge of the scientific laws that underlie all the industries, and to educate our people into still greater skill—a skill derived from a higher intelligence. Our opportunities hitherto, in England, to impart this sort of knowledge to our apprentices, and men who desire to learn after they have entered into the ordinary work of life, have been very few; they have been of a voluntary character, and dependent chiefly on mechanics’ institutes, workingmen’s colleges, and certain night schools, which have scarcely touched this one question that we are now seeking to solve.

INDUSTRIAL AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS IN EUROPE.

On the continent of Europe industrial and technical schools have been in existence—in Germany, France, and Switzerland particularly—for a considerable number of years, and the benefits accruing from these have at last invited our attention.

In order to see what we can learn from them, this royal commission has been making investigations for two years, and I have come to this country to see what you also have done in that direction. We have an idea in England that America excels, in all the mechanic arts, any other countries of the world. Her wonderful genius in the direction of original design—invention—and the excellence of her manufactures in regard to everything mechanical, has attracted our attention for a number of years, and we are curious to know how it is that the people of America have arrived at such excellence and proficiency.

ENGLISH APPRECIATION OF AMERICAN INTELLIGENCE.

The universal system of education you have enjoyed here, we have hitherto supposed, has accounted for the intelligence displayed by your working classes, and of course the immense resources of your country have attracted intelligent men from all parts of the world to settle here, and their families having grown up and enjoyed your system of education, have become very intelligent and superior working people.

The industries of England have flourished chiefly, hitherto, upon the great demand which all the world has made upon us for our products, and on the facility with which, owing to the abundance of material, we have manufactured all our machinery and textile goods.
ENFORCED CHANGES IN ENGLISH MANUFACTURES.

During the last ten years that demand, as I have said, has very much decreased, and we have now to pass on to a different kind of manufacture. Our people cannot respond to this higher demand made on them. We have not had the art schools or science schools to enable them to understand the laws or principles upon which this higher industry is based.

NECESSITY FOR KNOWLEDGE OF PRACTICAL SCIENCE IN INDUSTRY.

In order to meet this, we hope to establish in all our manufacturing districts certain institutions—you may call them technical schools—in which not trades shall be taught, but the science that underlies every industry shall be imparted to the children of workingmen at the same time that they are somewhat trained in industrial skill to manipulate, to pass through, and understand the operations which are necessary for the various kinds of manufactures that we desire to improve. The only source of encouragement in that direction hitherto with us has been the science and art department of South Kensington—the important department of our state which encourages studies throughout the country by offering sums of money to schools and institutions which will train students to pass through certain prescribed examinations.

THE SCIENCE AND ART DEPARTMENT OF SOUTH KENSINGTON, ENGLAND.

Q. The money goes to the school institution rather than to the student?—A. Yes, after the examination. The science and art department of the Government sends down an inspector every year, and the students come up for examination in the various branches of scientific study which the department has arranged, and, according to the proficiency of the pupil of each school or institution, a sum of money is given to that institution, which is divided generally among the teachers, or applied to the support of the school.

GROWTH OF SCIENCE SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND.

That has encouraged night study, and has created quite a large number of small science schools throughout the country, and the number is rapidly increasing. It is found that these boys and girls who have passed through these examinations are of so much higher intelligence than the ordinary run of operatives that those who have taken prizes in one of these schools are gladly taken into employ. Some get books, and some get other things, and there is a prize known as the “Queen’s prize,” which is given for the highest proficiency; so that a premium is put upon good work, and people take advantage of it. This system is not wide-spread at present, but it is the beginning of a state of things which is likely to help us forward when generally adopted.

Q. That is the parent school at Kensington?—A. Yes. The science and art department is, as you know, a museum of science and art, to which museum are attached various schools; there is an art school and a science school. Students come in there, and by the payment of a small sum of money they are enabled to receive instruction. There is a mechanical drawing school and a fine-art school.

Q. How far is that from London?—A. It is in London.
Q. In the city? — A. No; not in the city, but in the West End of London; the most fashionable part of the West End. It was located there because of the last international exhibition being there.

INFLUENCE OF THE SOUTH KENSINGTON SCIENCE AND ART DEPARTMENT.

Q. How many students were at the school last year? — A. That I could not tell you; but that is not pertinent. The science and art department has done more work throughout the country than it has in London.
Q. It ramifies everywhere throughout the kingdom? — A. Yes.

COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE OF APPRENTICES AT A PRIVATE SCIENCE SCHOOL.

Q. And they send inspectors to every point wherever there is a school, every year? — A. Yes. I will give you my own case. I have a number of engineer apprentices in my own works. I felt the necessity of these young fellows employing their leisure time more to their own benefit and profit, and also more to the interests of my concern, so we built a science school inside the works, and made it compulsory on every apprentice to attend that school.
Q. During what hours? — A. During the evening, two hours in the week. If they do not attend that school they are discharged from our employment.
Q. This applies to whom of your employés? — A. To all the boys; all the apprentices in our works. And in order to carry that out under the general system of encouragement offered to science and art training, I wrote to the department and asked them to put us on their list. They said, "If you will conform to certain conditions we will do so." Their conditions are printed, and require that three or four gentlemen will undertake to inspect this school once a year to see that the studies are fairly well attended to; that certain rooms are devoted to the work, or certain space set apart, and conveniences provided for the pupils. They will then appoint an inspector to come and inspect the place. After the examination they look at the general results and allot to that school a certain sum of money per capita just as the proficiency, or otherwise, as ascertained by the examination, may determine.
Q. Relative to other like schools? — A. Yes. We have one system for the whole country.

PRIZES FOR EXCELLENCE IN SCIENTIFIC STUDIES.

Q. In reference to the relative standing of those schools with each other are prizes ever given? — A. Prizes are always given. The highest prizes are the Queen's prizes. They consist probably of boxes of drawing instruments.
Q. That goes to the individual? — A. Yes; that is given by the Government to the individual.
Q. They are not pecuniary in their character? — A. No; a scholar generally gets books, or prizes of some other kind than money. When prizes are not given, certificates of merit are given, signed by the officials, and, of course, the young man getting one of these probably makes use of it in after life as a certificate of character.
Q. Any student, I suppose, can get some sort of certificate if he pays
attention to his studies?—A. After he passes the examination. There are first junior and second junior classes, and first and second senior classes, and passing through either or all of these entitles a boy to a prize.

SCIENCE SCHOOLS PECUNIARILY AIDED BY THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT.

Q. You spoke of pecuniary prizes which go to the institutions themselves?—A. Yes; for their pecuniary support—a certain sum of money which is intended to encourage even private science teachers to establish schools. A man may, at that, always earn something which will be in addition to his general income, by using one or two nights a week in this way, so that they endeavor to utilize, you see, all the scientific power that the country possesses.

NORMAL DEPARTMENT IN KENSINGTON SCIENCE SCHOOL.

There is a special department in Kensington for science teachers to pass an examination. They have a standing examination for teachers of science, and any young fellow who wants to qualify to teach, if he passes an examination, will receive from the department a certificate and may be employed in such schools afterward.

Q. Or he may establish one himself?—A. Yes; but he must have three or four reputable persons in the community to answer certain questions as to his character—whether he is a respectable man and is worthy of encouragement, and certifying that they will look after the school in a general way.

Q. They assume a sort of trusteeship of the school and a general supervision of it, and give the support of their reputation to it?—A. Yes; that is really all that we are doing in England at the present time, in what we call technical education.

Q. Is that system extending?—A. Very rapidly. It is now extending in a direction which is novel, and yet extremely important, as you will see.

SCIENCE TEACHING BECOMING A PART OF ENGLAND’S EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

Our national system of education, as you know, has got fully to work, and our board schools are increasing rapidly in every town. The board-school managers (or school-board members) have recently instituted classes for science teaching in the school-board schools. They employed a science teacher who has passed this examination of the South Kensington department, and then they put this night school of the board under the control of the South Kensington department, and in that way a certain number of boys who have left school probably at twelve or thirteen years of age have the advantage of continuing any subject afterward that will fit them better for their employment.

ENGLISH "SCHOOL-BORAD SCHOOLS."

Q. Will you please explain a little what in your national system of education you mean by the "school-board schools"?—A. Our school-board schools are your public schools.

The CHAIRMAN. I had supposed them to be so.

The WITNESS. The only difference is, unhappily for us, that ours are not free, while yours are free. Yours are also much more extensive; you
have enjoyed for twenty-five or thirty years this excellent system of free national education, and you have therefore better buildings, a larger stock of teachers, and all the facilities for popular education in this country better than with us.

Q. You say your system is not free; what are the fees, or what is the pecuniary cost to the student in your school-board schools?—A. They vary from 2 pence to 6 pence per week.

Q. They are as low as that?—A. Yes. In the better schools the price goes up to 6 pence, and in the general schools 2 pence to 3 pence per week; 2 pence for infants, or those under seven, and 3 pence for those over seven and up to thirteen. Then we have a few graded schools at the present time; we are building and extending them; but it is slow work. In the graded school we charge 6 pence, because there we teach science.

ATTENDANCE AT ENGLISH SCHOOLS.

Q. How extensively have they come to be attended by the children of the kingdom?—A. With us the attendance is excellent; on the whole better than it has been, in proportion to the number of children in the community. We have compulsory attendance, and a very well applied law.

Q. Do you have on your list the names of all the children of the country between specified ages?—A. In some towns there has been a house-to-house canvass in order to establish the validity or otherwise of the standard fixed by Government, which was simply an assumption, namely, that one-sixth of the population of the whole country composed that class called “children of school age,” and the school age with us is from five to thirteen. The house-to-house canvass established by school boards in various districts has proved that that is a fair assumption, and now we take that as the school population.

Q. This fee, paid by the scholar in each case, is not sufficient to provide the entire expense of maintaining the school?—A. No.

ENGLISH SCHOOLS AIDED BY GOVERNMENTAL GRANTS.

Q. What relation has the Government to the school?—A. The Government gives a grant according to results. Our education grant means every year some two or three million pounds sterling, and the amount will increase, of course, as our schools increase. That grant is accorded first of all according to attendance. The first condition of a Government grant is that the school shall have a certain standard of average attendance fixed by Government, which was simply an assumption, namely, that one-sixth of the population of the whole country composed that class called “children of school age,” and the school age with us is from five to thirteen. The house-to-house canvass established by school boards in various districts has proved that that is a fair assumption, and now we take that as the school population.

Q. What becomes of the fee paid by the scholar?—A. It helps to support the school.

Q. The fund thus accruing is paid to the school board, is it? or does it go to the teacher directly?—A. All the teachers in the school-board schools are paid by the board, and the amount received in school pence is taken in by the treasury of the school.

Q. It goes so far?—A. Yes; it goes so far, and any deficit beyond what Government and the children’s pence will amount to, is made up by the towns.
Q. What means are there for raising that money—can it be raised by taxation?—A. Yes; it comes out of what we call the "poor rates." Our rates are not divided like yours. It sometimes comes out of a borough rate, or city rate.

Q. But, by the general law of the country, this item is made payable from the borough or city rates?

GOVERNMENT LOANS FOR BUILDING SCHOOLS.

A. Yes; and not only that, but the cities have to build the schools. There is no grant of Government money for the building of schools. There is only a loan from the Government. The Treasury finds loans for us, if we prove, through the education department, that certain schools are required according to the school population of our various cities, the "public loans department" will lend certain sums of money, and on that the interest has to be paid, and the principal is spread over thirty or forty years. Posterity really is paying the expense of the schools.

Q. Posterity is to enjoy the benefit of them?—A. We are preparing for posterity, yes.

Q. Will you give us any further suggestion in relation to technical or training schools that occur to you?

CRITICISMS ON THE AMERICAN SCHOOL SYSTEM.

A. In my travels through your country in pursuit of my inquiries I have visited about twenty-two cities, and studied at each for a while, making inquiries. I suppose I have visited over one hundred institutions of various kinds, particularly schools and colleges, and I think I have a pretty fair notion of what you are doing in the direction of education, both generally and specifically. My opinion is, in regard to the question raised by your inquiry, that you would have an immense effect upon the condition of the working classes here if you would alter the methods of teaching in your primary and grammar schools, and very much also in the high schools. I think the whole tendency of your teaching is the imparting of temporary information to the children.

NEGLECT OF PRACTICAL EDUCATION IN AMERICAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

After having given reading, writing, arithmetic, and those rudiments of education, which you give thoroughly and intelligently—you seem in that respect to ground the children thoroughly well in the rudiments of education—you then seem to pile upon them a lot of studies which do not enter into their lives afterward, when they come to work, and you utterly ignore in all your public schools that element of industrial training which seems to me so necessary for every people, particularly a people like the Americans, so mechanical and industrial in their occupations. I find that only about 10 per cent. of your school population actually passes into the high schools; that practically at fifteen years of age the contents of your primary and grammar schools pass away into the various industrial occupations of the country.

TOO MUCH SCHOOL TIME DEVOTED TO REFINEMENTS OF GRAMMAR AND LITERATURE.

And, looking at the course of education of the grammar school, the graduates of that school everywhere appear to me to have spent a great
deal of time on the refinements of grammar and of literature, education of very little consequence to them when they pass into their life-employments, and during that time they have no opportunity of acquiring knowledge of the natural laws or elements of science, chemistry, natural philosophy, or the various sciences that underlie all the industries that abound in the country, and into one or other of which these children are passing. That is all a dark and unknown land to them, and I think it is a misfortune to the working classes of this country that their education runs so much to the side of literature, and not to the industrial and scientific side.

ATTRACTIVENESS OF PRACTICAL EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN.

To illustrate how readily children can acquire such information, we have adopted in England, in our new “board” schools, quite a different system. If you examine a boy of twelve to fourteen years of age, in our good, new “board” schools throughout any of our large cities, you will find that he will, at that age, know as much about the elements of science, natural philosophy, simple mathematics, mechanical drawing, chemistry, electricity, magnetism, and all these general elements of science, as many of your boys and girls do in the high schools when they are sixteen and seventeen years of age. That is not owing to the fact that our boys and girls are any smarter or more intelligent than yours, but is owing entirely to the system of education adopted. We are endeavoring to bring this national system of education in our country to a point where it will be of use to the working classes chiefly, and we endeavor to teach them those subjects that will have a direct bearing on their future employments. Without teaching them a trade or any particular handicraft, all the tendency of the teaching is to make them either commercially a success or industrially a success, in the way of having some scientific knowledge which they can utilize as they pass into their various occupations.

REFORM NEEDED IN THE CURRICULUM OF GRAMMAR SCHOOLS.

I find in this country what I should call a lamentable want in that respect. I think it only requires that your public men, your educators, should take this into immediate consideration, in order at once to alter the curriculum of the grammar schools, so that a large portion of the time should be devoted to these more important subjects, and less given to the facts of ancient history or remote matters which the children will never think of, probably, when they once pass out of the school into the ordinary occupation of life. I say your grammar school because your grammar school is about the only class of school we have got in our country. We have not got the high school.

Q. You have the elementary school?—A. Yes, we have two grades, though we hope to have three eventually. Our present grades correspond to your primary school and grammar school. Our graded school, as we call it, will probably take the place of your high school at present; but examples of those are very few and far between; we have not had the time or the money to establish them; we have only been working under the act for ten years.

CARPENTRY OR JOINERY CLASSES IN ENGLISH SCHOOLS.

Under the ordinary school arrangements we are now trying to introduce industrial occupations generally, and we have, thus far, tried it to
the extent of joinery or carpentry classes. We have, in several of the Manchester schools, put up sheds for carpentry classes, fitted up with benches, &c., and turned every boy in the school, notens volens, who is as old as ten years of age, into the carpentry class for three hours every week, dividing the time into three lessons per week. There all the various timbers from all parts of the world are collected, and a little lecture is given to the boys as to the character of the woods, and what they are good for. Then each boy must take his tools and cut off from a log a certain piece of timber, under the instruction of the foreman of the department. So each boy goes through the different lines of work in the department, always under instructions. This has had a wonderful effect on the pupils, and has really smartened them up intellectually, so that the three hours lost from the other departments of the school are not, in fact, lost, as the boys keep well abreast with the others in the other studies.

Q. They keep abreast in the same studies that they formerly pursued!—A. They do not learn really any less than they did, but the studies have been adjusted; they would probably be a little bit less on some matters.

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION BRIGHTENS THE UNDERSTANDING.

Q. You find this industrial education quite as beneficial to the intellect as the pursuit of the studies in the literary department?—A. Yes; it would almost seem to have revealed to us already that the proper method of training the intellect is to join industrial work with the teachings of the school. We find these boys are more capable of understanding the oral teaching, and they understand better what they read. Their minds are made more receptive and reflective by the fact that they have depended more upon themselves, and put into operation the knowledge that they have before acquired in the schools.

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION IN FRANCE.

That experiment has been tried, as you are probably aware, very extensively in France since the Republic was established there, and with very remarkable results. On seeing, in some cases, the benefits to be derived from that plan, we have made some experiments in England, and we think they are so satisfactory that we shall endeavor to bring to adoption in all our public schools some plan of industrial or mechanical training to go side by side with the intellectual courses.

Q. Have you had observation of your own in France?—A. Yes; I have traveled a good deal in France, Germany, Switzerland, Russia, and all over the continent of Europe, and observed what was going on there.

Q. Will you be kind enough to give us the results of your observation, if you please? We shall not often have opportunity to get it from so authoritative a source.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON INDUSTRIAL AND MECHANICAL EDUCATION IN EUROPE.

A. Well, I hardly think it would be quite pertinent to the question we are discussing. All I need to say is that I think the opportunities in France, Switzerland, and Germany, for technical training have of late years become quite extensive. In all large cities the training is very thorough. If they err at all there, it is, I think, that they theorize
too much, and cause their students to imagine, in passing through their
technical schools, that they have already acquired all the knowledge
necessary to make them engineers, chemists, miners, &c., and that the
actual practical work in shops, mines, and laboratories is not necessary.
That is the evil that is encountered by their methods of teaching, and
is one that I think neither the Americans nor the English are likely to
see in their own systems when they adopt anything of the kind.

AMERICAN TECHNICAL SCHOOLS UNEXCELLED, BUT NOT AVAILABLE
TO THE POOR.

As you know, your country does possess, already, a considerable num-
ber of very remarkable technical schools, which certainly are not sur-
passed by any school in Europe. They are schools, however, that are
not available for the working classes, as are those of France, Germany, and
Switzerland, and what little we have done in England. They belong
to a higher rank in society, and therefore you have not felt them in your
ordinary life. But for the training of skillful managers, foremen, and
even proprietors of large industries, about a dozen of the schools and
colleges of this country are not surpassed by anything we have in Europe.
I need only refer to the Technological Institute of Boston, for example.
That form of school is a purely technical school, and in the branches
which they adopt for their course of teaching they have a practical
method of carrying out all the occupations, industrial and practical, in
a simple form before the students, which I think is much more to the
purpose than anything that is done in Europe. The American mind is
essentially more practical than the German and the French, and in these
schools we see the effect of the difference. They keep their eyes fixed
upon one thing—that these young men are to become masters or cap-
tains of industry, and therefore all the teaching has a strong, practical
bias. The State universities in this country—those coming under the
Government grant—would of course become excellent sources for tech-
nical and industrial training, which might be utilized largely without
costing much money, either to the State or to the community.

WIDESPREAD OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA FOR TECHNICAL AND SCI-
ENTIFIC EDUCATION.

You seem to me to have a widespread, almost universal, opportunity
for all the people here to get a technical and scientific education. All
that you want is a shuffling of the cards to alter the curriculum of the
various institutions. There is more spent in this country than in any
country in the world; both, I think, by private beneficient individuals,
who have left money for certain colleges and universities, and, of course,
by the generosity of your towns and cities in the public school system;
that is a fact of world-wide notoriety. I do not think the working
classes here have anything at all to complain of in regard to education,
excepting that it does not have a strong enough and close enough rela-
tion to the industries which the working classes pursue.

SLIGHT CHANGES NEEDED TO PERFECT AMERICAN PUBLIC SCHOOL
SYSTEM.

When you turn out nine-tenths of all the boys and girls in this country
at the grammar-school age—fourteen or fifteen—you can see how im-
portant it is that at that age they should not have been carried through
that precise course of study which those may reasonably pass through who intend to pursue education up to the age of eighteen in the high school. I suppose it would be a very simple matter to make such regulations, in relation to primary and industrial schools for those children whose parents intend they shall leave at fourteen or fifteen years of age, and not pursue the studies of the high school; that in those cases such a change should be made in the curriculum of all the schools that the occupations or form of teaching should be of a more industrial nature, and give them that information which will enable them to pursue their occupations more intelligently. That, I think, is a thing that the working classes have a right to claim here—a revision of the course of instructions in the public schools.

WHY MANUAL LABOR IS UNINTERESTING.

One thing I have heard remarked by many Americans, and observed myself as I have gone through the country, that boys and girls just developing at that early age for entering into occupations involving manual labor, rather seek what we call in England polite employments—to be clerks, or to be in stores, or some work that does not involve ordinary manual labor. Frequently there is a considerable difficulty in some of the mills and manufactories, in keeping there those who may have commenced to learn a trade or occupation, because they find manual labor uninteresting, as they are sure to find it when they have no knowledge whatever of the meaning of all this labor, or of the scientific truths underlying it all; their respective powers are not interested; hence the manual labor becomes a drudgery, and they soon leave those industries, if they have opportunity. Most of your employers say they cannot keep the American youths at this work. They do not like manual labor.

NECESSITY FOR EXALTING MANUAL LABOR.

We want to elevate and exalt the idea of manual labor in England. We do not want our public school system to give the children of the working people the idea that labor is low, uninteresting, and vulgar. We want to avoid that by giving them opportunity to take interest in the great sciences that underlie all our industries, and so imbue them, through that instruction, with an intelligence that will give them an enjoyment of life unknown to their fathers. That character of instruction it is not possible to get at such schools as I have described.

Q. We should like if you would give us some idea of the actual condition of the working people of England, as there is a strong interest felt throughout our own country in the relative conditions of the working forces in the two countries, and I should like, in that connection, to call your attention to the trades unions as they exist in England as a factor in your industrial forces.

TRADES UNIONS IN ENGLAND.

A. Well, I am happy to say that trades unions with us have become part and parcel of our life. We have accepted them now as one of the proper societies for the working classes to form, and conducted as they are by able and, I think, in the main, conscientious and respectable men, we have joined with them rather than separated from them. Employers of labor generally have lost that violent antagonism which, you know,
existing at one time; the trades unions have moderated many of their demands, and whatever demands they now make they, at any rate, make in more moderate language and in more polite ways. The capitalists and laboring population have both learned by experience, and, I think I may say, have come to see that none of the interests of capital or labor can be served when there is an antagonism between them. On the other hand I think the labor classes see that capital has certain difficulties and trials and experiences of which laborers know nothing, and by frequently comparing ideas, as we do under the arbitration courts that are sometimes established between masters and workmen, a great deal of information is passed from one side to the other.

STRIKES IN ENGLAND.

The consequence is that our strikes now, though they may be long, are not violent though they may be stubborn on the part of the men, who will not see that trade is in such a state that higher wages cannot be granted, or, on the other hand, on the part of the masters, who have their own stubbornness sometimes, and try to withhold from the laboring classes the amount of wages they ought to give them when trade has improved; these two positions, while they will always, of course, to some extent, exist (for there will always become obstinacy on both sides), yet, as a rule, violence and passion have departed from those disputes and all questions settled with good feeling.

ALL TRADES ASIDE FROM TEXTILE INDUSTRIES FREE FROM STRIKES IN ENGLAND.

In all trades aside from the textile industries of our country we have for many years been, for the most part, entirely free from strikes. In all engineering difficulties disputes have been settled freely and without any ill feeling. The engineer class with us are the most intelligent, and therefore the most reasonable.

Q. What do you include under the term engineering, aside from your factory work?—A. The engineer trades with us would include pattern makers, molders, smiths, fitters, turners, and directors of machinery—everything connected with machinery we call engineer trades.

Q. How about builders?—A. They have their own trades unions, separate from the engineer trades.

Q. Do strikes continue to be a feature of working life in those trades?—A. Not in the engineer trades. Since 1851 there has been no strike.

Q. I mean in the building trades.

ARBITRATION IN ENGLAND.

A. They have a strike occasionally; but, compared with the number of differences that they settle by arbitration and conference, the strikes are not of much importance. They have had long-continued disputes from time to time, but, as I have said, there is no violence connected with them. After a certain amount of suffering on the part of the men (for, unhappily, it generally terminates that way with us), the difficulties are settled and they go to work. I think we have bridged over many difficulties by this simple remedy of arbitration. We have lessened the hours of labor, and have brought nine hours a day to be the standard instead of ten hours a day.
Employers generally have endeavored to show a sympathy with the social life of all our working people by establishing provident dispensaries for their succor or assistance when either injured in their work or stricken down by disease. We have nurseries—institutions carried on under the superintendence of our wives, who go down into the lowest parts to find and aid distress. This is common to every manufacturing town in the country.

Q. You mean the wives of the manufacturers, merchants, and employers generally?—A. Yes. They have found that the lives of the people, after their hours of work are over, are matters of their highest regard—for the sake of their own interests. Hence various institutions have been established by public subscription, and are managed by the manufacturing class for the benefit of the laborers.

Q. You say “for the sake of their own interests.” I would like to inquire whether you find that they secure any happiness themselves in doing it?

The WITNESS. You mean the manufacturers?

COMMERCIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE HUMANITARIAN POLICY.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and their wives.

The WITNESS. You may readily understand that any virtuous and good act brings its own reward. That is an axiom that we have all accepted. But when I spoke of their interests I meant that from quite a material point of view, leaving out the philanthropic motives and the higher relations of men, and speaking of it merely as a matter of business; wherever the employers of labor have manifested this interest they have found it to be of advantage in a business point of view. Whatever difficulties might arise between them and their employés in consequence of wages have been more readily adjusted, and, at any rate, the motives of the manufacturers are not misunderstood. The men only require to be convinced of the exigencies of the trade, and to see that the thing which is stated to them is really true, to induce them to yield. This sympathy, this endeavor to elevate and improve the working classes all round, sometimes by individual manufacturers, at other times by manufacturers combining together to make a district the center of some means of reaching and improving the working classes, is having the most excellent effect.

COFFEE-HOUSES, PUBLIC PARKS, MUSICAL ENTERTAINMENTS FOR WORKINGMEN.

For example, the establishment of coffee-houses all over our cities, to form a sort of antidote to the public house, to give workingmen a nice room in which they can meet their fellows, and sit in comfortable chairs and have a smoke and a talk together, and an opportunity to take this harmless beverage, and creature comforts of that sort, to the exclusion of spirituous liquors—all that has had a great effect. The public parks have also helped; the musical entertainments in the open air during the summer time—many of them encouraged by our corporations and supported largely by the employers—all that work is well-directed outlay for the enjoyment of the people.
HAPPY EFFECTS OF REDUCTION OF WORKING HOURS IN ENGLAND.

The reduction of the hours of labor from sixty hours a week to fifty-four has allowed all the working people to have a holiday, leaving their work on Saturdays at 12 o'clock. It gives them an opportunity to make their purchases in the day-time, and to take their children out into the parks and enjoy the fresh air. The working hours are such that the workingman has practically got daylight all through the year for his work; and then during the summer months, of course, there are long evenings of daylight, and the half hour less labor at each end of the day gives the workingman an opportunity to wash, and covers the time when he would be going home, and is a great consideration to him. In consideration of this extra time allowed for recreation, we find that men are attending reading-rooms more than they did.

LIBRARIES AND READING-ROOMS FOR WORKINGMEN.

We have free libraries and reading-rooms established in each ward or district of our towns. If the ward is very large we divide it into districts, and establish a reading-room which does not cost much money, (three or four thousand pounds), and there we keep the papers of the day, and scientific and literary periodicals, and some standard books, and we find that the working people are appreciating these advantages just in proportion as they get more time to devote to them. They have more leisure now, and many take advantage of their time to pursue some studies.

EVENING SCIENCE SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND.

And because of this we think our evening science schools, which we are endeavoring to improve, will be better attended, and we shall therefore get some science and art teaching into the adult working classes who have already begun their life-labor, who have almost always the desire to become better informed, and will in this way be able to satisfy that desire.

AMERICAN INTENSITY OF LABOR MAKES NINE HOURS A SUFFICIENT DAY'S WORK.

If you will allow me to, I should like to make another remark, as a result of my observation in America. I do not wish to say anything to intensify differences of opinion, but having said it to several employers of labor it may not be inappropriate to say it here. I believe that all American working people have greater activity, greater nervous energy than our people have, and I believe they do more work, and can do more work from that spirit of intense desire which they have to accomplish something, to accomplish more, even, day by day, than they have done before. This is in the spirit of your people. They work harder while at work, and I therefore say that nine hours of labor here, with the intensity of diligence which your people display, would, I think, count for more than ten hours of our people's work.

Q. And yet you think that nine is better for your people!—A. We think nine is enough for our people. I will give you my experience.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

OPERATION OF THE NINE-HOUR RULE IN ENGLAND.

When we had the ten-hour system our people came to me and said they were quite sure they would do as much work if they had nine hours, and we would not lose by it, as, in the summer time especially, they would not be so much wearied by their work, and would come fresher to their work in the morning. Looking at it from the humanitarian view, I thought they were right, and without any ado we at once gave them nine hours.

Q. How many people were you employing?—A. We were employing then about seven hundred or eight hundred men. We have increased the number, however, since then. I have discovered since that period that we have had less trouble in managing the men; less vigilance is necessary on the part of foremen and managers than before that period. We have kept the wages the same, and I believe the productive power of our work is now greater with the same number of men than it was with the ten hours.

CONTRAST OF THE ENGLISH NINE-HOUR RULE WITH AN AMERICAN EIGHT.

Q. You have alluded to a more intense capacity to work on the part of the American industrial classes than you think is possessed by your own. If you found a reduction of the hours of labor to nine attended with greater production from your laborers, would there be some reason to hope that the adoption of an eight-hour system, for which our working people almost universally ask, would result in a similar advantage?—A. I think the reduction to an eight-hour system would not compare with your ten-hour system to-day.

Q. Do you think it would compare favorably with the English labor of nine hours?—A. Yes; I should think that, all things being equal, if the eight hours would enable the managers and foremen to regulate their work so that it may be brought to the working people to perform—if all the operations connected with the machinery could be attended to as well with eight hours' employment—if they would all work for the eight hours as intensely as they seem to work now under the ten hours, I should think eight hours' work would be equivalent to our nine hours at the present time. We should not in England want to have an eight-hour system to-day. We think that nine hours gives them a reasonable day's work; it assures them a half-holiday on Saturday, and is, apparently, from their experience and ours too, a dividing line between excessive work and moderate work; but eight hours I should consider likely largely to reduce your production throughout the country.

Q. Undoubtedly it would, somewhat, but my question was to the point whether the eight hours' production by the American laborer would be probably equivalent to the nine hours' production by the English laborer?—A. I should think so, judging by the intensity that I see them put into their work here.

Q. You have had some opportunity, I suppose, of becoming acquainted with the wages generally paid here to the working people. I would like to know, taking into account the greater productiveness of the American people compared with your own, growing out of the cause you have stated, whether you think there is much difference; and, if so, which way it is, relatively, in the reward, or the purchasing power of the reward which labor gets here, as compared with that which it gets in England.
BETTER WAGES AND CONDITIONS OF LABOR IN AMERICA THAN ENGLAND.

A. Undoubtedly the condition of the working classes in this country is superior to ours, all round. The very fact that you have food just as cheap as we have it—in some places they say it is cheaper, but at any rate it is just as cheap as our working people enjoy; that you pay wages varying from one-half as much again to double as much again for similar employment; that you have, or have had, hitherto, as I think, more constant employment than our people have, and therefore the aggregate earnings in the whole year are greater than they are with our people—all these indicate that there is more purchasing power in the hands of the American workingman than an English workingman enjoys.

AMERICAN HOUSE-RENTS INCOMPREHENSIVELY HIGH.

The one subject which strikes me as being very difficult to comprehend, and most oppressive, I think, upon your working people, is the enormous amounts they pay for house-rent. I do not think I overstate the case when I say that rents are double, all through this country, for the same degree of comfort, that they are in England. That is so even in Pullman City, which is a model city. It has always struck me as being a very remarkable and almost unnatural condition of things that in a country where there is so much land, and where the resources of the people are so much greater, and material therefore ought to be so cheap, the habitations of your working people cost so much. It is certainly an indisputable fact that rents are double here what they are in England.

The CHAIRMAN. Our people think that the labor entering into the construction of houses costs them more. However, I should not like to lead you away from your thought. There is the fact that rents are higher.

The WITNESS. Yes. In other respects I think the opportunities for workingmen to become happy and prosperous in this country are immensely more numerous than in any other country in the world.

SURPLUS LABOR IN AMERICA.

When men complain in the New England States that there is too little work, I believe that if they were made of the same stuff as their forefathers were, they would be in the fields which have been so munificently provided by nature. I think the mistake of the working classes here is that they cling to the industries in which so much skill is required.

The CHAIRMAN. These men you find glutting the market here are not descended from the “forefathers” you speak of, but come almost immediately from the labor markets of Europe, and so keep our labor market more than full. That is the real difficulty, I think, in the way of surplus labor here, and it is almost impossible to effect a removal as fast as the new supply arrives.

The WITNESS. May I ask if the complaint that is made as to labor is the complaint of the particular class coming here as immigrants or of those whose parents have been here for two or three generations?

The CHAIRMAN. It is most largely from those who have more recently come. Of the witnesses who have been examined before us, in New
York, for instance, the majority were either of foreign birth or were the children of foreign parents, but born on our soil. It was very seldom that we had one of what would be called American descent before the committee. But I do not mean by that to make any objection, however indirect, to the immigrants coming here, but naturally the immigrant arriving in this country stops somewhere in the East; very often, being an operative himself, he stays here permanently perhaps, because there are generally more factories on the Atlantic coast, and of course it is harder for him to reach land where he could get it cheap. We had an operative here last night from Fall River, who described his condition there, and said it was like that of a thousand other persons in Fall River. Mr. Howard, who has just been testifying, brought that witness here and vouched for his reliability. The tale was one which I should be glad to believe was exceptional in any country whatever, and yet he said he was here as the representative of at least a thousand men. These hardships, I think, come to our workingmen very largely from the competition of the laborers who are constantly seeking this country with those who have been here a little longer. We have our protective system for goods, but that does not protect in any corresponding degree the working people from the competition of the living machine.

UNNATURAL STIMULATION BY PROTECTION.

The Witness. I think if you did you would bring upon those enjoying any of the fruits of that system a Nemesis as great as the one from which your manufacturers are now suffering. One of the difficulties arising here, out of your development, is, that you have artificially developed your industries; you are going at a rate that is not natural; you are forcing all around. On this very question of manufacture in the New England States, the system you have adopted of protecting your textile industries, has, of course, enabled manufacturers to get very large profits in a short time, and has attracted employers to invest and it has at last developed a competition here greater than we have at home with all the world to compete with. We are right down on the ground. We are thrown on the fact that we must produce a more artistic article in order to make ourselves felt in the future in the markets of the world. That is the only outlet for us, but it is a natural and desirable one.

In America, as testified, I think, by one of the witnesses this morning, you have continued to make, rapidly, a material which is not of a very high class, or of the highest class; you have sacrificed everything to quantity, in order to make profits. All this vast capital from all parts of the country put into these textile fabrics enters into competition; at the same time the wages remain what they were when you first established these industries—

Q. (Interposing.) Or they have increased.

The Witness. When you have been doing a “roaring” trade. The manufacturers feel now that their capital is engaged collectively in a vast industry, very creditably conducted, very well managed, and with the strictest economy, I think, regarding all labor-saving contrivances, but with an equally palpable waste with regard to raw material.

PRODIGAL WASTE OF RAW MATERIAL IN AMERICA.

In this country waste of raw materials is the normal condition of things. You waste your forests, your metals, your food, and your drink. There is so much waste here that it is not noticed.
INTELLIGENCE WITH WHICH AMERICAN MANUFACTURES ARE CONDUCTED.

But in regard to manufacturing industries as a whole, they are conducted here with an intelligence and success that I think equals anything in any part of the world; but they have been built up on this artificial system. This simple kind of work, for example, of making printed cloths, calico prints, and such simple industries, has been done under a protective system which has brought vast capital into the work; this capital must make some kind of return, and the general competition has, therefore, become intense. Then, when manufacturers say, "We are not making high profits; we can prove to you that we are not," the working people, accustomed to a certain amount of wages, complain that they must not take less, and here is a difficulty that can only be solved probably by much bitter experience on both sides. It is an artificial state of things, and can only be solved by natural law.

GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE WITH INDUSTRY UNNATURAL, EXCEPT AS TO HOURS OF LABOR, SANITARY REGULATIONS, AND WORK OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

I do not think it is possible to found any solid, reasonable argument in favor of any Government interference whatever in this country in regard to your working population other than that which we have in England; that is, the preservation of life, sanitary regulations of the manufactories, the regulation of the hours of labor, and the labor of women and children.

Q. You class that as a real sanitary regulation?—A. Yes; it is all sanitary. The general encouragement given by Government to all voluntary efforts to help the working classes is the most important thing; that is the secret of our success in England. We have an almost universally contented class—contented, I mean, with the form of Government and the industrial conditions. Government has simply aided other enterprises by establishing museums and institutions that shall directly or indirectly benefit the working classes. This voluntary effort has invoked the kindliest sympathy in every community, and that has brought the employers and their laborers together, so that now whether in our politics or social affairs we meet really on a ground common to both.

INTERCOURSE BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYÉS IN ENGLAND.

Q. What is the intercourse between the employers of labor in your country and the working people?—A. In the first place all the institutions for the aid of the working people are kept up by the employers—all our hospitals and dispensaries—to give cheap medical advice, and cheap surgical aid, and relief in time of need. We have workingmen's clubs established by philanthropic people; we have coffee houses where the workingmen can come and read. Into these members of the committee come from time to time, and take an interest in the young people. In the political clubs we have various means of bringing all the classes into sympathy. The political clubs are little places provided for meetings, and generally the leading men there are the leading employers.

Q. Like a political club with us?—A. Well, ours are for the advancement of either liberal or conservative interests. They do a great deal of good. They enable us to bring the classes together, and altogether
our life in England is tending in that direction—the attention of the employers of industrial labor has been directed to it, and they are mingling in a variety of ways with the social condition of the working people—down to the very bottom.

DEMOCRACY IN ENGLAND.

Q. You are rapidly approaching the condition of a democracy.—A. We are a democracy, we think, in many respects, now, more than you are; we are trying to solve some of those more difficult problems that are related to political economy, and related to a fair day’s work for a fair day’s wage, by showing some sympathy and attention to the working people. Of course this is done more in some places than in others, but we are all tending in that direction.

CONDITION OF AGRICULTURAL LABORERS IN ENGLAND.

Q. How is it about the agricultural laborer?—A. Undoubtedly he has not been touched yet by those influences. He is not yet under the influence of our public spirited men. He still lives under the patronage of the country parson, and in the employment, of course, of the country squire. The school boards are gradually permeating our country districts, and until we get extended franchise among the farm laborers we probably shall not have a great deal done for the agricultural laborer. All that can be said of him is that in twenty-five years his wages have increased from a starvation point to the possibility of just living.

Q. How numerous is that portion of your working people, relatively?—A. I do not know exactly the figures.

Q. Perhaps one-half?—A. Oh, I should think not more than one-third.

PROGRESS OF WORKING PEOPLE EVERYWHERE.

Q. Taking the working people—the common people—of this world, as you have observed them, using the word “world” in that restricted sense which implies some civilization—how are they getting on, better or worse?—A. They are improving all round, every way.

EFFECTS OF EMANCIPATION IN RUSSIA ON THE WORKING CLASS.

Q. You speak of Russia. How are they getting on there?—A. The working people of Russia are of course immensely improved—more than any people on the face of the earth—in consequence of emancipation. I was there before the emancipation of the serfs and saw how things were going on, and I have had opportunities of going there since. I have very interesting industrial arrangements in Russia, and know what has been the benefit of that wonderful thing, emancipation.

AMERICA THE LEAST GOVERNED COUNTRY IN THE WORLD.

The American workman (coming back to that question) should, I think, look more to his own self-help and the agencies in society which are gradually developing for his benefit in a variety of ways, rather than to any legislative action. I do not see how it is possible for the Government of this country to interfere any more than our Government has done. Happily in this country—I can see it as I go along—you are the least governed country in the world—and that is your great glory; you are the least controlled.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

PATERNAL GOVERNMENT NOT DESIRABLE.

I think the working classes would make a great mistake if they began to seek for paternal government in the Republic, if the paternal feature should involve helping them otherwise than as I have already indicated. If it came to be a question of granting them money every week I do not think in the long run they would benefit by it.

DUTY OF THE WEALTHY CLASSES TOWARD LABOR.

I think what you require here is a larger interest in the working classes by your wealthier people. You require more institutions for their intellectual enjoyment, for their entertainment and their recreation; you require less hours of labor certainly.

REDUCTION OF HOURS OF LABOR NECESSARY.

I think you ought to reduce your hours of labor to nine; it would be for the benefit of the whole country, employers and employees—so as to give a full, solid half holiday each week for the entire mass of the working people. They would enjoy family life more, and would have less temptation to indulge in vicious habits.

AMERICA'S NEED OF INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

Then, in your common-school system, by introducing industrial education side by side with intellectual education (and it would not hurt intellectual education, but would help it), you would have a larger number of people who would be willing to go out into the far West, and, meeting the forces of nature, subdue them in a territory that is apparently unlimited and as rich as it is boundless. All that spirit would be evoked by these simple changes, which would be very easy to make. It would only require probably the resolution to do it, and it would be done.

FAVORABLE SITUATION OF AMERICAN WORKINGMEN.

In all other respects the working classes of this country are infinitely better situated than any people abroad. They have in their form of government no hindrances of any kind, either from tradition or feudalism; they can acquire land easier—it is almost given away in many parts of this country. They have an equality among themselves and their foremen and managers that you do not see in any part of the world. I am particularly struck by the respect which the managers and foremen here seem to have for their workmen, the civility they show them; all of these are advantages to the workingmen, apart from their civil rights, which, of course, are universally admitted here; all these make up a social condition superior to anything we have in England. And if the working people were only by their habits to show that they were capable of taking the advantages offered them by nature and by your free institutions, they ought to be the happiest and most prosperous people in the world. Government need do nothing more for them, I think, but society requires to do a great deal more for them.

Q. Does any other observation occur to you?—A. Well, no; but I am afraid I have given you a rather rambling statement.

Mr. Pugh. You have made a very remarkable contribution, sir, to our fund of information. I do not know of anything now about which,
for my part, I should desire to inquire further. You have covered the ground remarkably well.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have done more for our country than if you had sent over your navy here, and we had sunk it.

ENGLISH PRIDE IN AMERICAN PROGRESS.

The WITNESS. I think England is growing year by year into a feeling of pride and satisfaction in regard to all your products. There is no jealousy of feeling. We like to emulate, and we like to hold our own, and we think we are superior yet in some respects; but we enjoy the observation of the superior excellence, originality, and general progress which is manifested throughout all those industries which are to a certain extent competing with our own. My only fear for them is this, that you are in such excellent form, you have learned your lesson so well, and the mechanical genius of your country is so great—it is a gift of nature, of Providence—that when you do strike down all your walls and barriers and flood the world with your products, the consequences may be rather difficult for us to face.

The CHAIRMAN. But there are about 1,500,000,000 of people in the world, and we can probably all get along by each man contributing what he can. I think the feeling now throughout the world is that England and the United States are one people. I think the differences between the people of the two countries are almost obsolete; and, as time passes, the two nations become more alike. I feel that the statement you have given us today, read as it will be universally throughout this country, will prove to be one of the most valuable contributions which the committee has received—valuable to us certainly, and possibly your observations in our country may be of some use to your own people. At least we hope so.

The WITNESS. Of that I have no doubt.

The CHAIRMAN. It will do our people good to see their faults as you have seen them, and I am sure they cannot be more complimented than you have complimented them.

FAILURE OF AMERICAN SOCIETY IN ITS DUTY TOWARD LABOR.

The WITNESS. I have heard a gentleman say here that corporations were not distinguished for their sympathy. That is true, and that is why I point out that society in America, in all the great centers of industry, has a duty laid upon it that I think it is not performing in the full sense of its responsibilities. In these great corporations the shares are held, I presume, by wealthy persons representing probably the culture of your cities, and probably occupying public positions. It would be a very simple matter for any of those corporations to appropriate, by their shareholders, from year to year, such amount of money as they might wish to appropriate for the benefit of the working people.

And if public opinion in this country were directed toward the amelioration of the condition of the working classes all around, it would not be an uncommon thing for certain sums of money, probably every year, to be given for their benefit. That is not uncommon with us. We are tending somewhat ourselves, you know, to turning all our concerns into joint stock companies; but I am very happy to be able to say that we often find that spirit of humanity among our corporations—not so much, perhaps, as with individuals—but there is coming, more and more, to be an acknowledgment of the fact that any employer of a
large class of people is bound to regard those people on the social side, as well as the industrial side.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that there is the great fault of this country; that whether among individuals or corporations the contest for the dollar itself has been so sharp that people have forgotten all about the humanity by which they have got it. The feeling that humanity has been disregarded is getting to be very strong among working people. It is getting to be felt more and more and must be heeded. If not heeded willingly, by the exercise of common sense, we shall find conditions arising that will compel attention to the circumstances of the working people.

I do not think, from what you state of the condition of the working people in England, that you would listen with any patience to some of the tales which we have heard, and yet they are very exceptional. The occasion for them ought not, however, to exist. They could exist only because those who have an abundance of means and are in close contact with the working people have forgotten that these workers, like themselves, are human beings. It is a shame that we have to listen to some of the tales which have been told us, and told us with truth. It is in the hands of those who have wealth, and I think that we must expect that the humanitarian element is likely to develop itself among that class of people. Indeed, it is already exhibiting itself. Many of our corporations, as well as individuals, are turning their attention to this side of the question, and industry is going to be more and more conducted upon humanitarian principles by the controllers of capital.

BOSTON, MASS., October 19, 1883.

CHARLES H. DALTON examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In Boston.

Q. What is your business?—A. Cotton manufacturing and calico printing; the management of cotton manufactures.

Q. For what companies, and where are they located?—A. I am treasurer of the American Manufacturing Company, of Lowell, and president of the Atlantic Cotton Mills at Lawrence and some other cotton mills in different parts of New England.

CONDITION OF COTTON MANUFACTURE IN AMERICA.

Q. What is the condition, at the present time, of the cotton manufacture in this country? I have reference to the amount of production and the market for the production.—A. The production I believe to be at its maximum. The market is in poorer condition than we have known it for several years. There is a large consumption, but at very low prices.

Q. Where do you find your market?—A. We market our goods in almost every State and Territory of the Union, but we consider the Mississippi Valley as the great consumer—the Western, Southwestern, and the Southern States. Our goods go to every part of the United States, however.

Q. Of course, the eastern market is also supplied?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you send any goods to other countries?—A. A very few—a very small percentage of the product.
NEED OF A FOREIGN MARKET.

Q. Do you consider it of much importance to the American manufacturers of cotton goods to be put in a condition to find an outlet into foreign countries for their manufactures?—A. Yes; I think that is highly important for the future.

Q. You have reflected upon most phases of the questions relating to the cotton and woollen manufactures. We should like to have your idea as to the conditions that ought to be brought about, and the way in which they could be brought about, if it occurs to you, in order that the foreign market may be secured for this surplus of American manufactures, so that the latent capacity to manufacture more may be exercised and employment given to our people.

ENGLAND'S METHODS OF MAINTAINING AND INCREASING HER MARKETS.

A. It is not a question that I have studied sufficiently in detail to give you any opinion that would be of value. I have supposed generally that any foreign distribution of American cotton fabrics would be of slow growth to be secured, and must accompany the general development of our foreign commerce. As we observe the success of England in distributing her goods, we find that the Government keeps a large army and a large navy, and in every possible way encourages communication between England and all parts of the civilized and semi-civilized world where she can introduce her manufactures. She is admirably represented by intelligent officials. If they are found to be competent, they are steadily advanced in dignity and importance, supplying information to manufacturers at home, which is disseminated throughout England, protecting her routes of communication abroad, and of course bringing back foreign products to England. That is an important element in distributing her own goods to these other countries. That has been done during the last 30 or 40 or 50 years, as you are aware, and has amazingly increased the commerce of England—unprecedentedly so in the history of the world. The English Government has always shown itself favorable to doing all it can possibly accomplish with its army and navy and diplomatic corps to extend its commerce. It seems to me that America must have communication with the world before she can expect to occupy her proper relations to the commerce of the world, or to establish very large commercial relations with foreign countries.

Q. If such means of communication existed, practically, under the patronage, control, and protection of our own Government, do you think you would be able to export to any considerable extent in your line of manufacture, all other conditions remaining the same?

ADVANTAGES OF ENGLAND OVER NEW ENGLAND IN MANUFACTURE—COAL.

A. No, sir. I think the other conditions would gradually modify themselves to meet the competition of the British manufacturer. He has certain physical advantages over the American manufacturer, at least in this part of the country. I confine my remarks to cotton manufacturers. The great advantage that England possesses over New England in those particulars is in her cheap coal. Coal, of course, enters into every change of structure, and the higher the grade of manu-
facture the more heat and the more coal are required, and at every step England has her cheap coal, raised frequently, as I have seen it, within half a mile or a mile of her furnaces, the very furnaces that consume the coal. New England brings her coal through four or five or six hundred miles of distance.

CHEAP LABOR IN ENGLAND.

The other positive advantages that England possesses to-day over American manufacturers, in competing, is the lower price of her labor; but that is temporary. The price of labor may advance there or decrease here, or it may come to be equalized; but there are certain physical conditions that no legislation and no change in prices will overcome entirely.

As a manufacturer and person interested, who has been engaged in devoting his life to developing American manufactures, I would say that for a great many years the whole idea was to secure the trade of America. Even that has not entirely been secured. There are some classes of cotton manufacture that are still supplied from abroad—of the higher grades—where the raw material, so-called, is a very small element in the value, and where the value is chiefly labor, such as very fine spinning of laces and the very finest kinds of cotton goods. They are still imported, so that we have not absolutely secured our own country for our own manufactures.

ENGLISH SHIPPING AN AID TO ENGLISH MANUFACTURES.

As to the methods which could be adopted for introducing our goods into foreign countries and contesting with the English and Germans in that respect, I must confess I have not given the subject much attention. But it is clear that England has great advantages in her communication with every part of the world where consumers could be found.

Q. You are connected with the working people generally in the cotton and in the woolen business. How do you find their condition as a rule; are there any grievances or hardships, or causes of general complaint, to your knowledge, among them; if so, what are they, and what suggestions can you make to the committee in connection with the labor question, properly so-called?

CONDITION OF OPERATIVES IN AMERICA.

Of course it is to the interest of the manufacturers to observe the condition of their operatives very closely, to see whether they are in a normal condition of health; whether they are contented to remain, instead of shifting from place to place; whether their general condition of morals is such as makes the property safe. In the field of my observation, I must say that I am not aware of any causes of dissatisfaction existing at present, and when cases have arisen of a difference of opinion between the employer and the employed, it has generally been upon local questions, not general questions—not such questions as even the legislature of a State could deal with wisely or effectually, but generally questions arising from differences of opinion of a local character that were easily overcome and adjusted.

DEPOSITS IN LOWELL SAVINGS BANKS EQUAL TO THE COMBINED CAPITAL OF ALL THE LOWELL COTTON MILLS.

The prosperity of the people at Lowell, for instance—taking that as a large typical town of New England, which has grown to be a great
manufacturing center entirely on account of its water-power—I would say as one item of the property accumulated there, that the deposits in the savings banks are equal to-day to the capital stock of all the cotton mills in Lowell.

Q. How largely are they owned by those who earn wages in those corporations?

PROPORTION OF OPERATIVES' DEPOSITS IN LOWELL SAVINGS BANKS.

A. That necessarily is, to a considerable degree, a matter of estimate; but the best estimates that I can get vary from 75 per cent. to 87½ per cent., as coming directly or indirectly from the pay-rolls of the corporations.

Q. Do you think it fair to suppose, when you take into account that the deposits are greater than the capital stock of the corporations, and the portion owned by operatives and earned in the mills is 75 or 80 per cent., that this portion owned by the operatives is probably equivalent to the capital stock of the corporation?—A. No, sir; I should think not.

Q. It would fall somewhat short?—A. Yes.

Q. But it would not be a great difference?—A. No, sir; it would not be a great difference. The coincidence of these two sums is a mere incident.

Q. It would be a curious incident, though, and seems probable, from your statement, that the operatives have the means, if they chose to so apply them, to buy out the corporations themselves.

STOCK IN LOWELL CORPORATIONS OWNED BY OPERATIVES.

A. Well, they do own more or less of the stock of the corporations, aside from their deposits in the banks; that is not the only property that they own. There is a vast amount of property that they own. For instance, one-fifth of the capital stock of the Merrimac Manufacturing Company, at the last time that I observed it, was owned in Lowell, and that has been bought from time to time. None of it was owned originally in Lowell.

Q. I understood you to say that some of it was owned by operatives in the mills?—A. Yes.

Q. They find the stock of the corporation a paying investment?

SAVINGS BANKS' LOANS TO MANUFACTURERS.

A. I should think it is generally the highly-paid operatives, such operatives as overseers and subordinate superintendents that would own it, so far as it may be owned among operatives, because the stock of the old companies was placed at $1,000 a share, and most of these stocks are $1,000, and it is rather a large sum for the common operative. Therefore they seek naturally the savings banks for deposit; but indirectly they are becoming interested in the corporations, because the corporations use and employ a great deal of this savings-bank money. It is a very favorite loan on the part of the savings bank to secure the paper of these corporations.

STRIKES.

Q. Have you had occasion to observe strikes and any of the causes of strikes in New England in thirty years?—A. I have been personally
concerned in only two or three strikes, I think, all of them arising from different causes—two of them at any rate. The first one that I recall was one that lasted two or three days only, and was entirely due to dissatisfaction of the operatives, arising from the removal of a superintend. It lasted less than forty-eight hours, I think. Another one was in the depressed period of 1857, when it was felt necessary to reduce the production of the mills, and all the operatives were required or requested—it was suggested—that they should work four days in a week. I think, or something of that kind, and one portion of the operatives belonging to the trades-unions, whose rules were very strict, struck, and refused to accede to the rules applied to the others of the operatives. Another strike was from some detail in the change of working hours, which was misunderstood, I think, as it turned out, by the operatives, and it lasted two or three days. In thirty years those have been the only strikes that I have had anything to do with.

Q. Strikes have not been frequent in New England?—A. No, sir; they are rare. It is hardly an element in considering the manufacturing interests of New England.

Q. Is there anything else that occurs to you to state?

STATE LEGISLATION REGARDING LABOR.

A. We are called upon frequently when appeals are before the legislature—when factory acts are being considered by the committees—to give evidence, and we find that the various interests—supposed or actual interests—of operatives are constantly being considered. Before these committees of the local legislature we find intelligent attention given to those questions, and committees are capable of securing every variety of information from every source, directly from the operatives and from the management, as well as from the public in general and from officials indirectly connected with manufacturing interests, such as the bank officers and that class of persons. The legislatures of the different New England States, however, arrive at different conclusions in regard to the same questions. Massachusetts is in advance in many points, especially in the hours of labor, which have been restricted here much more than they have in other States of New England. It has not seemed wise to the legislatures of other States to put the same restrictions on the hours of labor as Massachusetts has put.

INCONGRUITY OF NATIONAL LABOR LAWS.

It therefore occurs to me that any general law of the United States Government with regard to hours of labor and other things—sanitary matters, for instance—though they might work well for one or two States—as for a State like Massachusetts or New Hampshire, for example—might be very unfortunate for the interests of other States, such as California or Georgia. We have felt that there are not unfrequently bills proposed in our legislature ostensibly for the benefit of the laboring class—of the industrial class—that had better not be passed; that the relations between the industrial class and those whose duty it is to organize and look after the general scheme had better be as simple and elastic as possible. I had nothing in my mind to suggest that would be of any value to the committee in regard to any general laws as far as New England is concerned, and especially Massachusetts.
JAMES TARANT examined.

The Chairman. I understand you have something which you desire to state to the committee.

The Witness. I wanted to say that I was at the South lately, in North Carolina, for a few weeks, and a cotton manufacturer there told me that he worked children in his business twelve hours a day, and he worked himself I have forgotten how many hours; that he kept a store and paid his people in store goods. I asked him what if a person wanted to buy goods in some other store, and he said if he did he would be struck off the pay-rolls. He kept a mill in Deep River, Randolph County, North Carolina. That is the reason the South is competing with the mills here. They hire minors and pay their help out of store pay. He told me he made 20 per cent. interest on his money.

By Mr. Pugh:

Question. What is his name?—Answer. I can't give his name, but his mill is on Deep River, I think it is called. He kept a country store there, and he told me that.

By the Chairman:

Q. He is a manufacturer and also keeps a country store?—A. Yes.
Q. Cotton or woolen manufacture?—A. Cotton yarn.
Q. How many hands does he employ?—A. I judge about 70 or 100. That is what he told me; that is all I know about it. I only got it from his own words. I wasn't in his mill. Speaking about the Eastern mills, I say that down South they don't pay any money, probably.

Mr. Pugh. We will find that all out before we get through. We will not take hearsay testimony on it.

The Witness. That is what he told me.

Mr. Pugh. I know that is not true; that any man would not state what he stated to you if he were put on the stand. It is not the fact, and that will be shown by the proof taken by this committee.

BOSTON, MASS., October 19, 1883.

CHARLES J. CHANCE, JR., examined.

By the Chairman:

Q. What is your business?—A. I am a currier; have worked some at tanning, but am a journeyman currier.
Q. Who do you work for at present?—A. For Keubler, at North Cambridge.
Q. How many men work with you for him?—A. At present there are eight men in the shop.
Q. Is there much business done by curriers, or in the way of your trade there?—A. Yes. I have not been long in the shop.
Q. You have learned the trade, have you?—A. Yes; I served my time at it, and learned the trade thoroughly.
Q. And you work at it now for a living?—A. Yes, sir.

THE TANNERS' AND CURRIERS' UNION OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Q. Are you connected with any labor union?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. What is it?—A. The Tanners' and Curriers' Union of Massachusetts.
Q. How many members are there in that organization?—A. About 2,300; over 2,000 I would say. It is a new organization, not long in existence. It has been in existence only nine months.

Q. Have there been such organizations of your trade in other States, I suppose?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many of them are there—you are organized by States, I presume?—A. Well, that I don't know; I couldn't answer that question.

Q. How many lodges of curriers, or organizations corresponding to yours, are there in the country?—A. That I couldn't answer.

Q. About how many curriers are there in the country, do you think?—A. I suppose about 20,000 tanners and curriers.

Q. Your trade is that of tanner and currier?—A. The trade is tanners and curriers; yes, sir. In some places they have a combination and run tanning and currying both.

Q. Do you suppose one-half of the tanners and curriers of the country are included in organizations?—A. No, sir; not yet, through fear; there is one-half of them that are afraid to join any organization.

Q. Are nearly all of them that live in Massachusetts included in the Massachusetts organization?—A. No, sir.

Q. But there are about 2,300 you say?—A. About 2,000; it is something over 2,000; but say 2,000 for certain.

Q. Where are those 2,000, mainly?—A. Eleven branches of the union are situated in Boston, Roxbury, Charlestown, Somerville, Salem, Woburn, Stoneham, and Chelsea.

"BLACK-LISTED" FOR ORGANIZING A TRADE UNION.

Q. You have something to say to the committee; you may proceed to state it now.—A. Before I commence on anything for the committee I would state that I am in a position now, but having taken an active part in forming the curriers' union, I have been either black-listed or something of that sort, so that it was almost impossible for me to obtain work, until this last two weeks, when I managed to get into a place where they had either never heard my name or not known as much about the union matters as other shops had known. When I started in, in the union matter, I was fairly situated in my family and home. Since, of course, I have had to run, and have run, in debt for that reason. I have been known as a good workman, and never had any bother in that way. The matter to be brought before this committee I suppose—

Q. (Interposing.) Before you come to that, let us know more particularly about your connection with the union, and in what way it has resulted in your failure to get work; when did you commence these efforts, and what did you do by way of organization; where were you when you began?—A. Here in Boston.

Q. Well, what did you do?—A. I started in speaking for the men to join the organization.

Q. Speaking to them in public meetings?—A. Yes, some of them.

Q. And calling meetings yourself, with others, I suppose?—A. Yes, we called meetings.

Q. Where did you call your first meeting?—A. The first one that I called myself was in Charlestown.

Q. Where—in what building or hall?—A. Well, I couldn't tell you exactly the name of the hall.

Q. How many were present?—A. There were present 28.

Q. All of your trade?—A. All of my trade; yes.

Q. What did you do—what did you say to them?—A. I didn't say a 34—0 3—(5 LAW)
great deal. I gave them rules of organization of the union, as it was founded before I got into it, and encouraged them to join—to form a branch of the organization in Charlestown—which they did.

Q. What reason did you give them for forming such an organization?—A. The reason we gave was that we may possibly get the men all together; that they would come to a fair understanding between themselves, and that in time we may regulate the prices of wages more evenly than at the present time.

**ORGANIZATION AVOIDS STRIKES.**

Q. How could you do that?—A. We could do it, and have done it since the organization has been started; done it in several places by a unanimous movement of men, not in any hard manner, as by strikes or anything of that kind: there has been no severity used by any of them, but it was done in a legal manner, by the men waiting on the firm and coming to a settlement with them before there was any chance of strikes.

Q. Have there been any strikes?—A. There was one strike in Charlestown shortly after the organization was formed. The proprietors of the place, Hubbard, Buzzell & Blake made an attempt at reduction of wages and a demand for more work. The men refused to agree to it, and appointed a committee to wait upon them.

Q. They wanted the men to take less pay and do more work!—A. Yes. So the committee waited on one of the firm, and he gave them a very independent, "sassy" answer, and the consequence was that some of the men were discharged, and the rest, when they saw how matters were, left.

Q. How many men were there?—A. Eighty men went out at that time.

**LABOR LEADERS REFUSED EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF THEIR PROMINENCE.**

Q. You protested against either change—either more work or less pay?—A. Certainly. We didn't want to have any change, or to have the union brought in as the cause of it. We wanted to have the union first fairly started, and then to make any fair arrangement with them; but they undertook to break up the union on the start; that was their idea, and after they got beaten on that, they gave in to the strike, but since then they have discharged the eight men that waited on them as a committee.

Q. How long ago is that?—A. That is three months ago this month.

Q. Were you one of the committee?—A. I was. They have since discharged, as I say, those eight men that waited on them as a committee, and the member of the firm that I have spoken of promised faithfully that after things had been settled there would be no hard feelings between those men and him. But he has employed an incompetent foreman there, and the foreman is running the shop for himself—it looks so to the men, at any rate—either for himself, or on orders from the firm.

Q. You think, then, that the organization prevented the reduction of pay and the increase of work?—A. Yes, sir; instead of getting the reduction they received a half-dollar advance, and did less work.

Q. You attribute that to the organization, do you?—A. Well, not exactly to the organization, although part of the men were members of it.
It certainly had some effect on the firm, as the committee waited on
them and gave them the vote of the organization. Since that time, in
places where there was work to be got, I was refused the work myself,
for what reasons I don’t know. I had no hard words with any of the
firm or anybody else.

**WAGES OF CURRIERS.**

Q. Is there anything else you wish to say?—A. The men working in
these currier shops receive small wages, as a general thing, all through.
Q. What is the pay?—A. The average pay of a currier would be about
$6 per week.
Q. A dollar a day?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is that the pay of a first-class workman?—A. That is an average
of all the men.
Q. What are the extremes?—A. The extreme would be about $13.
Q. I mean what is the lowest sum received by them to-day, and what
is the highest?—A. The lowest is $4 a week and the highest $13 or $14.
Q. Are they paid weekly?—A. No, sir; not in all places; there are
a few of them that pay weekly. That is another thing that I wanted
to say.
Q. What pay did you receive when you were last working?—A.
When I was last working I received on an average about $12 a week.
Q. Are you an “agitator?”—A. No, sir; not to any extent; but I
have been encouraging unionism as much as possible.
The **CHAIRMAN.** We have heard something about “agitators.” You
do not look like a very dangerous man in the community.
The **WITNESS.** No, sir; I don’t think I am.
The **CHAIRMAN.** You seem to be a peaceable man, who would mind
his business and do his work; but you have delivered some addresses.
Do you think that was right?
The **WITNESS.** Yes, sir; I do. Resistance to oppression is an Ameri-
can right.
Q. You think it was right to call that meeting of 28 men over in
Charlestown and try to organize that society; do you think that was
consistent with your duty as an American citizen?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. You do not feel condemned for it at all?—A. I do not; no, sir. I
think, where you see your trade getting ruined, and getting underneath,
it is about time something should be done, and if one man don’t do it,
somebody will have to take hold and do it.
Q. What business have you to meddle with your trade?—A. Well, I
don’t know that I have any business to meddle with it any more than
the bosses have a right to meddle with us. When they come to cut us
down and demand of us work that we will not or cannot do, it is time
to do something.
Q. Do you really think so?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. You have got that idea in regard to your relations to society and
your rights as a man?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you still insist that you had a right to do it, and are not to
be condemned for doing it. Of what consequence is your trade to
you?—A. Of what consequence! I have to make a living by it.
Q. Do you think you have a right to make a living?—A. Well, ac-
cording to the ideas of some men, a workingman has no right to make
living.
Q. Then you were wrong in making that speech over in Charlestown,
were you not?—A. No, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. Well, society may be in more or less danger from "agitators" like you, but still we are going to give you a hearing. You may proceed to state whatever you wish the committee to hear.

The WITNESS. The principal thing you want to find out, I suppose, is the condition of the workingmen, and why they have those grievances to bring up?

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to hear what sort of speech you would make; so go on.

The WITNESS. Perhaps not so much as some of the political speakers when they start in.

The CHAIRMAN. But this is about your trade. That would not be a political speech, would it?

The WITNESS. Well, some of them would think so, perhaps.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, now, let us hear about your trade—what you wanted to say.

GRIEVANCES OF CURRIERS AND TANNERS.

The WITNESS. In the first place, the men working for low wages, as a general thing, are subject to hardships, in the winter especially; that is, the men on table-work, what they call "scouring." Most of them, as a general thing, are in poor condition. In winter, the ice is all over the floors, tables, and tools—for the want of keeping a little heat in the place. The men are consequently subject to severe colds, which they take. Then, the men working on the beams—"beamsters," they are called—are subject to diseases of the bowels.

Q. What produces them?—A. The works and the cold.
Q. Could the works be changed or improved in this respect?—A. All tanners' and curriers' shops could be heated.
Q. Are they inclosed in the winter, or open to the air in some parts?—A. They are inclosed.
Q. But they are too cold?—A. Yes.

COLD SHOPS.

Q. They are not heated as a rule?—A. Not as a rule. After 12 o'clock in the day, as a general thing, there is heat enough in almost all of them; but, take the first three or four hours in the morning, there is no heat in the places.
Q. There may be reasons—if so, what are they—why it is any harder or more dangerous for you to work under cover in the winter than for other working people to work in the open air?—A. The difference is that they have got to strip off some of their clothes when they go in, and to handle water, and "slosh" around in it; and when it is below zero in a place, and a man is handling water, it is not very easy to keep the ice from freezing him up.
Q. How much of that have you to do?—A. Men have to do it continually, from one end of the day to the other.
Q. With their hands in cold water all the year round?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Winter as well as summer?—A. Yes.
Q. And it has to be done with the outer clothing off?—A. Yes; it is impossible to work otherwise.
Q. Are you obliged to bare your arms?—A. Yes.
Q. How far up generally?—A. Above the elbow.
Q. You work with your forearms naked in the winter time?—A. Yes.
Q. And with no heat in the room?—A. As I say, most of the places are cold until about 12 o'clock.
Q. Is there a great quantity of water used?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. It is not possible, I suppose, to modify the temperature of the water in the winter season?—A. I don't know as it is.
Q. They use so much, I presume, that that would be impracticable?—A. Yes, sir; they use it continually; all day.
Q. In the summer season I suppose that is not so much of an objection?—A. They have not so much objection to it in the summer time.
Q. You say it is unhealthy; how do you know?—A. Well, it is unhealthy in this way, that they are subject to severe colds.
Q. Do you mean that they do get colds, and get sick frequently?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. More so than other working people, do you think?—A. Yes, sir; that is, that particular class of men.

NEGLECTED SANITARY ARRANGEMENTS.

Q. What other peculiar hardships are there about your trade, as it is practiced?—A. As a general thing there are no closets or privies for the men in more than one-half the tanners' and curriers' shops, and they are in poor condition when there are any—two or three boards nailed together, and in the heat of the day, when the shop does get warm, and they have occasion to use them, it is bad. The men have spoken to their employers about it, and have in some cases been discharged for speaking of it.
Q. Is your trade a difficult trade to learn?—A. Parts of it are.
Q. When you have learned that trade, it is hard to turn your hand to anything else, I suppose?—A. Yes.
Q. And if employment fails you there, you do not know what to do, I suppose?—A. No, sir.
Q. Have you any other trade?—A. No, sir.

MEN DISCHARGED FOR BELONGING TO TRADE-UNIONS.

Q. Is there any other point that you have on your mind which you wish to state?—A. Out here in Roxbury there is a shop running some 80 men, and the proprietor of the concern out there has threatened to break up the union, or the "clique," as he calls it, and he has commenced already to discharge men that have been belonging to the union.
Q. That is simply because they do belong to the union?—A. That is Quirin & Edwards' shop.
Q. Why do they want to break up the union; what reasons do they give?—A. That the men will be wanting to get more pay when they become organized.
Q. How do you know that they give that as a reason?—A. They have told the men that.
Q. They have themselves told them that?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do they claim that they are unable to give more pay?—A. No; and they have also demanded that the men do more work. That is where one-half of our Massachusetts curriers are making a mistake in regard to leather. They are driving the work out of the men, and they are making calf-skins to-day that are not as strong as common cloth.

QUALITY OF THE PRODUCT DEPRECIATED BY OVERWORK.

Q. The work depreciates?—A. Yes; the way they are doing it; they are driving so much out of the help that it is impossible to turn out
good leather. It is a big mistake they are making. They think that
the bigger the pile of work a man does the better it is for themselves.
There is one shop here in Boston that is an example for any of them.
It is Wescott's. It turns out what is known as Wescott's calf. They
pay their help more than any other shop in Massachusetts, and they
get out superior leather—better leather than any other.

HIGH RENTS.

Q. You get a dollar a day, wages!—A. That is the average pay that
men receive. The rents, especially in Somerville, are so high that it is
almost impossible for the workingmen to live in a house.
Q. What rent do you pay!—A. For the last year I have been pay-
ing $10 a month, and most of the men out there have to pay about that
amount for a house—$10 a month for rooms.
Q. For a full house, or for rooms only!—A. For rooms in a house.
Q. How many rooms!—A. Four or five.
Q. How much of your time have you been out of work, or idle, for
the last full year, say!—A. I have not been out of work more than
three weeks altogether, because I have been making a dollar or two
peddling or doing something, when I was out of work, in the carry-
ning line.
Q. Making about the same that you made at your trade!—A. Well,
I have made at my trade a little more than that, but that is the average.
Q. Are you a common drunkard!—A. No, sir.
Q. Do you smoke a great deal!—A. Well, yes, sir; I smoke as much
as any man.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to know how much you have got together in
the course of a year, and what you have spent your money for, so that
folks can see whether you have had pay enough to get rich on.

The WITNESS. A good idea.

The CHAIRMAN. That is precisely the sort of idea that people ought
to know. How much money do you think you have earned during this
last year; has it averaged a dollar a day for three hundred days?

The WITNESS. I have averaged more than that; I have averaged
$350 or $400, I will say, for the year.
Q. You pay $10 a month rent; that makes $120 a year!—A. Yes,
sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I have asked you these questions in this abrupt way
because I want to find out whether you have spent much for practices
that might have been dispensed with. You say you smoke?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

EXPENDITURES FOR NECESSITIES AND LUXURIES.

Q. How much a week do you spend for that!—A. I get 20 cents worth
of tobacco a week.
Q. That is $10.40 a year!—A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you say you are not a common drunkard!—A. No, sir.
Q. Do you imagine that you have spent as much more for any form
of beer, or ale, or anything of that kind, that you could have got along
without!—A. No, sir.
Q. How much do you think has gone in that way!—A. About $1 or
$2.
Q. During the whole year!—A. Yes, sir.
Q. That would make $11.40 or $12.40—we will call it $12—gone for
wickedness. Now, what else, besides your living, besides the support of your wife and children?—A. Well, I don't know as there is anything else.

Q. Can you not think of anything else that was wrong?—A. No, sir.
Q. Twelve dollars have gone for sin and iniquity; and $120 for rent; that makes $132!—A. Yes.
Q. How many children have you?—A. Two.
Q. Your family consists of yourself, your wife, and two children?—A. Yes.
Q. One hundred and thirty-two dollars from $400 leaves you $268, does it not?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. And with that amount you have furnished your family?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. You have been as economical as you could, I suppose?—A. Yes.
Q. How much money have you left?—A. Sixty dollars in debt.
Q. How did you do that?—A. I don't know, sir.
Q. Can you not think of something more that you have wasted?—A. No, sir.
Q. Have you been as careful as you could?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you have come out at the end of the year $60 in debt?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you been extravagant in your family expenses?—A. No, sir; a man can't be very extravagant on that much money.
Q. From year to year could you do any better than that at your trade?—A. Yes, sir; we could, providing they would——

PREMIUMS OFFERED FOR ABANDONMENT OF UNIONS.

Q. (Interposing.) I mean as things are?—A. If I would leave union matters alone and go to work at my trade as a non-union man and work against unionism I could receive 20 a week steady.
Q. How is that; they could not pay all the union men that way, could they?—A. No, sir.
Q. How do you know you could have that?—A. Because I am a competent workman.
Q. But you have said that the highest wages paid were $14!—A. You have asked me if I could do better, and the answer is that in that way I could do better.
Q. How do you know you could do better—that you could get $6 a week more than equally skilled workmen?—A. I have had the offer.
Q. What did they offer you $20 a week for when others only get $14?—A. The idea they have is that they could break up the union if they could get some of the men that are good workmen and officers of the union to abandon it—that they will gain their object that way—and the chances are that if I did take that $20 a week it would be only for a week or two, until things would get straightened out for themselves.
Q. When the union should be broken up you think you could not get $20?—A. No, sir; I couldn't get 20 cents then.
Q. You would be on the black-list again?—A. Sure.
Q. Are there any other points in the case?—A. I don't know as there is, except the matter of some of the men complaining about the human skins; quite an item, that.

EFFORTS TO BREAK UP UNIONS.

Q. Is there anything else that you know of that bears upon the way things work between the employers and the trades-unions—any efforts
to break the unions up—any means for doing it? You have spoken of the means used to get you away from the union.—A. Yes, sir. They have used the same means in Hubbard, Buzzell & Blake's, in Charlestown—they have sent those men out. And at Roxbury, at Quinrin's, they have done the same thing. There is a shop at Woburn where they have done the same thing; in fact, it has been done all around. As soon as there has been a union started, the men have been discharged.

Q. What is the prospect of their breaking the unions up—or are the unions progressing?—A. The unions get stronger every day, sir.

Q. "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church," is it?—A. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It has proved so in England, we have found from some witnesses who have testified already.

LABORERS PREVENTED FROM TESTIFYING BY FEAR.

The WITNESS. There are men that would be willing to come here and testify, but, like myself, they know that as soon as they get here they are done for. I have spoken to several of them, but they are all afraid. They are union men, but are afraid to come out in public and give any voice to their wrongs. It is a general feeling that all workingmen have; and I believe that I will be the only tanner and currier that you will find to come before you. There may be one or two more that would come if they could possibly get together, but as a general thing they have all got this fear in them. They have been asked about this human-hide tanning that has been carried on here in Massachusetts for eighteen years, and they are afraid to acknowledge it.

TANNING HUMAN HIDES.

Q. What do you know about it? If you know anything about it, tell it.—A. I don't know a great deal about it. All I know is that it has been done here for eighteen years—right here in Massachusetts; and inside of two hours a man could get all the information he wanted about it, providing the men would give it to him. I could get it from the men, but they are afraid to come out and speak for themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not suppose that it has been carried on to any great extent.

A. It has been stopped lately; it has been put down within the last three months, which has been one of the best things that ever happened for the tanners and curriers.

Q. Just what is it you mean to convey—I do not comprehend this talk of yours about the tanning of human skins. I have heard, of course, what has been in the papers, but that is campaign talk, I have supposed.—A. Well, I am in a position now, and if I speak out, who is going to support me if I am discharged from where I am to day?

The CHAIRMAN. You have spoken the whole thing, and, in what you have said about it, you cannot make yourself any better off (after saying that it has been carried on for eighteen years) by saying that you do not know anything about it.

The WITNESS. I know it has been done for eighteen years.

The CHAIRMAN. Now and then, perhaps, it has been done by somebody who represented nobody else—done as a freak or fancy—or from some whim or notion!

The WITNESS. It has been no bits or small pieces, but it has been
the regular hide, steadily; almost every month two or three or four whole human hides.

Q. You do not know that yourself?—A. That I don't know myself.

Q. You have heard things of that kind said?—A. Yes; I certainly have heard it said, and from the men that handled them, which is very good authority.

Q. For what purpose is it done?—A. That I can't answer. They use them for everything. I couldn't say what it is done for.

Q. This is something you know nothing of personally, only what you have heard from others?—A. Nothing for the eighteen years, but for the past three or four years I know it has been going on.

Q. How long is it since you first heard of it?—A. I have known it for eleven years or more, but I have not seen any until within four or five years.

Q. What have you seen?—A. I have seen the human hides.

Q. How large?—A. The whole length, the whole back; the whole skin of a woman, perfect.

Q. How do you know it was the skin of a woman, or of a man, or of any human being?—A. Well, sir, if you saw a woman naked you would know it was a woman; that is the only way I can answer that.

Q. You spoke of a piece of leather—tanned hide?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you know it was the skin of a human being?—A. Because it was just as natural as if the woman was alive. The hair and everything on her was just as natural as if she was alive.

Q. Yet tanned?—A. Yes, tanned.

Q. And you say you saw it yourself?—A. I saw it myself.

Q. How long ago?—A. That is three years ago.

Q. Where?—A. Well, that is a question I do not think I ought to answer, because it may injure me.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is a question you ought to answer, because many people will doubt your story unless you can give particulars.

The WITNESS. Well, I am satisfied to stand it. It was in Muller's, in Cambridge.

Q. Is that a tanning establishment there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did the proprietors know of it?—A. Sure. They must have.

Q. How came you to know of it?—A. Well, I am not the only one. There are men that never worked in a currying shop in their lives that saw them.

Q. Who?

The WITNESS. Do you want their names?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

A. Well, Dan McDermott, of Somerville, is one.

Q. Who is another?—A. Well, I don't know; I might injure these men by giving their names.

The CHAIRMAN. No, you will not. I take the responsibility of asking that question, and I want you to answer it.

The WITNESS. A man named Worster is another one.

Q. Do you know his given name?—A. No, sir; I couldn't say exactly what his given name is.

Q. Where do these two men live?—A. In Somerville.

Q. Do you know of any others that have seen what you say you have seen?—A. I know of others, but I can't think of names.

Q. Have you seen more than one such hide?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many?—A. Well, I would say five—six.

Q. When did you see the last one?—A. About a year ago, I should say.
Q. You say five or six, the first some five or six years ago?—A. Five or six; yes, sir.
Q. And you have known of such things you say for eleven years?—A. Yes; heard of them for twenty—for eighteen years; from men that have worked in tanneries.
Q. Did you ever hear of its being done anywhere else except where you say?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Where else?—A. It has been done at Woburn.
Q. What use do you understand they made of them?—A. I don’t know what use; I couldn’t say, sir. There are men that used to cut pieces off and carry them away with them. This McDermott, that I speak of, had a piece that he carried in his pocket for a couple of years.
Q. How large a piece?—A. Well, half an inch or so.
Q. Did you see it?—A. No, sir; I didn’t see the piece he had. I heard men talking of it.
Q. Have you ever helped tan one?—A. No, sir.
Q. You do not know whether the proprietors knew anything of this or not?—A. Of which?
Q. Of this practice, so far as it was carried on. You do not yourself know whether they understood it or not; you simply think they must have understood it?—A. Yes, sir; certainly they understood it, and did most of the work themselves, principally.
Q. Did most of the work with their own hands, do you mean?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. How do you know that?—A. The men in the shop say so, that have worked with them.

The Chairman. Well, let us go on to something else—if there is anything else that you wish to state to the committee relating to your trade.

TANNERS’ WAGES HIGHER ABROAD THAN HERE.

The Witness. Some witnesses have spoken to you of the effect of foreigners on wages here; but from what I can find out and from what I see of Frenchmen and Englishmen coming here to this country, as a general thing, they stay only a few weeks and go back to England or France again. As a general rule there are very few men of our trade, coming from abroad, that stay here, working at tanning and currying. They have better pay and accommodations in their own country; and as proof of that, they do not stay here long. There are but few Frenchmen that come here at all, and they stay but a short time here, for the reason that they can do better at home.
Q. Where were you born?—A. In Cambridge, Mass.
Q. Have you ever been out of the country?—A. Yes, sir; I have been to Germany.
Q. When?—Some few years ago.
Q. How long were you there?—A. Ten weeks.
Q. What did you go to Germany for?—A. Partly for the good of my health. I was run down at that time.
Q. Anything else, any business?—A. I went along with my father.
Q. Is your father still living?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Did you get better while you were gone?—A. Yes, sir; somewhat.
Q. Do you know anything of the working people there?

GREATER ENJOYMENT OF LIFE AMONG EUROPEAN THAN AMERICAN LABORERS.

A. Yes, sir, a little, not a great deal. I know they are fixed better in their homes than the working people of this country are, and are
happier—have more pleasures together—more social enjoyment than what they have in this country.

Q. Do you think they live better—that they have more to eat and drink and wear?—A. Well, I don’t know as they have any more to eat; they have plenty to eat—good and substantial as it is. They don’t eat so much flesh meat as they do in this country, but they use other dishes that are as strengthening, if not more so, than what the meats are that we get.

Q. Does any other matter occur to your mind that you would like to say to the committee!

EMPLOYERS DEMAND MORE WORK THAN CAN BE THOROUGHLY DONE.

A. I would like to speak of the way they have of running the labor in the currying shops. As a general rule, the boss hires one young man, of say nineteen or twenty or twenty-two years of age, and pays him to work very hard. If he is a good, smart young man, he gives him a half dollar a week more than he gives the rest of his help on the same class of work, so that he may “run” them—get them to do a certain amount of work. That is done in almost every shop in Massachusetts to-day. There are one or two men hired throughout the shop, and they “run” the rest of the help in the shop. They are generally French Canadians.

Q. What do you mean by “running” the help!—A. Doing more work; starting in the morning, and instead of doing a regular day’s work—for instance, regulating calf-skins, of which a good day’s work is fifty to sixty, to get the “stretch” out—he may do seventy-five to eighty, thereby gaining for the employer fifteen or twenty a day. That is a mistake they make, as I have said before. Then there are the “shavers”; almost all shavers that are working on calf-skins, or on leather either, the employers are demanding of them constantly to do more work, when it would be constantly an advantage to reduce the amount they have asked them to do instead of increasing it. The average day’s work on calf-skins would be about 85 to 90 to “skive” or shave. The shops, as a general rule, want them to do 120 to 135 or 140.

RESULTS OF THE PREFERENCE FOR QUANTITY RATHER THAN QUALITY.

They don’t seem to look at the amount of leather that is cut off, or the number of holes that are cut in a calf-skin, which will make it useless for a boot. These have to be turned into small shoes and made up for other purposes. As I have said, in Hubbard, Buzzell & Blake’s, in Charlestown, they practice that, and in all branches of work. The new foreman that they put there, who is running the concern at present, is running it on that principle, and if he knew his business it would certainly not be done in that way. The calf-skins manufactured in this country, some of them, as I say, are poor, for the reason that they will not put the time in to get out proper work—to get the leather out in good condition. There is no reason why there is a cry in this country for French goods, when we can go to work and manufacture leather ourselves and put it in a shoe that will outwear two pairs of French calf; but still people will not give in to it. The idea has got around among the richer people of this country that there is nothing like French calf; but there is a calf-skin manufactured here in Boston, as I say, that could be made as good, and better, with wages paid to the men not less than
§13 or $14 a week, and it would then give returns of 40 or 50 per cent. for the work.

Q. There would not be so large a market for boots and shoes, would there, if the leather were better?—A. Well, I don’t see why.

**BETTER WORKMANSHIP A PREVENTIVE OF IMPORTATION.**

Q. Do you think people would wear as many pairs?—A. No, I don’t know as they would; but if the leather was better manufactured here in Massachusetts, there would be more of our own leather bought and less of the imported stock. There is one concern here in Portland street—Dahl’s—that are running out, I suppose, 150 dozen a week into the market, and I have never known them to get out anything that was stronger than brown paper. And that stuff is put into boots and shoes and sold for calf-skin. That I know. I worked for the concern three years. They get out poor stock and sell it in the market, and run their prices lower than others—lower than men that are willing to give good wages and get out good stock; and, of course, those men are at a disadvantage for that reason. Dahl has also threatened to break up the union, if possible, working in an underhand manner with his brother, who is foreman at Quirin’s place.

Q. Is there anything else you wish to say?—A. That is all I can think of just now.

Q. How old are you?—A. Twenty-five, going on twenty-six.

Q. How long have you been married?—A. A little over three years.

Q. How much have you attended school—what education did you get while in Cambridge?—A. I have been to work ever since I have been nine years of age.

Q. Have you had any opportunities for schooling since then?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have not been at school at all since then?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you been at work at your trade since then?—A. Not all the time at the trade.

Q. What did you commence doing first?—A. Well, I commenced shining boots while my father was in the Army, and when I was nine years old I went to work in a telegraph office.

Q. You shined boots how long?—A. Well, on odd days, while my father was in the Army, I shined boots.

Q. Have you got brothers?—A. I have one.

Q. Is he older than you?—A. No, sir; younger.

Q. Are you the oldest child?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is your mother living?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You helped support the family in that way while your father was in the Army?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long was your father in the Army?—A. Two years and nine months, I think, or three years, I won’t be certain which.

Q. How long did you work in a telegraph office?—A. I suppose six or nine months; I don’t remember exactly.

Q. And then what did you do?—A. I worked in a tailor’s shop, then, running errands. From that I went to a bookstore, and was there two or three years.

Q. What bookstore?—A. The store of P. R. Sturges; he was a general agent for books. That was in Scollay’s building, in Scollay Square.

Q. How long were you with him?—A. I was with him, I think, two years; I lived with him.
Q. You lived in his family; do you mean? — A. Yes, sir; I lived in the building that is now overhead Horton's store and pavilion.

Q. Then where did you go? — A. Then for six months I was in a butcher's store.

Q. And then? — A. From that to currying.

Q. To the trade? — A. Yes, sir.

Q. How old were you when you commenced learning? — A. About fourteen years.

Q. Where was it? — A. In South Boston.

Q. With what establishment? — A. William V. Cogan's.

Q. How long did you work for him? — A. Over three years; I served my time with him.

Q. Were you apprenticed to him? — A. Yes, sir.

Q. Had a written agreement? — A. No, sir; well, my father made the agreement; I couldn't tell.

Q. You staid with him until you learned the trade? — A. Yes.

Q. How old were you when you got through; 19 or 20? — A. No, sir; 18.

Q. Did you work for yourself after you learned the trade? — A. Yes, sir.

Q. And earned all the money you have had since then? — A. Yes, sir; after I was a year out of my time I have earned all I have had since then. I saved up enough to go to the Centennial at Philadelphia, and then came back and worked and saved enough money to go to Germany.

Q. When did you say you were married? — A. About three years ago.

Q. That is since your return from Germany? — A. Yes.

Q. What property, or how much money had you when you were married? — A. Well, I don't know as I had a great deal. After I had paid for the furniture and everything that I bought, which was at that time mighty little, I guess I had about $50 left to start with.

Q. And you came out $60 in debt this year? — A. Yes, sir; I am $60 in debt to-day.

Q. And no property or money saved anywhere to meet it? — A. No, sir; and ordered out of the house I am living in, besides.

Q. What for? — A. The house has been sold, and a man by the name of Hunt has bought it, and he wants it for his own use. When I moved into the house I was promised to be left there as long as I wished to stay — 8 or 10 years — and the man that I hired the house from agreed to pay me any damage he would do me; but, like everything else, when it comes to getting any pay from these men, you can't get it. I got orders to leave; notice that he wanted the house, and if I didn't leave it by next Monday he would put my things into the street.

Q. Do you owe him any rent? — A. No, sir; there is no rent due him; he has received the rent regularly, and has got good recommendations for the rent, but he wants the house for himself; there is no other reason.

Q. Is there anything else you wish to say? — A. Nothing else, I guess, unless you have any questions to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think of any more. I wanted to get your story, and hear how you had got along.

The WITNESS. Well, I don't expect you will believe the story of a man of my kind until you find it out.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not see any reason why you cannot tell the truth; I do not doubt you; but I cannot do anything further about it. If anybody doubts what you say, they can find out what the record is.
I can pay no further attention to the matter. If anybody wants to know whether you are a truth-telling man, they can do so; the references are on the record, and can go to the public.

BOSTON, MASS., October 19, 1883.

ALBERT A. CARLTON examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:


Q. What is your business?—A. I am a shoe-cutter—a portion of a shoemaker.

Q. How long have you been a shoe-cutter?—A. Perhaps twenty years.

Q. Have you always worked in Lynn?—A. Always worked in Lynn.

Q. Are you connected with any labor society?—A. I am, sir.

THE "KNIGHTS OF LABOR."

Q. What is it, and what is your relation to it?—A. I am connected with the "Knights of Labor," and I hold a prominent position in that organization.

Q. How long have you been a member of the "Knights of Labor?"—A. Some five years.

Q. How many "knights" are there in Massachusetts?—A. Pardon me if I do not answer the question, because, for purposes of protection, it is not customary in the organization to tell the number of its members.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well; I never press a question that a man does not wish to answer.

Q. Is it to be found in all parts of the country?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the object of the association, so far as you can make it public?—A. The object of the association is to educate, first, the workers of the country; to place before them their condition, and also to find measures to better their condition; things of that sort.

OPPOSITION OF EMPLOYERS TO LABOR LEADERS.

Q. Won't you go on and state to the committee what you desire the committee to know?—A. The principal thing that occurs to me is in relation to those who take a prominent part in labor movements, or attempt to organize laboring men. When a man assumes a leading position he becomes a marked man, to some extent, by employers. Employers have an idea that he is a dangerous man, simply because he talks those things that he believes; and, after a while, it becomes difficult for him to obtain employment, at whatever his trade is.

Q. Is it as much so now as formerly?—A. I think it is, yes; in this vicinity; because in this vicinity the labor questions are agitated more now than formerly, and for that reason there seems to be a disposition on the part of leading employers to, if possible, crush out such movements.

Q. Leading employers in what kind of business?—A. In nearly all kinds of business, so far as I am able to ascertain.

ANTAGONISM OF CAPITAL TO LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

Q. What success are they having?—A. Well, it is just coming to a stubborn fight, apparently; both sides might, to a certain extent, be
said to be gaining some advantage. Labor is organizing, and there is one thing in connection with it: employers of labor have an idea that laboring men band themselves together for the purpose of encouraging strikes, when, as a rule, a strike is the last thing that they have in mind. Of course, a man naturally thinks of his wages, but at the same time the disposition of people is to effect this revolution (if it is a revolution) by peaceful measures—by such things as we have a legitimate right to use.

**STRIKES NOT THE OBJECT OF ORGANIZATION.**

We do not desire to indulge in strikes, although, apparently, to the first men who band themselves together a strike appears to be the only effective weapon that we have at hand; but by means of these organizations they are educated to something higher; they are educated to a realization of their position and condition, and are also expected to conduct themselves as men and as citizens who take pride in their country. Therefore, if we complain of laws or of regulations that are unsuited to us, we endeavor to educate men up to that standard to effect these changes by peaceable measures.

**OBJECTS OF LABOR ORGANIZATION.**

Q. What changes do you desire to effect?—A. There are certain things in our State regulations that we desire to change—the hours of labor principally. Another one of the principal objects is to effect a change in the hours of labor, because we do not believe that men have a sufficient time to educate themselves. We are entitled to a certain amount of education and culture—or we believe we are entitled to it—and are born to it just as well as others are. We know that as things are, and working at the rate of pressure, and for the length of time that we now work, our toil unfit us to get the education we want; we do not have the time; and, if we had the time, we are too tired to be able to utilize it properly. Therefore we consider that a shortening of the hours of labor will be a great blessing to the working people, and will, in the end, accomplish for them a larger education.

**EIGHT-HOUR LAW.**

Q. How much would you like to reduce the hours?—A. We have set the hours at eight per day, believing that that is fair. There is another thing we consider: It has been the custom among employers, whenever the matter of wages is taken into consideration, for them to say to us, “Hereafter you work at a reduction of so much;” and that is told us in such a manner that men are given no chance to consider it. That is the plan. That is one of the causes of strikes. A strike would not happen in many instances if the employers would confer with their men and show a disposition to have a fair discussion of the merits of the case.

Q. Is there any difficulty in employers getting what labor they want in any pursuit in the State at this time?—A. No; I do not think there is.

Q. You say they tell you to take it or leave it, in effect?—A. Yes.

Q. Labor is abundant now; if it were scarce, how would it be?—A. Like every other commodity, it would command the higher price.

**INTERCHANGE OF VIEWS AS A PREVENTIVE OF STRIKES.**

Q. You mentioned that you thought there should be more conference and friendly intercourse between the employer and his workmen, or em-
ployés, in regard to the matter of lowering or raising wages, &c. Is there any other matter that you have in your mind to state?—A. I principally desired to speak because the feeling seems to be growing so strong in the direction stated. Without too much repetition, there seems to be a division between the employer and the employed, and the lines appear to be more strongly drawn than formerly, as the employers seem to think they, to a certain extent, own these men for so many hours a day; and they also think they have the right to say how much they shall pay; and if a man raises his voice against it they say, “You have no right to interfere with my business,” and the principal actors are removed, as a general rule.

LABOR ENTITLED TO A VOICE IN FIXING WAGES.

Q. Why are they not right in saying that it is nothing to you, really? If they can get help cheaper, they have a right to. Why is it really any more a question for you to discuss, if you are a workman, with the man who employs you, than it is what price he shall pay for the raw leather, or the pegs, or the other materials that go into a shoe?—A. Perhaps there is not any difference as to what he shall pay for the raw material; but the man who sells the raw material has something to say as to what he will sell it for. The man who sells his labor should have something to say as to what he shall sell that for.

Q. Do you not have just the same to say about the labor that the other man does who sells the raw material?—A. Not at all.

Q. That man asks his price?—A. Yes.

Q. And the manufacturer pays it, or does not pay it; and the seller has just as much to say about the price he asks as the other about the price he will pay?—A. The man who sells the article oftentimes combines with other men selling the same article to regulate the price they will ask; and the man who sells his labor should have the same right of combination with his fellow laborers.

COMBINATIONS OF EMPLOYERS TO DETERMINE WAGES.

Q. How general is this disposition to say what they shall pay?—A. I think in nearly all industries it is the custom to have a combination of employers.

Q. What evidence is there of that?—A. Well, when we have been engaged in labor troubles we have seen accounts of the meetings of employers. Then after these meetings we have had submitted to us certain terms.

Q. That is not recent, is it?—A. That occurs whenever labor troubles occur.

Q. When last have labor troubles occurred in this State?—A. They are occurring, perhaps in a small way, but they are occurring right straight along, you may say, each year.

Q. None of any importance this season, are there!

THE TELEGRAPHERS’ STRIKE.

A. None since the telegraphers' strike.

Q. Do you consider that that strike was a failure?—A. It was a failure in one way; it was a success in another.

Q. Was it any special good to the telegraphers?—A. It may have been in learning them a lesson.
Q. Have there been any increases of pay, or changes since that strike?—A. We have been informed that there has been an increase of pay, to a certain extent, and a shortening of the hours of labor; but I have nothing official on that subject.

Q. Can you state whether Sunday work is paid for or not, now?—A. I believe it is; but my information is not official on the point.

Q. I think you are correct. I think changes have been made, and that Sunday work is paid for now. Have you some other matter in mind?—A. No; the only matters I desire to speak of are those mentioned.

CONDITION OF THE BOOT AND SHOE BUSINESS.

Q. What is now the general condition of the boot and shoe business; is it flourishing or otherwise?—A. It is not flourishing just now. It has not been in first rate condition this year. There is more uncertainty about it than customary.

Q. It is quite a fluctuating and uncertain trade, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you not think that on the whole for the last ten years the workmen engaged in the boot and shoe business have done as well, or, at least, have obtained a fair proportion of the profits of the business, as compared with the employers or managers of the business?—A. I hardly think they have—not a fair proportion.

Q. You do not think they have received a fair proportion?—A. No; I do not think they have received a fair proportion.

Q. Take the men who have managed the business during this time in and about Lynn; have you known, or do you now know, what has been their fortune pecuniarily?—A. Those that have capital to conduct a large business appear to be very successful. Those that enter it with a small capital appear generally to be swallowed up by the large capitalists.

SMALL SWALLOWED BY LARGE CAPITAL.

Q. The men with small capital fail, and the men with large capital go on in business and get richer?—A. Yes.

Q. How do you account for that?—A. Well, in the first place, of course the men who have the large capital can undersell the men who have small capital, because the man of large capital has facilities that are superior to those of the man with small capital. The latter has to ask for more credit, and the cash man gets his goods cheaper, because he pays cash. Then he can undersell the other. The man who manufactures 60 sets of women's shoes and wants to make a profit of at least $3 a set, can be undersold by the man who manufactures 100 sets, and who is satisfied with half the profit per set, and who, consequently, can crowd the other man out.

SMALL CAPITAL MOST BENEFICIAL TO LABOR.

Q. Which is the best system of doing business for the wage-worker—that by the large capitalist, or by the small?—A. By the small.

Q. Why so?—A. Because if men are conducting business in such a way that they can get larger profits on their goods—that is, can get a reasonable profit on their goods—they are willing to pay a reasonable sum for wages. The men who are engaged in large undertakings, and appear to be satisfied with small profits, are apt in a number of cases to increase their profits out of their employés.
Q. But why, as a natural result, should not they be the ones who would be likely to give the employed more, since the smaller profit means in the end a larger aggregate? — A. They might, as a natural result, but they are not willing to.

Q. You mean to be understood, as a rule, that the large employer is less liberal to the workingman than the small employer? — A. Yes.

Q. How do you account for that? It is more for the pecuniary interest of the small employer to get his wage-earner at a low rate. — A. Yes, it may be more for his interest; but it is not his custom. As a rule, the men who go into business on a small scale are assisted by friends; to some extent they are acquaintances of their companions in the shop, and have a brotherly feeling for them.

Q. You think it is there that the humanitarian feeling comes in! — A. Yes.

Q. The association between the employer and the man that works for him? — A. Yes; we can more easily confer with the man that does the small business than with the man who does the large business. The large man keeps us at a distance.

Q. Do you think that, as a rule, the small employer actually pays as much to his help as the large one? — A. They are willing to, at least.

Q. They feel compelled, in order to do business at all, to conform to the common rule! — A. Yes.

Q. Does any other matter occur to you? — A. Nothing.

Q. Are you a practical working man yourself? — A. I am, sir.

__________

BOSTON, MASS., OCTOBER 19, 1883.

CHARLES P. HARRINGTON examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:


Q. What is your business? — A. I am a granite cutter.

Q. How long have you worked at the business? — A. Twelve years.

Q. Are you connected with an association of men? — A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the name of it? — A. I am connected with two—the Granite Cutters' National Union and the Central Trades and Labor Union.

Q. Have you any official connection with them? — A. I am president of the Central Trades and Labor Union.

Q. Have you any official connection with the other? — A. Well, just at present I am a delegate to a national convention; that is all.

Q. You have learned the trade yourself? — A. Yes.

Q. Do you work at it still? — A. I do, sir.

WAGES OF GRANITE CUTTERS.

Q. What pay do you get when you work? — A. Three dollars a day are the wages at present.

Q. How much of the time have you worked for the last year? — A. I have worked nearly all the time.

Q. Are you an agitator?

The WITNESS. An agitator!

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

The WITNESS. Well, do you mean to get up and speak in favor of trades-unions?
The CHAIRMAN. I do not know just what it means; but I have heard about these agitators.

A. No, sir; I never appeared on the stump or spoke before an audience in my life outside of my trade-union. I endeavor to persuade those I come in contact with to join trade and labor unions. That is the extent of it.

Q. Where were you born?—A. In Fall River, Mass.
Q. Where did you learn your trade?—A. In Boston.
Q. How old are you?—A. Thirty-one years—a little over.
Q. Are you married?—A. No, sir.
Q. You get $3 a day wages?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. What are the prices paid to working men in your business?—A. It varies in different localities. Hereabouts the rate of wages is $2.75 per day, that is the lowest; but many of them receive more.
Q. You get as high pay as any one?—A. Well, I can’t say that I do, because we have a system of piece-work by which men that are speedy are enabled to make more, in some cases.
Q. You get as high as any who have worked by your side?—A. I presume I do, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You can state any matter that you have in mind that you desire to state to the committee.

The WITNESS. I desire to speak generally.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not care to ask you any question. You may go on and state what you wish to state.

The WITNESS. I have a few ideas of my own, which are not new by any means.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us have them.

THE EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

The WITNESS. My opinion is that the general adoption of the eight-hour system, with some other measures that I shall mention, would materially improve the social condition of the working classes.

MEASURES OF IMPROVEMENT FOR WAGE-WORKERS.

The other measures that in my opinion are most needed by wage-workers are: The prohibition of child labor under fourteen years of age; the discontinuance of the contract prison labor, frequent payment of wages, the abolition of the truck system, first lien for workmen’s wages, equal pay for equal work for both sexes, a national bureau of statistics of labor where all information can be had pertaining to the toiling masses, so that such information as is desired by this committee may be obtained from a reliable source; the enactment of an employer’s liability act in order that the employé may receive just remuneration when injured through the performance of his legitimate duties; also, to provide some means to prevent or some penalty for black-listing, as now practiced by employers, and which is one of the gravest evils that afflict us, actually depriving men and women of the privilege of earning a livelihood in a locality where perhaps they have been born and are surrounded by those ties that endear a place to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Right there let me suggest that your organizations initiate and press a movement to make that a criminal offense by the laws of the State of Massachusetts.

"BLACK-LISTING" OF EMPLOYÉS A CRIME.

The WITNESS. I believe it is a criminal offense, sir; but I do not know that we have any means of enforcing it. I believe it is now a criminal
offense, and can be prosecuted under the laws of Massachusetts; but it is difficult to enforce the law.

Q. Then can you ask for the enactment of a law that cannot be enforced?—A. I believe some means should be devised and could be devised by which this system could be put down.

Q. Any legal means?—A. Yes; I think so.

THE PRESENT STATE LAW AS TO "BLACK-LISTING" INEFFICIENT.

Q. Then you mean to say that the present law is inefficient and inoperative?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then it is not a reply to my suggestion to say that there is a law, since you say it is not a law. What I mean is that there is a sort of law for the enactment of which you must apply to the State jurisdiction. Get it drawn as it ought to be, and in such terms as will stand. You need some sharp lawyer to do it. I believe you do not take lawyers into your organization, but you will be obliged at least to get their aid if you want laws carefully drawn. You want your bill drafted so that it will secure the object, and then insist on its passage without its being emasculated by amendments—a law by which you can make testimony applicable; and a conviction or two will help you out.

The WITNESS. But the practical workingmen do not have any voice in framing the law.

The CHAIRMAN. You will not find any difficulty if you go to some good, honest lawyers.

The WITNESS. Good, honest lawyers?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; there are more of them than you think.

The WITNESS. We have had some experience with them, and it is not to their credit.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be; but I mean there are as many honest lawyers as there are of any other class.

THE "TRAMP" LAWS.

The WITNESS. That may be. I am also of opinion that the tramp laws should be abolished. I can speak intelligently on that subject, having worked on public works, where the custom is, upon the completion of, for instance, a railroad, for the men immediately to walk to some other place where, perhaps, a railroad is building, or, at any rate, for another job. The unsteadiness of industry, coupled with the meager wages received, would not warrant the payment of fares to any considerable distance. They are obliged to subsist as best they can during their journey, and usually evince a willingness to repay in work any favors extended to them. This class forms a large portion of the so-called tramps, and, like all classes of society, have some of the vicious among them; but they are the exception, not the rule, the greatest part of them being peaceful and law-abiding men who take hold of work to which they are adapted as readily as any other class of workmen.

THE "TRUCK" SYSTEM.

I shall say a word more about the truck system, and on that I am also prepared to speak from experience, having been employed in the granite trade at some of the largest quarries in Maine; namely, at Vinal Haven, for the Bondwell Company, and at St. George, Knox County. At those places men were obliged to trade at company stores, where
goods were much higher than in rival stores, if any there be. As a rule, however, rival stores cannot live, and thereby the company gets a monopoly, to the detriment of workmen. It was, and I believe it is yet, the custom to pay employees whenever it suits the convenience of the company, sometimes two months elapsing in the interval of payments.

Q. Have you any other points in your mind?—A. That is all I care to speak of generally, but I will answer any questions. I desire to say in regard to my trade that there will probably be other testimony here that will give you more information.

Q. Is it here now?—A. No, sir; it will, perhaps, be here before the hearing ends.

The Chairman. It ends to-night; but we will keep busy all day.

The Witness. This system of "black-listing" is a most pernicious thing, and affects some people seriously. If, as you suggested, it may be remedied by local legislation, I hope the committee will lay the matter before the country.

The Chairman. It will be heard of, of course, through our report; but that is a matter which the mass of the people of this country consider within the jurisdiction of the State, and there is something of a fight as to whether the nation is a nation, or whether it is nothing. A good part of the people throughout the country North and South think it is nothing, and that American citizenship is nothing, and that an evil, however general or national in its scope, is not for that reason a subject of national jurisdiction at all, but has to be taken up piecemeal by the separate localities—a sort of local option in human rights. It is conceded all round that Massachusetts has jurisdiction in that matter, and it is not worth while to fight all the time against that idea. You have as enlightened ideas in Massachusetts as anywhere, unless Republican institutions are a failure, and they are, probably, as good as any. The best way is to appeal to the legislature, and keep appealing until you get a law; but you must have that law drafted by some body who knows how to draft one. I assure you I am quite sincere in the statement that the mass of the profession of lawyers is as honest as any lot of men you can find. You can't find any difficulty in getting a law drafted. The trouble is that it would be spoiled by amendments in getting through the legislature—amendments which will be proposed there by men who are not lawyers. Get a good law passed, and then when you get a fair case, go to the grand jury, and a few convictions will stop it.

The Witness. I will say in regard to your idea of going before the legislature, that we consider it the duty of the Central Trades Union to appear before committees in matters pertaining to labor, and to vigorously push those matters; have not met with much success.

Boston, Mass., October 19, 1883.

Ellis B. McKenzie further examined.

The Chairman. I understand that there was some point which you desired to present, and which you did not have time to present last evening. You may now state it.

The Centralization of Wealth in the United States.

The Witness. It was in reference to the centralization of wealth. It is very evident that wealth is concentrated in the hands of a few men.
I have seen a statement to the effect that previously to 1860 there were only ten millionaires in the United States, and that now there are five hundred. By the census of 1880 the entire valuation of property in the United States is put at $50,000,000,000. Now, 500,000 men worth $100,000 apiece would control that entire wealth, and the 52,000,000 or 53,000,000 of people outside of them would practically be in the condition of tramps. This is a state of things which, if the centralization of wealth as now going on is not arrested, will be disastrous to the interests of the country. The millionaires in the single city of San Francisco represent $450,000,000. In the city of New York they probably represent as much more. One man worth $100,000,000 stands for one thousand persons worth $100,000 each, and it will be seen that the immensely rich represent a great number of these. When we run down to persons worth less than a million, and to those worth less than $100,000, we find that we approach a state of things where five hundred men practically own and control the entire capital of the country.

MILLIONAIRES ABSORBING ALL THE WEALTH OF AMERICA.

Now, the increase of wealth in this State Mr. Atkinson states to be 1 per cent. per annum; in the United States, I think, it is put at 3 per cent. If the founders of this wealth spent one-half their income and saved the other half (3 per cent.) and held it, it is evident, if these figures are correct, that those who control the wealth absorb the entire net product of the country, so that there is no possibility, if this statement is correct, of the great mass of the people coming into possession of any more property or bettering their condition.

It seems to me that this is a matter that should be seriously considered, and that this phase of the labor question should have some attention paid to it.

THE CENTRALIZATION OF WEALTH PRODUCING INDUSTRIAL FEUDALISM.

I also wish to point out that this centralization of wealth has produced in our midst a kind of commercial or industrial feudalism. For instance, Mr. Warren, who sat in this chair yesterday morning, owns or controls the paper mills in Maine known as the Cumberland Mills. He has established a little village there. He is a baron. His income is something ranging between $100,000 and $200,000 a year. He owns the church, and of course he owns the minister; and these operatives are practically his retainers or serfs; and while that condition has not at present become intolerable, the movement of industry, the whole trend of things, is to make it intolerable, and to bring about, as I have said, a condition of commercial and industrial feudalism.

EXCESSIVE WEALTH PRODUCES FINANCIAL CONGESTION.

I wish also to remark (and this will end my testimony at this time) that this centralization of wealth leads to the difficulties in regard to which your committee is trying to find out something. If a man has an income of $1,000,000 a year, it is evident that he cannot spend it, no matter how great a spendthrift he may be. There is by this process a glut—a congestion produced. If laborers received the product of their labor they would consume, products would be circulated, and exchange and circulation would not be disturbed; equivalents would
balance each other. But in the case of the rich man he cannot possibly consume his income, and circulation is disturbed and congested as a consequence.

OVER-PRODUCTION PARTIALLY DUE TO CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH.

That is one of the things that produces what is commonly called over-production. If there were a free movement in exchanges there would be no apparent over-production, everything would be smooth, and all these troubles would disappear.

The CHAIRMAN. Your difficulty about the millionaire is in the idea expressed by the word "hoarded." If his income is $1,000,000, or any other large sum, you say he cannot possibly spend it; the idea being that it is hoarded. If hoarded, it is out of use, of course; it is like money buried in the earth. Now, if that money is hoarded the difficulty you mention is quite apparent; but if it is not hoarded, but is distributed, it is active capital in the hands of somebody—paying to the millionaire or the owner some rate of interest, but still in actual use; so that it is not quite a proper term to say that it is hoarded.

The WITNESS. No.

Q. Well, now, what is the difficulty of the large ownership in the hands of a single man when he does not hoard it, but lends, or makes over to the use of the community at large in some way, its annual accumulation or income?

DISASTEROUS EFFECTS OF COMPOUND INTEREST.

A. I wish to state, in answer to that, that no man now hoards—that is, if he has any sense. He reinvests this surplus which he does not spend, and it is, in the community, active capital; but here is the difficulty which flows from that: It is lent out at compound interest. Vanderbuilt has $65,000,000 in United States bonds. The interest on that is compounded quarterly; there is a constant accumulation; that doubles up in, say eleven to fifteen years; and if he does nothing whatever, and retires from business and only drives fast horses and gives parties, that property, of itself, by the operation of the economic principle of interest, is doubled in that time, and of course it is quadrupled in double that time, and so on.

Q. But still, where is it?—A. It is active capital, and accumulates. I say the process of concentration acts in that way, so that these few millionaires, under the present economic laws and industrial system, have society at their mercy by the operation of this constantly compounding increase.

BOSTON, MASS., October 19, 1883.

SAMUEL A. BANCROFT examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where is your residence?—Answer. I reside in Boston.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am a seller of dry-goods; that is, I would be called a "drummer," I suppose.

Q. What is your age?—A. Sixty-one.

Q. Are you connected with any labor organization?—A. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You may state your object in appearing before the committee, and what you would like to say to it.
The WITNESS. There are some views which I entertain of some of the questions that have been presented to the committee upon which I would like to say something. Some statements that have been made before you have suggested to me the propriety of making the remarks that I am about to make.

BALANCE OF TRADE IN FAVOR OF AMERICA.

Mr. Dalton suggested that the thing we need was a larger market. This country has had a larger balance of trade in its favor than any other nation. During the last eight years we have had a large balance of trade in our favor. During that time England has purchased some $500,000,000 worth a year for a large part of the time; sometimes, I think, more than that; but it would average $500,000,000.

BEING A DEBTOR NATION, THE UNITED STATES NEEDS A FAVORABLE BALANCE OF TRADE.

But the condition of this country and of England, relatively, is like that of two men, one of whom has $10,000 out at interest with $600 a year coming in, so that he can afford to spend that $600 a year in addition to what he can make in his business, while the other man, who might represent, say, this country, is one who must not only make a living out of his business, but enough besides to pay interest on $10,000. It has been urged repeatedly by the newspaper having the largest circulation in Boston that it was not necessary to have a balance of trade in your favor to retain gold.

ENGLAND A CREDITOR NATION.

But, according to Robert Giffen, an eminent statistician, who recently read an article before the English Statistical Society upon the wealth of England, the annual interest upon that wealth is $600,000,000, and England has purchased some $500,000,000 a year more than she has sold; yet she has grown richer.

MOVEMENTS OF GOLD.

An article has appeared in a paper here during the present year showing some gain of a small amount of gold, and yet we sold during that year thirty-five millions more than we bought—yet we had lost twenty-five millions of gold, and the newspaper argued from that that it was not necessary to have it.

THE INTEREST PAID TO ENGLAND ON INVESTMENTS IN AMERICA.

Mr. Norvin Green, president of the Western Union Telegraph Company, made a statement in his speech in England recently that we were paying to England every year $120,000,000 of interest upon the amount of English money invested here, that amount of money being $2,000,000,000. I think that is correct. In addition to that we have to pay a large amount to foreign vessels for freights. It is necessary, therefore, for us to have a large balance of trade in our favor, or we will go behindhand every year. During the last year we have had a balance of trade in our favor of something over $100,000,000. We have had a few millions of gold—some five or six—coming to this country, but there has been thirty or forty millions of British money invested in real estate here.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

THE UNITED STATES THE ONLY NATION EXPORTING MORE THAN IT IMPORTS.

We do what no other nation does—we export a great deal more than we import. Both England and France have imported more than they have exported. It is useless to tell us that we can buy more than we sell, simply because England or France does. We have interest to pay out, and we must do a large amount of business to pay it.

CAUSES OF THE FINANCIAL PANIC OF 1873.

The effect of buying more than we sell was fully illustrated ten years before the crash of 1873. During that time we imported a thousand millions more than we exported. Circumstances favored us for hiring a large amount of foreign capital, owing to the large amounts of interest paid, and we went along apparently swimmingly, but really getting into debt every year. During 1872-73 alone these extra imports amounted to two or three hundred million dollars. Then came the crash of 1873, and when that came it lasted a long while—five or six years.

AMERICA SHOULD MAKE WHAT IT NEEDS AND STOP IMPORTING.

I think that what is necessary for this country is to make every article that we can make, but paying a fair price for the labor, instead of buying in foreign countries. For illustration, when we put a duty on the article spool-cotton, for instance, the large manufacturers of spool-cotton—Coates and Clarke—started their factories here; they could make it here cheaper than to pay duty. They testified that they pay here $2 a day where they pay $1 in England and Scotland, where they have carried on their works. One man kept at work here at $2 a day is worth a dozen men kept at work in England, for he spends all his money among us, and will do more for us than a man kept at work in England, spending perhaps 10 cents a day on what we raise. We want, and are willing to pay other people, what we need for ourselves. If I were a stonemason I should be willing to pay a good price, in order that the workers in that trade should get good wages. I believe we should have things made here, and so arranged that by paying a fair price for labor we can make them here. I do not make any exception. We have as great a variety of soil and climate as any nation in the world.

IMMIGRATION TO AMERICA, IN THREE YEARS, OF TWO MILLION PEOPLE.

We have had coming to our shores within the last three years over 2,000,000 people. That fact tells us whether we are, as a people, in a better condition than other people. No such immigration has been known in the world. England is a country which boasts that the sun does not set on her flag; yet, during the last two years over half a million of her subjects have come to this country from under the shelter of that flag, and they are not all from Ireland; there are more from England and Wales than from Ireland during the last three years. There are more coming even from Canada, notwithstanding its abundance of cheap lands, to this country than are coming from Ireland. There are more, by nearly fifteen or twenty thousand a year, coming from Canada alone to the United States than are coming from Ireland. Germany
has sent us three times as many as Ireland has, but then Germany has forty-five millions of people and Ireland only five millions. The proportion, however, is larger for Ireland, because Ireland alone sent us last year 63,000, while Germany, with eight times the population, sent, I think, only 190,000.

VALUE OF IMMIGRATION.

Now, I believe that we should keep these people at work here, where they will spend their money. They will make more money for us. The goods, being made here will make ten times as much business for us as they will if made in Europe.

I do not know that you will think my points well made; but they are points that have presented themselves to me in thinking this subject out for myself. I am today, as I told you, in the dry goods business, but I have worked at a business about which one of my friends has testified here, and I can vouch for the truth of his statements.

AMERICA THE HOPE OF THE WORLD'S LABORERS.

I think we need in every proper way to encourage the making of ourselves independent of these influences which are driving from other countries the laboring men—the bone and sinew of any country. When three quarters of a million of people come to this country every year from other countries, the fact speaks for itself as to where the hopes of the laboring portion of the world lie. The figures I have given you are from official returns; they may not be entirely accurate, but they are quite close enough for the purposes of the argument. They have been impressed deeply on my mind.

FLOW OF GOLD TO AMERICA.

The need of our having a large balance of trade in our favor was shown in the few years ending 1873. In 1874 and 1875 the trade was entirely equal. Then came the short crops in Europe, and we had a large balance of trade in our favor, but it was not until we had $150,000,000, or more, in our favor that any net increase of gold came to our shores, and during these years, with thirty millions of imports in our favor, we have gained net from the other countries not over one hundred millions of gold. If you take into consideration the exports of silver over imports, it would be about $60,000,000.

ENGLISH INVESTMENTS IN AMERICA TWO BILLIONS OF DOLLARS.

You see, then, where we stand. We are exposed at any time to the same trouble that we had in 1857, when there was trouble in Europe—when the British capitalists sent over thirty or forty millions of our bonds, and a demand for gold was created, and a crisis came on. Two billions of English gold are invested here in city, county, and State bonds, and in mortgages on real estate, and they can call for that gold at any time. I think Dr. Green said there was not a State, and hardly a county, in the United States in which British money was not invested. From what I learn from other sources, I do not think he spoke far out of the way; but they can get gold from this country at any time.

EUROPE'S FEAR OF A LOSS OF GOLD.

The European countries have been for the last two or three years in constant fear of a loss of gold. If they lose a little gold, they begin to put up the price of exchange; but they can at any time get gold from this country by sending over a small quantity of these bonds, or they
can take the greenbacks and demand gold and silver, and there is where our silver is a great blessing to us, because when our gold gamblers attempt to get up a corner in gold, the Government has it in its power to take a little silver, and they can bluff any attempt to create a corner in gold in that way.

Q. At 85 cents on the dollar?—A. Well, it is better than any European silver.

Q. That is your point—that they can treat it as worth 85 cents on the dollar?—A. Yes; silver is a bulky article; but our silver is worth more than European silver. The Mexican dollar is worth a cent more than our dollar, but we make a better silver dollar than any other country, with the exception of Mexico.

Q. But you do not think there is any danger that they will make the demand?—A. Our silver is a product of our own soil, our own labor.

The Chairman. I am not finding any fault with the silver.

The Witness. In France they have three times as much silver as we have. Ours is worth 3 cents on the dollar more than theirs.

**SILVER AN AMERICAN PRODUCT.**

All the gold gamblers know how silver would block them, and that is why there is so much opposition to silver. We coin one-half the product of the world to-day, of silver—nearly fifty millions; probably in a few years it will be quite fifty millions. That is one of the great industries of the country; we produce half the product of the world in that line.

If people should stop dealing in gold, gold would fall in price. There is really more silver in circulation in every European country than there is here. The reason of that is that there are no small bills there. The Bank of England only issues £5 notes (23).

**A TARIFF TO PROTECT AMERICAN ARTISANS.**

The thing to do is to keep men at work here; to adjust the tariff so as to keep American artisans at work in all departments. Our laws should be so framed as to encourage every industry which can be followed here by making it possible to pay a fair price for labor, and I include in that the silver question.

**SILVER CURRENCY IN THE UNITED STATES.**

Q. How many car loads have we of silver?—A. I do not know. The Government has issued some $90,000,000 of silver certificates which are to-day doing business as money. There are $82,000,000 out, and they pay better than the gold certificates do.

Q. Somebody hoards the gold certificates, do they not; is it in the banks, or where?—A. No; it is paid in.

Q. Why does silver stay out better than gold when the gold is worth so much?—A. I will tell you; three gold certificates are paid in for duties to one silver certificate; the gold comes back into the Treasury quicker. The silver stays out better.

Q. Will not the Treasury take the silver?—A. Yes.

Q. Then why do they not pay it for duties?

**SILVER CERTIFICATES REMAIN IN CIRCULATION, GOLD CERTIFICATES DO NOT.**

A. I do not know. I only see from the records that there are three times as many gold certificates paid in.
Q. Is it not because the man that pays customs duties goes for those gold certificates and pays his customs with them?—A. I should think it is rather because somebody has gone for the silver certificates and kept them.

Q. I ask you how it is that the man who pays the customs duties happens to have the gold certificates, unless it is because he values them more, and that class of men understand the difference?—A. I simply state the fact that the silver certificates do stay out, even at a so-called value of 85 cents.

Q. They are just as good as gold, are they not?—A. They pass just as well. Imagine the effect of withdrawing them from circulation; our people are constantly expressing fear of the effects on the country by a withdrawal of the circulation; but we have added $90,000,000 to the circulation.

Q. You think we ought to keep right on mining?

NECESSITY FOR SILVER AS A CIRCULATING MEDIUM.

A. Yes; I think if God has uncovered the treasures of the earth to us and given us silver, we ought to use it. If we have at least as much in proportion as other nations have, we need not feel any alarm. France has three times as much silver as we have, although she has only three-fourths as much population. France has over $300,000,000 in the banks alone, and the silver is not produced there either, but is bought. From 1873 to 1875, France bought $100,000,000 worth of silver, while we have it in the ground and have only got to dig it out.

Q. Why is it useful except to work in the arts?—A. For the same reason that gold is. It is used for money in every country in the world.

Q. You think it is a demonstration that the amount of our circulating medium is small, and that there is every year a demand for more, at least equivalent to the amount that we coin?—A. A country growing at the rate of a million or more of people a year is going to need more currency. When we commenced mining silver we had none, while other countries had a great deal. It will take eighteen years at the present rate of coinage to have as much as France has to-day, with only three-fourths of our population, and by that time we will have double the population.

NO APPREHENSION FROM THE SILVER QUESTION.

Q. You are not frightened, as Mr. Atkinson is, by the idea of silver coinage?—A. Not at all. The silver is in the ground, and by digging it out we can get it and can have so much money to send to other nations. Go to any European market and you will find American silver circulating there, even in England.

Q. Which will be the crank, you or Mr. Atkinson?—A. I do not know anything about Mr. Atkinson's views.

Q. You heard his testimony, did you not?—A. No, I did not; I was not here.

Q. He apprehends convulsions to this country by the coinage of silver?

BENEFICIAL RESULTS OF SILVER MONEY IN FRANCE.

A. Well, France has three times as much as we have, and that is not the product of their own mines but that which they have purchased, and it has not produced a convulsion there. If three times our silver does not produce a convulsion there with three-fourths of our population,
why should we fear? And by the time the eighteen years are up that
I have spoken of we shall have double the population.

The CHAIRMAN. The great difficulty is, with gentlemen like Mr. At-
tkinson, that, the coinage going on, there will by-and-by be more silver
than gold, and the transition would be from gold as legal tender to sil-
ver as legal tender, worth 15 cents less on the dollar, and thus all the
contracts of the country will be liquidated at 85 per cent. of what they
have been hitherto calling for.

AMOUNT OF GOLD AND SILVER IN THIS COUNTRY.

The WITNESS. The last report of the amount of gold in the country
was $560,000,000. That was some months ago. The amount is increas-
ing every day. The amount in the Treasury to-day is about $200,000,000
of gold and $100,000,000 of silver. The Bank of France has to-day
$207,000,000 of silver and less than $200,000,000 of gold. Two years
ago it had less than $120,000,000 of gold to more than $247,000,000 of
silver.

EXCESS OF SILVER OVER GOLD IN EUROPE.

Any European country that reports silver has more silver in bank
than gold. It is always understood that there is three times as much
silver in the banks of Germany as there is gold. The banks of the
Netherlands, of Austro-Hungary, and all those banks, have a great deal
larger a proportion of silver than gold, and it does not produce a con-
vulsion there. Why should it do so here, especially when our silver is the
product of our own mines? What would you think of a man who has
the largest crop of potatoes in this country, and uses no potatoes, but
uses corn.

Q. Mr. Atkinson was trifling and frightening us for nothing then?

THE COINAGE OF SILVER NOT DRIVING OUT GOLD.

A. I think so. When they first commenced the agitation of the silver
question it struck me as odd that they should demand that there should
be a dollar's worth of silver in the dollar. I did not see why the Gov-
ernment should put a dollar's worth of silver into the coin any more
than a shoemaker should put a dollar's worth of leather into shoes. I
saw, then, that we had more silver than any country except Mexico,
and they said it was going to drive all the gold out of the country.
That seemed absurd to me, and I watched it with interest, and I found
my ideas of its absurdity to be correct.

GOLD MORE PLENTIFUL SINCE THE COINAGE OF SILVER.

We have never had so much gold in the country as we have to-day.
We have not been able to retain the product of our own mines, and had
to obtain some from foreign countries. We have never seen the day
when we had half as much gold in the country as we have to-day. If
it were not for the foreign debt we should have a very large supply.

Q. Do you believe that they will ever call for that silver across the
water?—A. They are calling for it every day.

Q. I mean for the two billions of dollars of bonds that we have abroad.—
A. They have not got to do that. If they send for one hundred millions
that would be enough.

Q. Do you believe they will ever do that? Do you think they will
ever send for it as long as they get the interest in gold?—A. I do not think they will, but I say in case of any trouble in Europe they have only to send over here forty or fifty million dollars.

Q. Do you suppose we could hire the money over there somewhere?—A. What we want to get is gold.

Q. Do you not suppose we could buy gold there?

EFFECTS OF EUROPEAN NATIONS TO RETAIN GOLD.

A. There is a constant pulling and hauling between the European nations to-day to get gold. Just as soon as it begins to go out of the country a little bit, up goes the price of discount.

Q. Do you think Great Britain is likely to want that gold?—A. Her banks have put up the price of discounts almost double what they used to be within a year or so. They have done that at times in order to retain gold.

Q. The banks in England have done that?—A. Yes.

Q. Suppose they wanted fifty millions of gold, could we not raise it; we have $200,000,000 in the Treasury?—A. We could raise it very well.

Q. Then, if they did not call for more than that, we could pay for that in silver, could we not?—A. I say that the demand for gold would set our people here to work. My main point is to keep people at work. The point I have always had in view is that when we keep a man at work here we do five times as much business for ourselves as by keeping him at work in Europe. I ought to say that in the reports of the banks of Europe, as to silver, they show none. For instance, there is in England a circulation of silver among the people, but none in the banks.

BOSTON, MASS., OCTOBER 19, 1883.

GEORGE W. SIMONDS EXAMINED.

By the CHAIRMAN:


Q. What is your business?—A. General mechanic.

Q. "General mechanic"—Jack of all trades?—A. Well, yes; I have practically learned several trades.

Q. What would like to say to the committee?

SHORT HOURS TEND TO MORE AND BETTER WORK.

A. I wanted to give you a little experience in relation to the eight-hour system. I am an advocate for giving men from eight to nine hours’ work. I went to work in 1853, for a firm in Shirley, Mass., near Ayre Junction, and I found that the men were working there from early candle-light until late in the evening. My own experience for years before in my works was that I could do more work in a shorter amount of time, and do it better, by daylight. I talked to the firm and they said they would keep an account that year particularly to see what amount of work was done. They had forty-five to fifty men constantly at work—blacksmiths, painters, wood-workers, and the like. They kept a strict account of the work that year. The next spring they hired all their men to work eleven hours in the summer and nine in the winter, making an average of ten hours’ work for the year. That year they kept an account of their work, and they produced a larger amount of work with
the less number of hours. The help took more interest in the work and its quality. I know that. They seemed to feel that the work was their own. That firm carried on business for a number of years, but has gone out of business now. Afterwards I carried on business for myself in the town of Linville, in this State. I commenced business with hardly anything—first hiring one man, then two.

BENEFITS OF SYMPATHY BETWEEN EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYÉ.

Q. At what business?—A. Carriage manufacturing, horse-shoeing, and the blacksmith business. I talked with my men, and associated with them and boarded them at my house, and found that by interesting myself in the affairs of the men they would interest themselves for me; and if I were going to start a business to-morrow I would not hire men to work over eight or nine hours. In some kinds of business more hours are required to do the work; but where a man can concentrate his labor on his work, I am confident that he can do as much labor as he ought to do in eight hours of the twenty-four.

THE EIGHT-HOUR LAW AND EDUCATION.

I am satisfied of another thing, that a man working that number of hours has more time to educate himself. The greatest trouble we have at the present time is that those who are workingmen are not educated as they should be. For instance, we have organized in this city a fair that has been running now for three years—this is the third year. I should like to see every workingman have the opportunity of visiting that fair for a few days. It is the best school that can be found for workingmen to go through. I worked there a whole season on the building last year and this year. I have been there four weeks steady, and I tell you it is a great educator.

Q. Do any working people go there?—A. Many working people could not go there.

Q. Is it free?—A. No, sir; they have to pay 50 cents to get in. If the State could appropriate money enough so that all the workingmen could get into it for three days each season, they could not expend the money in a better way. People learn quicker with the eye than with a book, and when they see things, as they do at such a fair, it is better for them than reading about things.

A VOLUNTARY RATHER THAN AN ENFORCED EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

But I have no idea that an enforced-eight hour system is so good in its results as the results would be if such a rule was brought about by the voluntary action of the employers. There would be great social benefits arising from it then. My idea is that the person who employs labor will encourage his help more by letting them see what efforts he voluntarily makes for their good than by any other course. If he helps them to educate themselves, and gives them time to do it, they will do more and better work and, whatever the number of hours of labor, they will do willingly everything that is done, and will take an interest in his business. It can hardly be expected that they will take interest in the business of men who are compelled by law to observe certain hours for their help to work. Many men do not like to be legally forced to do a certain thing. And, as things are among the working people, a great many of them, if they had more time to themselves than they have now,
would be able to educate themselves, provided they were helped a little. I am not a member of a trades-union of any kind, consequently I can look somewhat impartially at the relations between the workingmen and the employers.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. The kindly employer uses persuasion; the other man does not; and if the other man does not, the kindly employer is brought into competition in his business and is obliged to act accordingly. — A. Well, perhaps so. I know that I succeeded with my help very fairly.

A FAVORABLE EXPERIENCE WITH SHORT HOURS.

Q. You think it was demonstrated that you could do more business the way you managed your help on short time? — A. Yes; I was satisfied of it, because I know that in Shirley we did more with the same amount of help in less hours than we did with longer hours.

Q. That could not be so with a large factory, could it, where most of the work is done by machinery and the human agency is of indifferent importance? — A. Well, a human being can do a certain amount of work in a given time, and he cannot do any more. A man can’t do more than a certain amount of work in a year, and I think a man ought to work so that he can work every day in a year, and so that at the end of that year he would not be tired. I should like to see men feel just as fresh the next day, as they ought to feel, able and willing and ready to take hold.

Q. Would not this be the rule: That where machinery dominates, the shorter day’s work would produce less; and where human agency dominates, the day’s work would produce more? — A. Well, a man can do better on a machine by working diligently and given better attention to it for eight hours.

Q. There is no rule that will apply to it, then? — A. No. My idea is that the employer and the employed have interests in common.

Q. And is it not true that a man can stand some kinds of work twelve hours in a day easier than at others he can stand eight? — A. Certainly.

Q. That is a fact, you think? — A. Yes.

CAPITAL AND LABOR NOT INIMICAL.

Q. Is not that one of the great difficulties that comes from fixing a definite term for a day’s work by general law? — A. My idea is that forcing a man to a legal day’s work for everything is not as good as a general education that shall bring the employer and employed to see that their interests are one. That is the way I look at it. I can see no conflict between capital and labor if it is rightly employed. I cannot see it under any circumstances.

Q. Is it a question between capital and labor, or rather as to who is to handle the price of the product? — A. I think there would be less trouble if the employer should feel that he was not any better than his help, and if the help should feel that he was not any better than his employer in one sense of the word, if I may express it in that way.

Q. You think it is a social question? — A. I think it is a social question. I think the more inducements we can give the help, and the better we treat them, the better the help will do for us, and the more we are well treated the better we can do. It is working for our common interests—each man working for the other’s interest.

Q. Then your prescription is the Christian religion? — A. Well, it comes about as near that as almost anything.
COMMON SCHOOLS.

My idea in relation to common schools is: I heard a gentleman this morning speaking here, and saying that they should teach natural philosophy and mathematics. Natural philosophy is not brought out in our schools in this State, and this State has as good schools as any State, I think.

Q. Except New Hampshire.—A. Well, New Hampshire has good schools, but I think Massachusetts has better. I think that in all schools, if we could let the children have more practical education in mechanics and natural philosophy it would be better.

Q. Do you think that in the common schools they can study natural philosophy and understand it?—A. Certain portions of it could be brought out by the teachers.

Q. Do they not study philosophy in the common schools here a good deal?—A. When you get to the upper benches they do.

Q. At what age would you commence?—A. As soon as I could teach a boy the simple balance.

Q. As soon as he could learn to teeter?—A. Yes; I would teach him on a teeter-board that that was about as near perpetual motion as he could get. I would take him into the fairs and show him the operation of machines, and into the cotton-mills.

Q. That could not be done in school, could it?—A. I would have those things explained in the schools.

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

Q. Then you would have the industrial idea introduced?—A. Yes; I would have the industrial idea taught in the schools, and let children learn practical measurements, and practical heights more than they are taught at the present time. My idea would be that common schools all over the country should have magic lanterns, and could give exhibitions and lectures on them—throwing on the screens everything that is possible to illustrate that way. Almost everything can be thrown on screens by the magic lantern, and I think it would be one of the best auxiliaries to teachers.

Q. Is it made use of at all in these schools here?—A. I do not know that it is in the common schools. I have not seen it in the common schools.

THE MAGIC LANTERN AS AN EDUCATOR.

Q. What illustrations of its efficiency have you seen?—A. I have been in towns where free lectures have been given in the winter where they hired people with apparatus of that sort, and I found that scholars having seen such things would take up their geography, or other studies, with more interest. It seemed to give a new interest to the school work. I have lived in the country a large share of my life, and taken a great interest in the education of the young. Knowing that many grown men were deficient, I wanted to see the younger ones get a better education.

Q. Do you think that if that idea should be applied by the General Government in the Territories and the District of Columbia, it would be imitated in the States?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. And it would be in those Territories?—A. Yes; I think that if I were active in Congress, and were forming a law for general education in the Territories I should encourage the industrial education of the younger classes.

36—C 3—(5 LAW)
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

BOSTON, MASS., October 19, 1883.

GEORGE W. WARREN examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. I reside in Boston, and have resided there for sixty-odd years.

Q. What have been your pursuits?—A. I have been in the mercantile and banking business for forty-odd years.

MAKE THE SILVER DOLLAR PAYABLE IN GOLD.

Before I proceed to the point upon which I really came to speak, I wish to say that, having made a life study of finance, and knowing something of the temper and tone of the community, my conviction is that the disturbing cause to all the industries and business of the United States is the cataclysm we stand over—the dishonest silver dollar—that until that is made payable in gold you can see no restoration of confidence. Make that payable in gold as you have made your small silver, and as all the countries of the world have made their small silver—for no European country uses anything but small silver—and you at once have a standard.

THE BOSTON EVENING HIGH SCHOOL.

I came here last night to hear my friend, Mr. E. O. Carrigan, of the board of education, talk upon the public evening schools of Boston, and it is on that subject that I wish to say a word, because I was one of the earliest promoters of it. I wish to say that next to our common-school system I know of nothing that has done so much for humanity. I have myself raised from ignorance one of the best men I ever had in my business—as assistant porter—an Irishman who very much wanted to learn. I got him to attend an evening school, and he is now at the head of one of the departments of Jordan Marsh & Co. That evening school is doing an immense amount of good, and the evening schools generally will help to keep us from being swamped by the enormous immigration that is coming in among us. Forty years ago I went to the labor centers of Europe and studied labor. I have revisited Europe eighteen times since that time. I am a son of a carpenter and I am proud of my early training in that direction—a training in the mechanical arts.

The CHAIRMAN. A man may well be proud of his origin who is a son of a carpenter.

The WITNESS. And his name was Joseph—a very good name—Joseph Warren.

THE LABOR QUESTION DEPENDENT ON THE MONEY QUESTION.

Now, as to the labor question, I have to start upon the money question in order to get at it.

WAGES OF LABOR IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

In the seventeenth century labor was a valueless portion. From a penny on to sixpence per day was the price of labor—sixpence per day being the highest known value of labor in all Europe. The weavers were the first that ever appeared in the ranks of labor who could earn sixpence a day. All the other industrial classes belonged to the soil on which they were born. With the settlement of this country the de-
mand for labor was a shilling a day, and from that day to this we have gone on increasing, keeping the lead of Europe in most employments. There are employments that are now paying very nearly as well as our own.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE BANKS OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

The point I now come to is the most vital of all, underlying everything in this world—honest money. Honest money and skilled labor have made New England, and have made Scotland what she is. And as we go over the centuries of finance, from the eighth century B.C. to this day, we come to A.D. 1694 before we find a single green spot upon which we may refresh ourselves—that is, the Bank of England. The first pure credit was a bank of England bill, of even sum, £20 and upward, for merchants.

A dozen Scotchmen—for Scotchmen were the same then as they are to-day, the bright “Yankees” of the Old World—seeing the advantages of the Bank of England, immediately organized a little bank for Scotland with £100,000 for capital. They paid in only 10 per cent., £10,000. In 1694 there was very little that people could do with their money. Those men established branches at Dundee, Glasgow, and Aberdeen, and soon had to withdraw them because they did not pay. Gradually they loaned the money out and thus encouraged the people of that benighted and almost barbarous district to industry and thrift. McLeod, the Scotchman, in writing of it, says that Scotland was the most barbarous of all the civilized nations of the world at that time. There had been battles between England and Scotland for centuries; Scotland had been depopulated and impoverished, and her interests in every way destroyed. When this little banking capital went in there, it gradually fostered industry. The money was lent to the mechanic, or the small hand-loom weaver, or the farmer, and soon the bank men were able—after about twelve years—to call in 10 per cent. more.

In 1702 they were allowed to issue £1 notes instead of £5 notes, which up to that time they had been issuing. From that day to this that has been a bone of contention with the Bank of England. This £1 note went largely into circulation. Mind you, a bank had then only circulation and capital. There were no deposits.

ORIGINATION OF BANK DEPOSITS AND CHECKS.

Checks, and what we would call banking them (deposits), began in 1780. Our present banking system is only one hundred years old. Scotland went on and called for 10 per cent. more, when the Royal Bank of Scotland was chartered in 1727, and two years later—and I now come to the point—the marriage of capital and labor took place. In 1729 the Royal Bank instituted what is called in Scotland their cash-credit system.

THE CASH-CREDIT SYSTEM OF SCOTTISH BANKS.

This cash-credit system extends to every man of character and capacity—every man who can bring what they call three or four “cautioners” (what we call guarantors)—to be security for his credit. That credit was granted to him from £100 to £1,000; and it was a revolving credit. As fast as he could pay in, if he needed it, it would be renewed, and he paid interest only on the amount of money used, and for the time it was used. That system went on, carrying prosperity everywhere, attracting inhabitants and encouraging industries; schools sprang up;
soon churches; soon the commerce of Glasgow with the Jamaica Islands, formerly very famous, was established—I am sketching the ground rapidly.

The whole of that field began to blossom, and the Scotch school system was established, which is now so famous and which has done so much for Scotland. The churches followed the schools, and that barbarous people were lifted out of their ignorance and poverty into a position as to which it may be said that there is not to-day a more intelligent community on the face of the earth, taking the average through, than the Scotch people. Scotland is sometimes called the "Yankeeland" of the Old World, and it is a compliment alike to New England and to Scotland.

THE MONOMETALLIC STANDARD; ITS RESULTS.

Now, the point I am coming to is this: that Scotland started with the honest gold standard—following England—the first time in the history of the world that we find the monometallic standard. And what has been its experience? To-day, silver countries, alike with gold countries, have to pay their exchanges in the gold sterling value of Great Britain. And that financial equity which has been the history of Great Britain, with that one currency to settle the balances and exchanges of the world—pounds, shillings, and pence—is an example for christendom. If we in this country had had the sense to keep the same standard dollar from the beginning to now, our decimal system, from its greater simplicity, would have ruled the exchanges of the world.

PERSONAL LIABILITY OF BANK DIRECTORS IN SCOTLAND.

I have touched upon that history of Scotland simply to show you something about its currency. A gentleman who spoke before you last night spoke of a private banker failing. There are no private bankers who ever issued bills in Scotland. Every bank in Scotland is a joint-stock bank, and every stockholder in a bank is liable for every debt of the bank. We saw that in a late remarkable case of the Western Bank, with its immense loss, which had all to be subscribed and paid up by the wealthy stockholders who were able to respond. And I have to say this for Scotch currency, that from 1695 down to our day there has never been a time when the currency of Scotland has not been at par. Why? It has had some unfortunate periods. When in 1745 the rebellion occurred, the pretender appeared, and Edinburgh was taken possession of. Before his coming the bank invited all to bring in their bills and get their gold, and they said, "If we do not pay, we will pay interest until we do pay." Six per cent. interest was allowed, and the bills kept at par.

With this circulation of £1 notes, and this cash-credit system, there, as I have said, was the first union I find in history of capital with labor.

INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION IN PREPARING FOR THE UNION OF CAPITAL WITH LABOR.

I must step aside now to call your attention to the educational influences that have been started in this good city of Boston. In 1637 the first free school in the world was established here, where the children of the poor and rich all attended, sat upon the same pine penches and learned their lessons of equality.
The publication of the grand old Bible of King James, where the common people found English that they could read, stimulated everybody to learn to read, so that they might learn to read the Bible; and then they learned to think, and the laboring classes who had been using only muscle began to put thought into their work, and began to do better work, and with the close of that century and the beginning of the eighteenth century capital began to join them.

UNION OF CAPITAL WITH LABOR IN THE 18TH CENTURY.

So we have in the 18th century the beginning of the union of capital with labor, which has seemed to be such a blessed thing, but may be run into the ground (as it has been in the past), if danger be not guarded against. Capital and intelligence under the forms of money and skilled labor have moved on together, until, with this century, and in this country, first, from the laborer appeared the workman (a name unknown before), then the master workman, and in time, the inventor; for at the beginning of the century whose termination we celebrated at Philadelphia in 1876, of all the machines exhibited, not one was in being at the beginning of the century. The very name of machinist was unknown at the beginning of the century, though, we had our blacksmiths and whitesmiths.

NECESSITY OF GOLD STANDARD.

This century has seen the incoming of the inventor, and now, with all this grand extension of skill and labor and inventive power, we need more than ever a measure of value that shall not only be fixed and eternal, but beyond suspicion. The moment you bring a suspicion in it checks the confidence of the community, and when you check the confidence of the community you check credit, and when you check credit you check every industry. We are now in a position where, if the balance of trade goes against us, gold leaves us. Why? Because it will pay 100 per cent. on the dollar outside of our own borders, while silver will only pay five-sixths of a dollar. The amount of silver that we have in our silver dollar to-day is only five-sixths of a dollar, and it goes nowhere for a dollar outside of our own borders. It is a forced currency—what Daniel Webster called a “degraded coin”—next to an irredeemable currency; he called it the greatest curse that can be inflicted upon an industrial community, and that is true, for it takes away confidence; it paralyzes capital; it destroys the expectation of prosperity.

I had the pleasure of writing, before resumption, that if we would resume with $30,000,000, we probably never would reduce it $5,000,000, and that we would probably increase it, for resumption in the history of the world has always been restoration of confidence in all industries, and if we could only have had the courage to resume ten years earlier, we should have seen ten years earlier the prosperity that came with resumption.

HONEST MONEY, HONEST LABOR, AND THE SCHOOL-HOUSE.

To come to the point, then, I feel that in this question, in relation to industry, there are three things intimately related—honest money, honest labor, and the school-house. You might call it intelligence and honest labor. These are the three interests which we are to preserve with
care, for as we look back over their introduction and their influence upon humanity, and see what a boon and blessing they have been, we are impressed with the importance of preserving them with the care with which we would preserve the most precious things we have in this world—our honor, our virtue, our integrity. We cannot preserve either of them without preserving the standard measure of value which includes quality as well as quantity.

Our gold measure is a measure of transfer in exchange that settles a debt—an entirely different thing from the purchasing power which the Greenbackers are so deluded about; that because the price of the use of money varies, the price of money varies. The purchasing power of money is one thing, and the paying power of money is an entirely different thing.

Since the appearance upon the stage of the gold coin as the master coin, four centuries after silver began—in all that time, in all the exchanges of the world, we cannot see a shadow or a shade of turning in the measure of value of that gold coin as a paying coin. Some will say you cannot buy as much now with gold as you formerly could. Why? Labor was then four pence and six pence a day; everything that labor produced was cheap. The moment you make wages a dollar a day, or two dollars, or five dollars a day, you not only have more cost, but you have more quality, and the changes are in the comforts which any man who has been in Europe, to say nothing of this country, has seen in forty years. In the withdrawal of so much labor from Europe we have benefited every man that remained behind who had intelligence and industry enough to go to work.

To illustrate the point I have reference to—because it is a revelation in the financial world—to demonstrate the reason why raising the rate of interest by the Bank of England stops the outflow of gold which our friend [Mr. Bancroft] referred to, it will be manifest to every one that where money is 10 per cent. it will be at 10 years' purchase. In England we have for a number of years had the familiar twenty years' purchase—5 per cent. and if real estate rents for £1,000 per annum it will sell for £20,000. Twenty times the lease held will be the value of the property. In 1869 and 1870, in our Western States, I bought 10 per cent. bonds at from 95 to par, but at an average of say, par. That is 10 years' purchase. There the purchasing power of money at 10 per cent. is just twice what it is when money is at 5 per cent. My money is returned to me every ten years instead of twenty years.

POWER OF THE BANK OF ENGLAND OVER EXCHANGES.

The Bank of England has the power of raising the rate of interest, a power which we have not. If we had that power, we might stop every panic, almost, of the world—for they all begin here. With the exception of the panic of 1866, we have no record of any that did not commence here.

When the Bank of England gives notice of its intention to consider the raising of the rate of interest that is considered as a note of warning. If that does not answer, then they raise the rate of interest one-half of 1 per cent.; and if that does not answer, they raise it another one-half of 1 per cent.; and if that does not answer, they raise it 1 per cent., and so they change the value of the exchange from being against to being for London. Raising the rate of interest increases the purchasing power of the money; in other words, everything else falls. You buy more than you did before. Orders for exports that could not be filled
before are filled now, and an increasing volume of exports flows out. Orders for imports are countermanded, and the diminished volume of imports going to meet the other volume of exports, gold ceases to flow, because it does not pay—it is not wanted. That question of ‘Does it pay?’ settles everything in regard to whether the bonds of the United States should go to England or come from England here. It is done as easily as water flows down hill by the laws of gravitation. So all values are forced to the market that pays most by the law of value.

**DISADVANTAGES OF BIMETALLIC STANDARDS.**

I am rather crude in my remarks, because I have tried to get over a little too much ground; but the point I am trying to get at is this: We are without any financial system in the United States. We have two standards of value—two measures—one worth five-sixths of an honest dollar, current only here as a forced currency, the other the value of the whole world. So many millions of gold, whether coined or not, in every market of the world are worth what we call 100 cents on the dollar. That gold must leave us if a balance of trade comes against us. Fortunately it has not been against us since the folly was first perpetrated, and we began to accumulate this wealth of silver. Since that time, and after the first rush of prosperity, we have had this uneasiness, which is increasing every day, and it is the interest next after education that more affects the industrial classes than it does any of the millionaires. I mean more vitally so for the good of the country. And the one thing that we ought to have learned in our day, with all the schooling we have had, is that honesty is the best policy; and that in the history of the world an honest dollar, or an honest coin, has been the only thing that has ever brought prosperity to the land, and that whatever that measure shall be, it must be unchangeable, like the gold coin of England, which redeems all its silver. Like the gold coin of England, it must promise to pay the same for one day, one month, one year, ten years, one hundred years. For nearly three hundred years that unchangeable standard has existed, and it has become from that very unchangeable character, with honesty and equity, the mistress of the commercial world.

**SAMUEL A. BANCROFT** further examined at his own request.

**GOLD AND SILVER IN THE UNITED STATES AND FRANCE.**

The Witness. For forty years before 1873 silver had been worth a premium in gold. Daniel Webster could not therefore have called it "dishonest money." Before 1879 there was no silver in the country to drive out gold. For sixteen years we exported more gold than we imported, amounting to $500,000,000 in that time. Since that date we have imported one hundred millions more than we exported; that is, since we had silver. The United States coined but eight millions of standard dollars before 1878. France has more five-franc pieces than we have standard dollars, and French silver is worth 3 per cent. less than the United States dollar.

---

**BOSTON, MASS., October 19, 1883.**

**CARROLL D. WRIGHT** recalled and further examined.

The Witness. I have stated that after paying the interest on capital invested and the expenses of manufacture, there was left, in all the in-
dustries of Massachusetts, $34,505,000, and over, as a net profit to the establishment. You asked me why that net profit could not be distributed among the laborers.

The CHAIRMAN. A portion of it.
The WITNESS. A portion of it.

WHY PROFITS CANNOT BE DISTRIBUTED AMONG EMPLOYEES.

The reasons which I gave you, whether valid or invalid, but the best that there were, may be supplemented by still another: that is, that net profit must pay for the management of 14,352 establishments, which gives but $2,404 for the compensation of management of each industrial establishment in the Commonwealth, and the only question that can be raised about that is whether, say, $2,400, is an exorbitant compensation for the management, on an average, of the industrial concerns of the Commonwealth.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. How many industrial concerns are there?—Answer. Fourteen thousand three hundred and fifty-two, which make, say, $34,000,000 profit. Those figures that I give you are derived from returns of manufacturers, certified as correct, to the United States Census of 1880, and the results of my own estimates.

Q. What were the average wages to each laborer?—A. My report will tell you that. I think it was $364.

Q. Do you recollect the number of laborers?—A. It was 352,255.

Q. Is there any other matter that has occurred to you that it might be well to state?—A. I have nothing specific, unless you care to investigate the question of convict labor to any extent.

The CHAIRMAN. That has been called to our attention several times, and we would be glad to get your views about it.

CONVICT PRISON LABOR.

The WITNESS. Under the instructions of the legislature, I very thoroughly examined that question, and I find that while the ordinary contract system, as known in the North, is the best for the treasury of the State, it is not the best for the reform of the convicts; and yet all the remedies that have been suggested simply shift the burden from one side to the other, and do not remove the evils, whatever they are, that grow out of the employment of convicts. The only real remedy which I have been able to discover, lies in the manufacture of all the goods which a State might use for its own purposes, thereby throwing the product of convict labor entirely out of the market, and the State having the benefit of whatever immediately results from such manufacture.

CONVICT LABOR A QUESTION FOR THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.

I do not know but that the National Government will, some day, have to settle the question of convict labor, because if one State prohibits the employment of convicts on a certain industry which prevails within its borders, it only throws that industry into the prisons of a neighboring State, and does not solve the difficulty at all, while if the National Government should contract with the different States to manufacture in their respective prisons whatever goods the General Government
might need in clothing the Army and the Navy, and for use in various other directions, they might be able to solve this question and reduce whatever evil there is coming from the employment of convicts in industrial trades to the very smallest possible point.

Q. How serious do you think the production of convict labor is a disturbing force in industry?—A. It is not particularly serious. There are only a very few thousand in the United States employed on productive industry in our prisons. It is a mere cipher compared with the total product; but it is not the quantity that is so much involved, it is the influence which a very small product may have in regulating the prices in the market.

Q. Is the quality of such production usually poorer than that of the outside manufacturer?—A. Yes.

Q. And you think that, as an article of inferior quality, it yet tends to reduce the price of outside manufacture?—A. In some instances, as in the manufacture of boots and shoes. Some of our prisons turn out pretty good work in that line—such as to compete in the market with the product of pretty fair establishments. If the State itself conducts the manufactures of a prison, the evil is still worse than if contractors conduct it, so far as the influence upon outside industry is concerned—for this reason: The State is not obliged to make a profit on its manufactures, and it cannot be forced into bankruptcy, while a private concern contracting for the manufacture of goods in a prison must make a profit or fail, so that the State and public-account system offer a worse and more demoralizing condition than the contract system.

EXPORTING GOODS PRODUCED BY CONVICT LABOR.

Q. What is the reason that the State cannot export its entire production, and thus in no sense whatever become a competitor with American production?—A. That might be a very excellent plan in some directions.

Q. Why not in all—you get the work the same, get it for nothing, exert the reformatory influence, send the work all out of the country, and it competes with no American manufacture whatever, being sold out of the country?—A. As a temporary expedient that might work very well; but the time will soon come when nations will see that it is to their advantage to be on the same terms in commercial matters that States are now; that there shall be no more dividing line between one nation and another than there is between States now.

Q. You mean when the tariff laws will disappear?—A. No; when the systems of tariff will become more uniform.

Q. We can probably find among the developing peoples of the world the opportunity of selling the sort of goods that are manufactured in prisons, and to make enough out of the trade to pay for the raw material.—A. That might be very well. The chief objection I see to it now is that of Governments engaging in industrial business.

Q. And yet it does so—it keeps the men at work; so that that objection is met by the fact that the Government already does engage in the business.—A. The influence of the removal of the contract system is purely a moral one—in a very small degree an economical one—but the Government should certainly have an eye to the moral influences of such trade. I think your proposition is one that ought to be pretty carefully studied. I will certainly give it serious thought.

The CHAIRMAN. I presume it has never been suggested before; but I have thought somewhat on the subject of contract prison labor, and
I have wondered whether it might not be the duty of the State, if it takes the man's labor, to give him the benefit of it, so that, for example, after the State is indemnified for all the expense it has been to, of legal process and of the maintenance of the convict, there should be some way in which the results of his labor should be available as a fund from which he might draw, under suitable regulations, when he should be let out again, as a means toward his making an honest livelihood.

The WITNESS. That experiment has been tried in our prison, is now being tried in the overwork system.

Q. And I believe they shorten the sentence a little!—A. Yes; they shorten the sentence for good behavior, and pay cash wages for overwork, so that there is now over a thousand dollars a month being accumulated, I understand.

Q. That is about a dollar a month, however, to each of a thousand convicts?—A. It would be; we have about 600 now.

The CHAIRMAN. If a man remains there for life he may have enough to bury him; but I mean that the convict might receive, for instance, three-fourths of the earnings of an ordinary workman—that he should receive the benefit of whatever trade is carried on by him in the prison. It seems to me that society should make that fund available to the prisoner in some way; it is the strongest guarantee of reform, while the method now acted upon is almost a guarantee that the man will continue in crime, no matter what good impulses may have been implanted during the time that coercion has compelled good behavior; and the contract system—carrying the profit to the contractor—is, it seems to me, in the last degree objectionable; so that the whole subject-matter should be rethought over.

The WITNESS. It involves a recasting of our whole prison system, which I have but very little faith in.

The CHAIRMAN. But we certainly coincide in believing that the present system is very bad.

The WITNESS. Yes; it does not accomplish anything except the manufacture of criminals. Three-fourths of the criminals in the prisons of the United States are accidental criminals, and 50 per cent. of them all are less than twenty-six years of age.

Q. And we make criminality a vested right, almost?—A. We do. We see that the legacy is strictly handed down.

THE STATES WHICH HAVE ESTABLISHED LABOR BUREAUS.

Q. Will you please state what bureaus of labor statistics there are now established in this country?—A. There is one in each of the States of New Jersey, Ohio, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Indiana, New York, Pennsylvania, and California.

Q. Would you recommend the establishment of a national bureau of statistics?—A. I would, if it could be properly organized and given sufficient power and means to carry on its work.

Q. Would it be too much trouble, if you have the subject in your mind, to state what you think such a bureau should be, and what should be its organization and powers?

FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION OF A NATIONAL BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS.

A. It should be constituted entirely on a scientific basis; should not be run on theories at all, but absolutely as a statistical bureau, having
for its special province the gathering of statistics of labor and industry, and of economic statistics. It should have power and means to establish an agency in every State, which agency might be, in each instance, the State bureau, so far as such bureaus are established and as fast as they are established. It should be entirely free from political influence, so far as the appointment of subordinates is concerned, so that it might work purely on a scientific basis. If such an office could be established at Washington, with power to report annually, and, at the same time, with power to publish bulletins, on special information of importance, at particular periods, to the whole country, it might be considered one of the strongest auxiliaries to the educational forces of the nation. Such a bureau as that I should most heartily indorse and recommend.

Q. Would you establish it as an independent bureau, or let it be made an appurtenance of some existing bureau of the Government?—A. It might be a bureau of the Department of the Interior for the sake of conforming to the existing machinery of government.

Q. You would make it an additional and distinct bureau?—A. Yes.

Q. You would not attach it to the Agricultural Department?—A. Not at all. The Agricultural Department has particular, distinct features from what an industrial department would have. It has in charge methods of propagating and producing different species of plants and of animals—which calls for a different kind of information and different cast of mind from what industrial statistics would call for. The field would be a different one.

Q. So different that you would, I suppose, not consider it any infringement upon the functions of the Bureau of Agriculture, or the Department of Agriculture, that this bureau of statistics should collect information of a statistical character in reference to the farming population?—A. I should not suppose that it would conflict at all, nor with the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, which is now conducted by Mr. Nimmo. You cannot combine very many things and get good results. If a man understands the industrial situation pretty well, that is about sufficient for him, without asking him to be familiar with the agricultural and commercial statistics of the country, except incidentally.

Q. You say "the industrial situation"—would that be substantially comprised in all the trades and occupations in which wage-workers are employed—the operations of capital combined with wage-labor?—A. I should think that that would be sufficient scope for a national bureau of statistics of labor.

Q. And excluding possibly the agricultural population?—A. Only so far as they relate to the general economic conditions.

Q. But so far as agricultural work is carried on by combination of capital and wage labor, it is all included in that.—A. The Department of Agriculture, I understand, disseminates information generally to the actual farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; in the prosecution of his trade.

The WITNESS. In the prosecution of his trade; but it does not go into the economic relations of the farmer to the world.

Q. Nor the farmer to the hired man?—A. No; except incidentally, possibly.
LETTER FROM MR. ARTHUR T. LYMAN.

EXPLANATION OF THE STATEMENT ASCRIBING 16 PER CENT. PER ANNUN PROFIT TO MANUFACTURERS.

The following letter is here inserted:

[Office of the Lowell Manufacturing Company, Arthur T. Lyman, Treasurer, 18 Summer street. P. O. Box 2305.]

BOSTON, October 23, 1883.

DEAR SIR: Perhaps you may like to read the article on profit sharing in the Nineteenth Century of May, 1881, sent herewith. It seems to me to embody the real substance of the whole matter, so far as tried or developed. I have read a good deal about the matter, and this article seems to cover the case very concisely. The application of the principle to operations in large cotton or woolen factories is difficult, certainly. I have paid a share of profits for some years to overseers and second hands in one mill, but so small a sum could be paid at the end of a year from any usual profits to the mass of the operatives that I am not sure that it would produce any effect. An operative would probably think that $1 or $2 per week extra might be paid without affecting capital, but in most cases this would absorb the whole profit.

Colonel Wright told me yesterday that his figures for the 16 percent profits were for the year 1880; that was a wholly exceptional year—the enormous advance in all raw materials, induced by a sudden and great demand on a market which held very light stocks, comparatively, owing to the constantly declining prices of the years 1872 to 1879, gave a great profit. At the present time laborers are really sharing in proceeds of goods, based on the rates of profit of 1880, and as many mills are now running without profit, the operatives share is at the moment too high.

The sudden and great demand for goods in 1879 (late) and 1880, led to an undue increase of machinery, and now there is a superfluity of product, depressing prices severely; but the increase of machinery (of which not much has yet been stopped) takes more operatives, and consequently there is not yet any surplus of skilled labor.

Yours, respectfully,

ARTHUR T. LYMAN.

Hon. H. W. Blair, Chairman Committee on Education and Labor.

BOSTON, MASS., October 19, 1883.

HUGH THOMAS ELMER examined.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that you desire to make a statement to the committee. You may now proceed.

TRADES-UNIONS PRESERVE AN EQUILIBRIUM BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

The WITNESS. The committee has heard a great deal in reference to trades-unions. I have been connected with trades-unions for the past twenty years, and I think the more the public hears in reference to them the more they will be understood. It has been stated by capitalists
throughout the country that trades unions have been gotten up to combine against capital. The committee has probably heard that several times. That, however, is erroneous; trades unions were gotten up to stop disputes and to preserve an equilibrium between labor and capital.

What the workingmen of this country need most is something whereby they can be protected and secured in some manner from the strikes. There is at all times an uncertainty among the mass of the working classes, no matter how employed, that something may turn up that will deprive them of a living. That is why we have in this country at the present time so many men, especially in New England, who are not owners of their own homesteads.

**BOARDS OF ARBITRATION.**

What we need most is to have a Board of Arbitration—whether appointed by the General Government or elected by the people—no matter how it is gotten up, so that it is legalized—and all matters of strikes or matters relating to strikes, should be left to that Board of Arbitration.

Having, as I say, been connected with trades unions for the last twenty years, I believe that it is utterly impossible for any man to rule the workingmen, or set the ideas for them. Some new leader comes up who will upset every plan that has been devised. That leader steps in and calls the man who preceded him hard names. What we need most in this Government, and I believe what this committee should recommend to the Government, is some sort of Board of Arbitration. I believe the committee has heard testimony about the Amalgamated Society of Pennsylvania, of which Mr. Jarrett is president. That society prevented a great strike in the iron districts during this last spring, and that was admitted to be one of the best things that ever happened in the iron district.

**REASONS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF SECRET LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.**

I want to state to the committee that the reason why we have these secret organizations for the purpose of helping labor is that we have nothing else to look to; while by the co-operation of different trades unions throughout the country we think we can bring enough to bear to get our just dues from capital. That is why the Knights of Labor have been brought into existence, and that, in my mind, is the only reason—no matter what the organization may be used for now—no matter what political purpose it may serve, it has been brought into existence by the very fact that the workingmen throughout the country were not protected by law. Of course, there has been a law which gives a man the amount of wages that he contracted with the capitalist for—there has been a law to compel payment of the amount agreed upon; but there was nothing to step in between the capitalist and laborer and to say that capital has had its just share and labor its just share, and that they must each stop at a certain line. I see by the newspapers that a member of this committee said it had been tried out West. I think it was Senator Pugh that was reported, whether reported correctly or not.

By the **CHAIRMAN:**

Q. **He said what?**—A. That arbitration had been tried in the West, and that the workingmen had voted against it. Every trade might have voted against it; but if it had been legalized the workingmen of the West and of New England would have taken the means held out to them.
A man appeared before you last night who gave some testimony, and when I read the report in the papers, about what he had said I was very much mystified, because when I talked to him I thought he was not a man that intended to create any feeling among the working classes—any feeling or prejudice in reference to nationality; that was Mr. Newell. What he meant was that while there was great strikes in this country capital could go to Europe and import into the country, without any trouble at all, a large class of men who would take the striker's place; he meant that they should be restricted by law in some way in that respect. Now, the only way that such restriction, can be had, in my opinion, is by arbitration.

CHEAP FARMS IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Some testimony has been given before the committee with reference to farms in Massachusetts, and one gentleman who has been here, I believe Mr. Charles L. Harding, of Cambridge (who belongs to the city government there, and is president of the Merchants' Woolen Company, of Dedham), makes a statement, according to newspaper accounts, that some farms in Massachusetts can be bought for in fact less than it cost to produce the buildings on them. Now, let me state here to the committee that that is correct; but he does not say the reason why such farms can be bought. A person reading these articles in a newspaper would be led to believe from his argument throughout that capital was the only thing in New England that was of any consequence, and that if capital were withdrawn New England would not be worth anything at all to live in. Now, I beg leave to differ with Mr. Harding.

WHY FARMS ARE CHEAP.

In all cases that I have investigated, and I have investigated several, I have discovered that there is either lack of management or there is laziness or something of that kind interfering with the farms that can be bought in New England for what the buildings cost. I know of one instance, not one mile from where I live, where a gentleman, an Irishman, who came to this country twenty years ago, and had saved something like $1,100 out of his earnings, bought the farm that he lives on at the present time for that $1,100. That was some $600 or $700 less than the cost of the buildings that were on the farm—less than they could be put up for. That man is worth $20,000 today. Why? Because he understood the business of farming, and that is what you want in people who buy farms; they must understand farming as a business; if they do not it will go hard with them. I think that disposes of Mr. Harding's remarks in reference to farms being so cheap in New England. When we go right to the root of the matter we will find that where farms are so extremely cheap there is lack of management on the part of the farmer, or that there exists upon it a mortgage larger than the farm will pay, or that the farmer does not know his business.

AUSTRALIAN WOOL.

In reference to wool, Mr. Harding states to the committee that he does not know why wool can be imported into this country as cheap as we can grow it here. Now, it stands to sense and reason that a person in Australia, where they grow grass the year round, and it does not cost
any money to do it, can grow it easier than it can be grown in Ohio, West Virginia, or Pennsylvania. I believe those are the only places, except California, where sheep have become an industry. Where men can work the year round, as in Australia, and keep the sheep or cattle the year round without any expense whatever, it is a pretty favorable condition for the wool-grower; but the farmer of Pennsylvania has to house his animals for three months in the year. He has to provide for them and to take care of them, and why should not the man in Australia get his wool into this country and sell it cheaper than the man in Ohio?

ADVANTAGES OF A NATIONAL BOARD OF ARBITRATION.

My main object in coming before the committee was to impress upon the committee the desirableness of having a commission or board of arbitration appointed and legalized by some act of Congress, which would be a great benefit to the poor man who is working, and whose constant work is necessary for the support of his family. With such a board of arbitration existing, he could rest assured that if any trouble arose where he was working the matter would be fairly heard on all sides and fairly adjudicated, it would come before this board and they would hear testimony on both sides, and would be able to say which of the parties to the controversy were nearest right, and then they would be able to say to the employer, “You are wrong and must give way,” or to the working man, “You are wrong and you must work for this pay.”

WHAT DETERS WORKERS FROM BUYING HOMES.

I will state here parenthetically that there is a great strain on the poor man when he is trying to get a little house. I recollect myself that the first $300 I ever saved I hesitated a long while before making an investment of it. I considered it slowly and carefully, and finally I bought a little tract of land of 16,000 square feet, where I am now living. There was not a solitary house on that hill. I said to myself, “Suppose there is any trouble; if I am turned out of work I will certainly have to leave this little property. It is all that I have, and I will have to hunt up some other place for a living, so I had better wait and see.” There is where the poor man hangs all the time. He hangs on suspense, and it is generally the case that if he has a few hundred dollars he sees something that he thinks favorable, and he puts the money into it.

I know there are many instances where men are compelled to work for a good deal less than they ought to receive. But I do not want the committee to go back from New England thinking that New England is the worst place in the world. One man testified before you that it was impossible for him to get a livelihood, and he showed this committee that things were in a bad state in the town he came from—a state that is simply horrible, if the account of his testimony in the newspapers be correct. Now, 14 miles from that very town he could get work for at least $1.75 per day.

Q. At what business?—A. Laboring, picking, or shoveling, or anything else. I employ at the present time a small force of men. I am putting up a house for speculation, and by and by I may wish to say a few words in reference to tenement houses. I employ men, and I pay no one less than $1.75 per day. Help is scarce in the town.

Q. What town?—A. In the town of Arlington.
I noticed that one of the witnesses who appeared before the committee stated that the mill owners had provided tenement houses for their help at an entirely nominal percentage of the money invested. He gave the rates at which these tenements were rented as $40 to $70 a year. Now, let us take one of these tenement houses, for instance, which has four rooms, and would rent for $40 a year, or one having six rooms (though they very seldom have more than five), but say that the six-room house would rent for $70. We will draw the line there. Now, suppose he receives on an average $55 a year for each tenement that he rents. There is not a tenement that I ever saw built for the laboring or factory classes in New England, unless five or six families lived in one tenement, that I could not build for $800 apiece on an average. Now take the case of an owner of these tenement houses; he has got a pretty sure thing on his rent, because whether his help is working or not, whether his mill is closed or not, he has always got his rent; and if one man leaves his tenement he always finds some one else to step in and take it.

RENTS NOT A NOMINAL PERCENTAGE OF COST.

Fifty-five dollars a year on $800 makes 7 per cent. interest on the investment, and it is safe to say that there is not a mill corporation in New England that does not reap on tenement houses from 6 to 7 per cent. Still they come before this committee and state that they give these laborers a great advantage in building tenements. Now if this board of arbitration were established that I have recommended the poor man could own his own tenement.

ORGANIZERS OF TRADES UNIONS “SPOTTED.”

The moment a man starts for a higher rate of wages—there is the trouble with our trades unions—the moment a man becomes prominent in a trades union, especially in a factory village, and tries to agitate for an increase of pay, that moment that man is spotted, and he is quickly shoved overboard, or else they give him some job that he cannot make a living at. I have a brother-in-law who has worked in Tompsovville. He is a carpet weaver there. He tried to organize a union there. Pretty soon he discovered that he was not needed. Still, going through the town of Tompsovville you do not find any misery. I do not claim that there is any misery in the town of Tompsonville, but the mill owners there, those who manage the affairs of that mill, do not want an organization to protect the workmen.

CAPITAL NOT PHILANTHROPIC.

They want everything in their own hands. I am in favor of giving capital all that belongs to it; but I do not claim that capital is philanthropic. A man does not put up his money, except in a very few cases, to benefit workingmen. He put it in because he has no use for it and wants to make good use of it. If there were a board of arbitrators a man would be perfectly secure in building or owning his own house, and that could be done by legislation in a very simple way. Seven years ago we tried in the Massachusetts legislature to get a law similar to the homestead law of Philadelphia. It is said of Philadelphia that it is the home of the workingman. Almost every man in Philadelphia owns his own home, but it is through the principles of co-operation.
CO-OPERATION AND TRADES UNIONISM IDENTICAL.

Now, I claim that co-operation and trades unionism are the same thing. We co-operate to help each other, and by doing that we are conferring a blessing on every one. Some capitalists in New England who ought to know better would claim that a trades union was a curse to society. Why, even in the city of Boston people say that they would not treat with a trades union. “No, sir; we treat with our own men; we have no trades union men in our employ; we don’t wish them in our employ.” “Why!” “Because they can strike at any time.”

TRADES UNIONS FAVOR ARBITRATION.

I am free to say before this committee that there is no trades union that I know of that has not in its constitution a clause relating to arbitration—expressing a willingness to arbitrate. It is impossible for us, according to our constitution, to strike, unless we give a month’s notice. When we ask for an advance of pay we must give a month’s notice. All we ask of them is to give us the same thing in return. That they are not willing to do. If they want their employees to come down in their wages they simply send word, probably a week beforehand, that they are going to reduce wages, and in nine cases out of ten if the hands are not willing to accept some one else will be found to take their places. Take the case of the Boston Post. The men left that office on Saturday night—one of the biggest outrages ever perpetrated on men—men who had been in their employ twenty years.

Q. When?—A. A short time ago—about three years ago, I think. Those men came in to work on Saturday, to get ready to go to work at composing the next day, and they were simply told, “Your services are no longer needed.” Why! They were not asked to work for any less. Those men who had become old in their service, who had made from $20 to $25 a week there, and had educated their children properly—those very men were not given one week’s time to consider whether they would take reduced pay. They were simply told, “We have no further use for you.” A number of worthy men were thus thrown on the cold charity of the world, and two of them lost their property by reason of it.

Q. They were turned off without notice?—A. Without notice.

Q. What was the reason of it?—A. None whatever. The paper was probably losing money.

Q. The Boston Post?—A. The Boston Daily Post. Of course they had a perfect right to do it. This is a free country. It was their right; but, after all, was it right? I consider that it was one of the biggest outrages that was ever perpetrated.

Q. Was that under its present management?—A. Well, I guess some of the parties own stock in it now that owned it then, I am sorry to say. If I had owned the stock in it I should have tried to sell. And all this goes to prove that what we ask for in the line of arbitration should in all fairness be granted. I think the committee should consider that matter very fully.

FALL RIVER STRIKES AND IMPORTATION OF LABOR.

In reference to the strikes in Fall River, that is a point I know very little about; but there have been strikes in Fall River. I have read of them in the newspapers, and I have noticed that whenever there was
trouble there, the manufacturers were either threatening to or were sending to Europe to bring in a supply of operatives to take the places of those who struck. We have helped the strikers there several times. Now, there is where arbitration would come in. Mr. Newell, I suppose, meant to convey the idea that the Government should put a stop, as far as possible, to this practice of bringing men in from a foreign country when labor and capital are at war—put a stop to this indiscriminate and wholesale importation of men to take the places of men who try to get their just dues from capital.

**ARBITRATION AS A BALANCE-WHEEL.**

I will admit that labor has never offered to come down; but in what case has capital ever offered to go up. If there were a balance-wheel between the two, I claim that there would be but very little friction.

Q. You all use the word “capital” as if it meant employer, I suppose?—A. I mean employer when I say capital.

Q. And you say the word “labor” as though it meant the man hired?—A. Yes; always. I do not mean that it is any disgrace to be rich. But what the workingmen really need in this country, is to have something substantial upon which they can depend for their rights when they attempt to organize themselves—so that they will know that even if they take a little active part in agitating for higher wages they will not be frowned down upon, and finally frowned out of employment. That is a very important point.

**ADVOCACY OF LABOR’S RIGHTS PREVENTS EMPLOYMENT.**

A gentleman by the name of Nicholl was elected to the legislature from Lawrence, I think, though I may be mistaken in the town. He was a smart fellow, who understood all the phases of mill and factory help, and knew all their shortcomings. After having been elected to the legislature by the working people, when he got through there and went back, he could not get a job in any one of those mills. Why? Simply because he went before that legislature and advocated weekly payments for the help, nothing more, nothing less.

**NEED OF CO-OPERATIVE STORES.**

There is another thing that I have not heard mentioned here, at least if it has been mentioned I have not seen it reported in the newspapers. Most of the mills have stores, and the help have hardly ever any money with which to trade at any other place. The mill-owners keep the money back every month. If they would pay wages every week, I think that the necessities of life could be bought for a great deal less. I claim too, that the workingmen could establish their own stores. The great Rochdale business was started by twelve operatives, and see what it has grown to to-day by co-operation. It is one of the most gigantic institutions in the world. We could not run such a thing here.

**DETRIMENTAL EFFECT OF THE CREDIT SYSTEM.**

Josiah Quincy, who was once mayor of Boston, and who, if any man living had the interest of the laboring man at heart, it was he—helped to start one of those places, but it was a failure. Why? Because it is in this country an established fact that there is more business done on
credit by the poorer classes than there ought to be. If a man can pay
cash for an article he will often rather take it on credit. It is part and
parcel of the system resulting from the method of pay adopted in these
mills—at least it is encouraged by that system. If they want something
that will cost 3 or 4 cents they think it is too small a matter to trouble
with, they won’t take out cash, but they will go to the store and have it
charged, and let the bill run to the end of the month. This man Nicholl
was discharged, as I have said, because he advocated in the legislature
a bill requiring factory operatives to be paid weekly.

MILL OPERATIVES GOOD FOR NO OTHER PURSUIT.

When a man leaves these mills he is simply good for nothing; he
cannot work at anything else; he has neither physical strength nor am-
bition. Any man in the country who has a dollar in his pocket is a man
who has some ambition and has something to back him up. But the
mill operative has not got the dollar, and therefore has not the ambition.

WEEKLY WAGES WOULD DESTROY THE CREDIT SYSTEM.

I am only expressing my opinions before you as a simple individual,
who has given the subject of labor some thought; I do not know whether
I have said anything that is of interest or not. I do not appear before
you for any union or corporation. As a union man I think individually
that it would be a great benefit to the working classes to receive their
wages weekly. I think that in New England especially, the system of
credit would be entirely abolished if they would take off the trustee law.
That is a thing that the United States Government has nothing to do
with, I am sorry to say.

NEED OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.

I think that the condition of the working classes could be greatly
benefited by Congress passing a law by which they could be protected
in their rights. Everything else will find its level. I do not care how
many foreigners come into this country so long as they work on the
same plan that I do—so long as they purchase in general the same as I
do—so long as their necessities are the same as mine, I care not how
many men come.

CHINESE EXCLUSION.

I am not in favor of Chinese labor. I do object to any men coming
to this country who will not fall in the ways of the Americans or those
who have been brought up here. The general mass of emigrants ar-
riving in this country soon adapt themselves to the customs of the peo-
lace, and require as much to eat and to wear as the people who have been
here all the time; they learn that quickly by association. I find that
they come to like good beefsteak just as well as I do. They may live
for awhile on mush and milk, but they soon call for other things. I
think it was a great thing for the laboring men of this country when
the restriction was placed on the immigration of Chinese.

IMMIGRATION UNOBJECTABLE IF NOT TO REPLACE STRIKERS.

What we want is to restrict the bringing of people to this country
who are brought here to take the places of striking citizens; nothing
more. Trades unions do not want any more than that. That is what I believe my friend Mr. Newell meant to convey in his testimony before this committee. We do not want any class distinction, or distinction of nationality engendered. If I can't compete with a man who eats the same as I do, and dresses the same as I do, I am not fit to enter the field of competition. But where we cannot compete is where they bring in men who are all totally different socially, and in their habits and methods of life, and whose necessities are so different from ours. Recollect that I do not say that these men will not in time become just the same as those that have struck, for they are all foreigners who work in these mills. It may be two years or three years, but in time they will have the same trouble with those whom they bring out to put in the places of the strikers. And so capital is at war with labor all the time. There is no cessation of hostilities. Every time, however, capital has the victory, and it stands to reason that it must have it.

FUTILITY OF STRIKES.

I was talking the other day with a railroad man. I said to him, "How much do you get a month?" He said, "$40." Yet a million of dollars of property goes through that man's hands every year. How can that man strike successfully against such a corporation? Why, when the telegraphers were on a strike lately, they had the operators in this city scared nearly to death. They said, "We will have five hundred men here from London, and you had better go back to work." Who have harder work than the telegraph operators? Yet, if they ask for an increase of pay, the only answer they get is, "Why, we can fill your places with men from London; we can get men from England, Scotland, Wales, or France, or some other place, and fill your places in a short time." It stands to reason that where capital can be made with a scratch of a pen at the rate of $80,000,000 in about two minutes, it can crush out labor, and therefore the Government of the United States ought to step in and protect that labor. If I get a little worked up in talking on this subject, I hope the chairman will not think that I am getting too much excited.

LABOR AGITATORS MISREPRESENT.

But there is where labor is at a disadvantage. Capital is so strong and so remorseless; and, as I say, is sometimes made out of nothing by the scratch of a pen. On the other hand, labor does not always do right. Labor is greatly at fault from the simple fact that the agitator of the labor unions is a man who always forces himself to the front, and of course there is more or less discontent.

Q. Where are the agitators?—A. I do not want to name them; but I can find them in our unions.

Q. How many are there in Boston?—A. I should judge that I know ten.

Q. Has any of them been before the committee?—A. One of them has, I believe.

Q. Only one?—A. Only one that I know of.

Q. Are there any workingmen that are not agitators?—A. Oh, yes; I think some workingmen here give a very fair idea of the condition of the laboring classes in New England.

Q. You think the agitator always misrepresents it?—A. Yes; he would not be an agitator unless he did misrepresent—all the time. That
is his stock in trade. One of the gentlemen that appeared before this committee I helped along, I think, at the last session of the union, and I did him a favor. Still he appeared before your committee and made it seem that we were all slaves. Now, printers are not all slaves; and the reporter, while he has a hard time, I admit, is not a slave. If a man goes to work and calls one of them a slave he would be very apt to get pretty mad, I can tell you.

UNDEE INFLUENCE OF AGITATORS.

Q. How much influence do these agitators have in the management of the affairs of the laboring men?—A. They have a great deal. They can start a story, and they can break down men who have got influence in the different unions and in the different trades, so that their counsel would be worth nothing at all; they simply get disgusted. When a man goes into a society and works the best he can for all, and is always being met by some agitator with some of his stories, he finally gets disgusted. He will say to himself, “Well, I am satisfied with my own condition; why should I try to work for others?” That is why we have not got more men at the front.

SELF-SEEKING OF LABOR LEADERS.

Q. You think agitators get this influence?—A. There are lots of parties who are always out of work, and they have their friends who are in work. They start stories. I must admit many of our workingmen are very suspicious and tenacious of what they call their rights, and very often those who have got up to the head of the ladder have looked with scorn upon those who are down at the bottom. Of course this makes men jealous. They say, “After all we do for this man—having raised him up—as soon as he gets there he sits upon us, and does not recognize us any more.” There is no trades union that has not got its faction. There is nothing in trades unions, so far as I have ever known, that has worked in harmony. It is not all brotherly love, and it is not brotherly love that points them to this union; it is what they can get—it is what benefit that union can be for them as a body. That is the point they are after. I may be stating things rather hard as a workingman, but it is a fact.

In this city—I speak more particularly of this city because I know more about it than about other places, we have had men in the union who would not care whether they sacrificed their principle so that they could, as they term it in their parlance, “down” the men they were opposed to. They do not care whether they would produce a strike throughout the whole city, or not, and whether they would throw everybody out of employment so long as they would gain their own ends. I am charitable enough to say that these men have been misled, that they have had mistaken ideas; but still if their counsel had been taken we would have been simply thrown out of employment and had a strike on our hands. It is those men that I call agitators—cranks. I suppose you have heard the term crank before now.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes; it has been applied to every witness who has been before the committee.

The WITNESS. I may be a crank to-morrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think you are about as much of a crank as any of them; however, we are all cranks. It has got so that the only respectable men in the community are the cranks; the term has become so indefinite that it amounts to nothing so go right on.
WAGES OF COMPOSITORS.

The WITNESS. With regard to the wages of my trade in this city, I was going to say that the scale of our union is $15 a week for day work; newspaper work all the way from 40 to 45 cents per thousand ems; some papers pay 42 or 43, and I think the Herald pays 45 per thousand ems.

DEFINITION OF A PRINTER’S EM.

Q. What is an em!—A. An em is supposed to be a square in any style of type; for example, in long primer it would be just as broad one way as it is another.

Q. How long would it take to set up an em!—A. It would take about three motions to fill up what would be the size of an em; to fill up the space of an em, or in other words, it would require between three and four thousand motions to complete a thousand ems.

Q. That is done for 45 cents!—A. Yes.

Q. How much time would it take!—A. With a smart compositor the average is one thousand an hour; then he has got to correct that and put it in the galley, and pull out slugs, &c.

PRINTERS’ WAGES IN BOSTON.

Q. You were going to state the compensation of printers!—A. Yes; I was going to state with reference to what they get in other trades; that in the city of Boston the printers are paid less than they are in any other trade; still they manage to live. It is poor pay I admit, and we would like to get better pay.

Q. Why do you not get it!—A. That point I am coming to; the competition is very great. There are so many in the business and it requires so much capital that they say they cannot pay any more.

PRINTERS’ WAGES IN ENGLAND.

I suppose they cannot pay any more from this fact—probably it is not known to many printers that any one who wishes to publish a book in this country can take and send his manuscript to London and get his book set up there, and bring his manuscript back to this country again, compare his proof and get the proofsheets back to England, and get his electrotype plates made there and sent over here and delivered in Boston cheaper than he can get the type set here. That is a thing people do not always consider.

Q. Why do you not go West!—A. Because I can live here. I do not ask Congress to do anything for me in this respect. I did not come here to ask that the committee should recommend Congress to make me wealthy or give me $20 a week.

The CHAIRMAN. I have been wondering why a portion of the printers did not break up this keenness of competition by leaving the city and going somewhere else.—A. Well, but you can empty the city of printers to-day, and to-morrow you can fill their places by parties who have learned the trade in a garret.

DIVISION OF LABOR AMONG PRINTERS.

Our business is now divided into so many different departments that each department is a business of itself; it is a specialty. When I
learned the trade I had to go through the whole office. I commenced with sweeping, and then went in as a roller-boy, and then I went to the job-room, then to the newspaper-room, then to the press-room; but now the thing is so broken up that a compositor is a different thing from a pressman, and from a newspaper man, and different from a book printer, and each of these differ from a job printer.

Q. It is hardly worth while to go into such particulars. You say there is a great deal of competition; but, notwithstanding that, you prefer to stay here and get such living as you do get in preference to going somewhere else!—A. Certainly. I only appear before the committee to give my ideas of the difficulties which labor has to encounter.

Q. Have you any other point to present?

FEMALE COMPOSITORS UNDERPAID.

A. There is another point. There are many female compositors in the city of Boston who are not paid what they ought to be paid—the same compensation for doing their work that men are paid. They are doing exactly the same amount of work; they are working by the piece, and they are compelled to work for 10 or 15 cents a thousand ems less than a man.

Q. Taking that for granted at once, what would you do about it?—A. I should bring their price up to the same standard as that of the men.

Q. How?—A. By giving them just the same amount of pay as a man gets.

Q. Who is to give it?—A. It can be done very easily.

METHOD OF RECTIFYING UNEQUAL COMPENSATION.

Q. How, I say!—A. The moment a strike occurs in an office and your board of arbitration steps in, you can say it is fair to pay all parties employed in your office so much, and it is fair for them to work for so much; but you must not go outside the country and bring in somebody to fill the places of these people. Would it not be fair to presume that that could be done?

Q. How would you enforce the opinion of this board of arbitration?—A. It would either have to be a law which would be enforced, or else the man would have to take his capital and go to something else. I think I have imposed upon your time now long enough.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not wish you to use the term impose. I only wanted you not to go too much into detail, because we get lost in all these details of the printers' business.

PLANS FOR ASSISTING THE LABORING MAN.

The WITNESS. I could have stated in a stickful the whole matter, probably; what is needed in this country, and the only thing that I claim is needed, is a board of arbitration that can settle labor disputes. Then there should be laws which will protect laboring men in the establishment of co-operative societies for their benefit; and some plan should be devised by which he can get, when he wants it, all the information possible in reference to land in this country. There is no way that I know of that a man can get any information now about those things, without perhaps some knowledge of the ways in which things are done in the Government offices—even about the land; but there is no way
that I know of by which a man can get any reliable information with regard to trades, or where he could get work at them. Even if he wishes to engage in farming pursuits, I do not know any way in which he can get counsel in reference to lands that he might choose to buy of the Government—where there is one section of the country that might be productive in wheat and oats or corn, and other sections which would not produce those articles. But I believe it is the system of the Government to take it for granted that every man who goes around this country understands his business. He does not, however. I might go West, as you suggest, and buy a farm, and put my money into it and undertake to raise oats, and the land might not grow oats well, but it might grow wheat well. So that when a poor man wants to engage in a pursuit he wants information about it. If there is any way in which the committee can work that out, it certainly would be a great good to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been a proposition made lately in Congress about that, and it would accomplish great good if it could be accomplished. A gentleman came from England at the last Congress with a proposition to establish such an office in England, and on the continent of Europe for the dissemination of information—something like a universal American gazetteer relating to land. Something of that kind I hope will be accomplished. It would be a great service to our own people.

The WITNESS. In reference to the postal telegraph, I had some ideas bearing on that subject. But I think the great thing needed is a board of arbitration. That would remedy many things that now seem very difficult of adjustment, and I should be in favor of trying the board of arbitration before recommending the Government to take hold of any corporation business. I think that matter can be legislated by Congress so that it will be satisfactory for the time being, at any rate. Of course, there are always exigencies arising that may change matters.

JOHN DALY examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In Boston.

Q. What is your business?—A. I am a harness-maker.

Q. What do you wish to say to the committee?—A. I am sorry that I did not give the matter more thought, although I have read the testimony taken before the committee with a great deal of interest. If the committee will pardon me, I would like to make a suggestion, and that is that they send a notice to the different trades unions of the city, or rather I would suggest whether the different trades unions of the city could not be notified previous to their coming here, and have each of the unions select a representative or two to state their grievances as concisely and briefly as possible. I think that would be a very good idea. I am here on my own responsibility. As I have said, I have read the testimony taken, as reported in the newspapers, and at supper tonight a young man told me that the committee took testimony in the evening, and I came down here simply to hear and not to give testimony. But I have some ideas in regard to my business that I should like to bring before the committee and before the Congress of the United States in the hope that Congress will legislate upon it.

BOSTON, MASS., October 19, 1883.
PROTECTION TO SADDLERY.

I certainly think it fair to say that I represent the sentiment of the trade to which I belong in regard to the matter of protection versus free trade. I know some men in my business who are most expert workmen who are idle now and have been so for two months simply on account of the great increase in the importation of English saddlery and harness into this country lately. It appears to me that that is a very serious question. I have been reading free-trade literature, and I must say I was a good deal of a free trader, but the matter comes right home to me now. There was a reduction of my wages of $3 or $4 a week as a consequence of these large importations of foreign goods.

Q. You can see the harness all round town, I suppose?—A. Yes.

Q. And you did not make them here?—A. No, sir; and I should be making them, and those men who are idle should be making them—men who now have to walk the streets, and whose families probably suffer. The English workingmen, of course, are busy and making good wages, while we are here in Boston and all over the country, who are called upon to pay the taxes and defend the country in case of war, are lying idle. I hold that that is one of the great things that Congress should legislate on.

Q. Can you get that into these Boston newspapers?—A. No, sir.

NEWSPAPERS AS GUIDES ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

Q. Can you not take these editors down and show them the harnesses?—A. Well, I have not enough to do that.

Q. Why not take them one of the harnesses?—A. Well, I do not know in regard to that. I suppose they are well aware of the facts, however.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no; they do not know anything about it. You read their editorials.

The WITNESS. The papers have tried to poke considerable fun at this committee and at the testimony, but, for my part, I do not always agree with the editors of the papers. I think they are not always truthful. I have read the testimony taken before this committee with a great deal of interest, and I think it has a tendency to do a great deal of good.

The CHAIRMAN. I have just been thinking about those harnesses and these free-trade editorials here in Boston; a harness in one shop, and a free-trade editorial written next door, while harness-makers are walking about the streets with nothing to do, and more harnesses coming in from England next week.

The WITNESS. Well, what can be done about it? It is a Congressional matter, and must be legislated for in Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. But very often the man that gets to Congress gets there on account of that editorial, or is kept there on account of that editorial.

The WITNESS. Yes; very often, I suppose.

The CHAIRMAN. Because that editorial influences a voter. Now if you could get the editorials right you can keep these harnesses out, or make them yourself; and if you vote right yourself, and take the workmen round and show them these harnesses, that would have its effect.

The WITNESS. The workmen are about as well posted as anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. But quite a number of workmen have been before the committee and advocated having the English harnesses.

The WITNESS. Imported here?

The CHAIRMAN. Why, certainly; they have wanted free trade.
PROTECTION THE GREATEST GOOD TO THE GREATEST NUMBER.

The Witness. Well, then, they are free traders, and that may be for their benefit; but it is for my injury. I believe in the greatest good to the greatest number. I should not have said a word in regard to free trade versus protection if the consumer was benefitted any. I hold that the consumer is not benefitted. I hold that the man who buys this English harness is not benefitted. He pays as much for it, and it is not as good. I will state honestly what is my opinion: that there is no work that is made that is superior to Boston work—no work in any city in the world that excels it. I think I can say that without any egotism. I have seen at the Centennial harness from all the countries of Europe, and the different cities of America, and I know that Boston work is equal to any work made anywhere, if not superior; so that, so far as the workmanship goes, they cannot find any fault with it.

ANGLO-MANIA INJURIOUS TO AMERICAN LABOR.

But some of our people have a sort of idea—an old one, but one that is growing, I think—a sort of aristocratic idea that whatever comes from London is all right, and they will pay much more money for an inferior article that comes from London, simply because it has the name of being imported, while in reality it is inferior, and they get cheated, though you cannot make them understand it. The workmen suffer on account of this. They have to curtail their expenses; they can barely have the necessities of life, and can hardly support their families in any sort of decency.

Q. Why don't you go West?—A. Because Boston is a better place. I stop at the best place.

Q. Why do you say that?—A. I know it.

Q. How do you know? You are doing nothing at all, you say, on account of these harnesses.—A. Oh, I am working.

The Chairman. I am speaking of you not as an individual, but as a representative man.

GOING WEST NO REMEDY FOR IDLENESS.

The Witness. Well, men might travel now from Boston to San Francisco and not get a job at their business.

Q. And there are many here who are out of work?—A. Yes; well, I would not say many; there are some.

Q. Are those English harnesses out West?—A. I could not say that.

Q. For some reason, however, the American workmen does not get the work, and you say this is the best place. If idle here they must be idle elsewhere?—A. Yes; Boston is one of the best places in the Union for our business; but when I say that I do not mean to contradict the former statement that there are some idle here.

Q. I do not understand you to do so; but if this is the best place there must be more idle elsewhere!—A. Yes.

Q. If they are idle here on account of the English harnesses, probably these harnesses have something to do with the idleness of the rest?—A. I should say so; yes.

Q. And they will keep on bringing those English harnesses, won't they?—A. No doubt of it, unless the duties are increased. I was going to say what an old experienced workman told me the other day. He said if the tariff goes on, and there is another reduction made in it, I do
not know what we have got to do. We can't get anything to do at our
business, and we will either have to go to London or somewhere else.
If a man has a family and a little house paid for, or half paid for, it
will be very inconvenient for him to leave; but certainly something
will have to be done. I see that the last bill passed by Congress re-
duced the tariff 5 per cent.; I think. It was 35 per cent. before, and it
was made 30 per cent. I told him I thought it ought to be increased,
and he said he thought it ought to be doubled.

COST OF LIVING IN AMERICA AND EUROPE COMPARED.

Q. Can you not make poorer harness, cheat a little, and get on a level
with the English harness?—A. We can't do that. There is a very cheap
sort of harness made—cheaper, perhaps, than is made in London, but I
don't think we could sell it. It has been said here that we are getting
so that we can cheat as well as anybody, and sell cotton as cheap as
English cotton. That may be, but there are many workmen in our
business, and the harness-maker cannot live in Boston for what he can
live for in London; he would starve, he must get more wages. Leather
is more expensive and trimmings are more expensive. We cannot manu-
facture harness here as cheap as in England any more than iron or steel
can be manufactured here as cheap as in England; but I am not an in-
discriminate protectionist. I hold that there are some things that could
be free, and one is wool. I was astounded that there should be a duty
of 10 per cent. on wool.

THE TARIFF ON WOOL.

Q. You are aware that there are a number of men in this country who
are raising wool?—A. Yes; and I want to take that into account.
Q. These men will find as much fault about free wool as you do about
the English harness?—A. I believe that.
Q. There are more wool-growers than harness-makers in the country,
are there not?—A. I doubt it. For instance, one man will take care of
a thousand sheep, probably. I think there is very little labor in sheep-
raising. I want to be perfectly square and fair, but my opinion in re-
gard to the matter of wool is that if it were imported free of duty, as it
is a raw material which enters a great deal into the employment of mill
operatives, it would be a great blessing to the people to have woolen
goods, both in clothing and otherwise, as cheaply as possible. Wool
enters into many of the necessaries of life, and it certainly would be a
great blessing to the people of the country if Congress could only take
it into its head to look at it in that light.

FREE WOOL BENEFICIAL TO MANY—INJURIOUS TO FEW.

Q. Suppose you turn all the wool operatives and manufacturers into
some other pursuit by opening the tariff in such way that they can bring
in that foreign manufacture, as you say; what will this wool-growing
and this wool-working people do?—A. That would benefit the woolen
manufacturers. I hold that when the raw material is imported free
there will be an increase in the manufacture of woolen goods; but, of
course, probably the man who raises sheep would find himself getting
a less price for his wool; but the laborer would certainly not be injured,
and the great mass of the people would be benefited by it.
Q. Half the people of the country are agriculturists, you know, and
they think they have the hardest time of anybody, and a very large proportion of them raise more or less sheep.—A. Yes, but there is very little labor, as I said, in raising wool. One man could take care of a thousand sheep.

Q. Did you ever take care of sheep?—A. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I have; and I can assure you it is a good deal of work to take care of sheep; one-half the lambs will be apt to freeze to death in the spring of the year in spite of all you can do. It is a great and difficult industry.

The WITNESS. Of course it has its difficulties and drawbacks; but few in comparison are employed at wool-raising compared with woolen manufacturers and operatives.

A PROHIBITORY TARIFF UNWISE.

Q. How would it be to fence this country in so that we could have our woolen market in every respect?—A. I do not think that would be wise.

Q. Why not?—A. Because it would not be for the best interests of the country to have a Chinese wall of that kind. Let us bring in what is for our benefit, and will make us more comfortable.

Q. What we cannot raise ourselves, you mean?—A. Well, of course, what we cannot raise ourselves—there is no question but that that should be allowed to come in free of duty.

Q. As tea and coffee, for example?—A. Yes; but I hold that so many would be benefited by cheap woolen goods that wool should be free, and, of course, there should be a corresponding duty on imported woolen goods.

Q. Do you know the rate at which woolen goods have been rendered cheap by American competition, invention, and skill?—A. Yes; there has been a great deal done lately.

Q. Are you of American birth? I suppose you are.—A. No, sir; I was born in Ireland.

Q. Well, if you had been of American birth you would at your age remember that there were in New England in former times three deaths by consumption to one such death at the present time, and more has been done to save life by being able to furnish ourselves with good underclothing than by any other cause. We could not have done that for ourselves if we bought the woolen manufactures abroad; they would have cost so much more. However, I see your point, and it is a strong one. It is all very well when you stick to your own case, because you are informed on all sides of the question in respect to that, but when you undertake to say that another large section of the American people shall have their industries destroyed by taking off the tariff, then your argument ceases to be reciprocal.

The WITNESS. I do not wish to be understood that I wish to destroy the industry of any class of people.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose not.

The WITNESS. But I hold that by having the raw material imported free it would give a great number of hands employment in its manufacture. I think a greater number would be benefited than would be injured.

Q. Then you would, for the sake of benefiting all a little, starve a few to death. Here comes in this right to live. Why should you starve me to death for the sake of fattening ten other men?

The WITNESS. I would not do it.
The CHAIRMAN. The questions of individual life and liberty are involved, and the whole country should go to work to defend its meanest citizen; so that we have to be very careful to see that we do not starve out a whole industry for the benefit of others.

The WITNESS. Well, so far as I am concerned I should be willing to allow the tariff to remain on wool, provided it was raised on harnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no reason why both could not be done.

FREE TRADE A CAPTIVATING THEORY.

The WITNESS. Of course I know these free traders talk very finely about the benefits of free trade. Probably in theory it may be the best plan; or probably when the millennium arrives it may be the best plan, when we come to live on a level; but as we are now, I hold that we should have protection in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. I think free trade would be starvation to the American people who have to work for a living. Is there any other point you wish to present?

The WITNESS. The free traders tell us that we can get all kinds of goods cheaper by having free trade. I do not see what advantage it is to me if I can get a suit of clothes for $10, and I am idle and have not got the $10 to get the suit of clothes with.

Q. It comes all back to these harnesses, does it not?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, is there any other point you wish to present? I am glad to see that you understand this harness question. The next point to be considered, is the votes which are at the bottom of all questions—A. I will guarantee there will be a change in votes in Boston at the next election, if protection versus free trade is a question before the people.

——

BOSTON, MASS., October 20, 1883.

ELIZABETH WRIGHT examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. I reside in Medford, about 6 miles out from Boston.

Q. What is your profession?—A. I am a consulting actuary.

Q. Will you state to the committee what have been your opportunities for the study and practical observation of the relations between labor and capital, or of the labor question generally? We should be glad if you would present your views upon the subject in such way and at such length as you see fit.—A. I was born in Canaan, Conn.; my father was a graduate of Yale College. About the time of the Revolutionary war, after getting through college, inheriting his father’s farm, he settled in Canaan; and, having pretty strong mechanical inclination, became the mechanical engineer—although not known by that term—of a Mr. Forbes who got up the first anchor shop in this country. His iron came from the Salisbury mines, just opposite. He studied the iron manufacture pretty thoroughly from all the English publications he could get, and was the inventor of a good deal of the iron plant of this country. In 1810 he emigrated to Ohio. He was intimate with some of the iron manufacturers of Pittsburgh, so that from my boyhood I was educated, physically, in regard to my hands, to know how to use and sharpen edged tools, and to understand machinery; but I was brought up on a farm generally, and destined to a quite different profession.
I went to college where my father had graduated and I graduated in 1826. I received an appointment as tutor in my college for two years, and also professor of mathematics in the Western Reserve College, a college founded principally by my father. For two years after graduation I taught the academy at Groton. I was quite familiar with Boston and found my wife there. I moved to Hudson, Ohio, after my marriage, and was for years a professor in the college. Prior to my marriage and the acceptance of the professorship I took an appointment from the Tract Society, of which Mr. Arthur Tappan was president, and I traveled some 1,500 miles in Western Pennsylvania and Virginia as a colporteur, as they called it, in the new settlements. In Pennsylvania, especially, I had an opportunity to see the nascent iron manufacture of this country, and have since traveled in that region, noticing that particularly, because I had a sort of iron education and was interested in that subject. The subject of manufactures especially interested me, because it interested my father. He made the attempt to introduce silk manufacture into Connecticut and also into Ohio, and invented machines for the purpose, which project was never fully carried out because of the sparseness of the population in Ohio and the difficulty of raising silk worms without a proper population; and, besides, the climate was somewhat against it.

After being in the college four years, then, on account of my wife’s health (she having had Western fever), I received the position of secretary of the American Anti-Slavery Society, which was formerly in Philadelphia, in 1833, and the headquarters of which were in New York. I remained there until 1838-39. I then published a translation of La Fontaine, which would not sell in this country and I went abroad to sell it.

EARLY LIFE-INSURANCE.

Having had a commission to inquire there in regard to life-insurance, I became aware of the fact that the system was, to a large extent, imperfect; that a great deal of insurance on life was effected without insurable interest, and without guaranteeing against loss those that should take long policies. When I returned I endeavored to correct those errors, and supply the defects. The system of life-insurance grew, and under the plan which had been established by Dr. Price, by which banking was mixed with insurance, very large funds were collected. In the year 1838 I was appointed one of the commissioners of insurance for Massachusetts, whose business it was to supervise not only life-insurance companies, and other insurance companies, but also loan-fund companies.

LOAN FUND ASSOCIATIONS IN MASSACHUSETTS.

There were about fifty loan-fund associations, the object of which was to collect the savings of laboring people, and lend those savings under certain conditions to those who wished to build and foster homesteads. It was a Scotch invention, very crude as to its mathematics and financial rules, and it did not work favorably here, although the members of those associations to the number of one thousand obtained loans, and, through them, became possessed of their homesteads, amounting to from a thousand to three thousand dollars. The war prevented such action of our legislature in regard to them as to remedy their defects. They have succeeded elsewhere, where the care of them has fallen into the hands of disinterested parties of sufficient intelligence, and where the intelligence of the members who get the loans is so low that they do not un-
understand exactly how much interest they pay. The one thousand men who in Massachusetts got homesteads of these associations really paid on the money they borrowed about 14 per cent. on the average, though in the main it was a good thing for them, for they would otherwise have paid for rent, without owning the building, about 20 per cent. on the property. These are facts which can be verified from the reports of the insurance commissioners on the loan-fund associations.

WORKINGMEN SHOULD OWN THEIR OWN HOMES.

The conclusion which I came to from examining both life-insurance companies and this loan-fund association, was that the best thing for the workingmen was to own their own houses or homesteads, with some little garden land, and to live out of the cities. The people in the country parts generally are well off. The poorer class of laborers are generally housed in cellars or basements in the city, and that is a cause of great deterioration.

We see the laboring people in the country divided into two classes—those who begin poor and are sure to become rich by taking advantage of savings banks, loan associations, and life-insurance; and another class that cannot be helped because they spend as fast as they go; their children are sick and they have to pay large doctor’s bills, &c., and they sink gradually into pauperism. There are in this country in the hands of the great life-insurance companies (some thirty or forty of them) over $400,000,000, on which, according to their premiums, they must make at least 4 per cent., and it is becoming difficult for them to invest safely, so as to pay their heavy expenses and to carry out their policy obligations. The class of people who need houses, who have the ability to pay for them, and to govern themselves so as to fulfill all their contracts, is so great that that money might be invested for their benefit. To a great extent the millions deposited in our savings banks are invested in that way, but there might be more.

PLAN FOR SECURING HOMESTEADS FOR LABORERS.

The laboring people who want to get homesteads can well afford to pay 6 per cent. for the use of money if they have the use under proper contract, so that as payments are made interest on the amount paid ceases. When a laboring man has deposited in the savings bank or invested with a life-insurance company in an endowment policy enough to give a fair margin for a loan, there could not be a safer investment than loaning him the money and taking the security of the estate which he occupies. If it is in his own name he will take care to preserve it, he will not destroy it, as the laboring tenant usually does his house. So that my idea for the benefit of the laboring classes is that the thing to do is to encourage their saving propensities by making loans to them to put them in ownership of their homesteads as soon as may be, as soon as they get a sufficient margin for security.

That is the advice that I have been giving to the life-insurance companies for a good many years.

We endeavored in this State, though at a time the currency was unsettled, to get up a Massachusetts family bank, which should comprise a savings bank and life-insurance company. It did not go into operation on account of the unsettled state of the currency. We did not wish to make contracts for a long time until the currency was better settled,
and in the mean time a movement was made to alter the life-insurance laws in regard to the companies of this State so as to make them really all family banks; that is to say, the interest of the policy holder of the institution, as a banking institution, is now secured by law; so that, in fact, the way is open to apply all the funds that have to be invested for the benefit of those who patronize the institution, who hold its policies. And I have no doubt that as interest on large masses of capital or large loans goes down the Massachusetts companies will see that they can make better and safer investments and at a higher interest by loaning to their own policy holders than by making any other loans.

Q. Do the companies show any disposition to invest in this way in homesteads for the poor?—A. Well, yes, I think they do. They have always done it to a certain extent; but they are now becoming convinced that an endowment policy adds to the security of the loan very much, because if the party who is insured—the bread winner—dies, there is his life policy paid; if he lives through, he wipes out the debt.

Q. You would have the homesteader—the laboring man—take the property (after the land is bought and the building erected by the company) at cost price, with perhaps some reasonable profit upon it, and then give security to the company in the nature of a note, or bond, secured by mortgage upon the premises at a certain rate of interest; and, as an additional security, have him take out an endowment policy, which could be available in case of his death, to the extent of the policy, as a discharge of the mortgage loan, if any of it remained due?—A. Yes; the process would be this: He would first have to deposit in the savings bank until he had got enough for a margin on the loan he proposed to take. Then he would take his money out of the savings bank and would procure a policy, and at the same time a loan from the life-insurance company. Then, suppose he were to die the next day, he would wipe out his loan.

Q. Suppose the homestead was to cost $1,000, and he wanted a loan to that amount, what policy would you expect him to take out at the same time that he took the loan?—A. A policy of $1,000, say, payable to himself if he should survive fifteen or twenty years.

Q. Meantime he would pay interest on the loan as it accrues?—A. Certainly.

Q. And also the premium on the policy?—A. Yes.

Q. And in that way the company would be willing, you think, to make a loan of the same amount as the cost of the homestead?—A. Certainly.

Q. The endowment policy, on which he is paying a premium all the while, being the additional security required?—A. Yes. He really would not need a loan of more than $750, because he would have $250.

Q. You would expect him to accumulate that amount in the first instance?—A. He would accumulate that in the savings banks, unless the life-insurance company should have the right to take the deposits themselves; they would have to have their charter modified to enable them to do that, if they took small deposits. He would have to have first a sufficient margin; all loans require a margin of security. That plan would reach such laboring men as desire homesteads; that is to say, those who have families; it would reach a very large class.

Q. You think the inclination to become heads of families would be greatly promoted?—A. I think so, certainly; that is the great object in the life of industrious, good men.

Q. That would necessitate, in most instances, the location of manufacturing establishments which are now in cities outside of cities, would
it not A. Yes. They are very largely outside now. It would necessitate workingmen living outside of cities.

The CHAIRMAN. Take a place like New York City, where they have eight hundred thousand persons living in tenement houses on Manhattan Island. There was a great deal of evidence before the committee in regard to the bad condition of those living in the tenement houses, and we had many suggestions from those testifying, to the effect that workingmen ought to find homes in the surrounding country. But some of the manufacturers stated that this was impracticable, because in the winter time it would be impossible for the workingmen to come any great distance—such as several miles—in sleet and snow and cold, over the ferry boats and along the streets to get to their work, and that the city being full of factories, or places of labor, it was almost impossible that the laborer himself should be anywhere except in the city, and in those tenement houses, for there was nowhere else that he could be with convenience to his business, and the expense of 5 or 10 cents fare each way, getting in and out of town, would be a very substantial subtraction from the wages of workingmen and women. But it seems to me that your idea is a very excellent one to apply to a large class of laboring people—those living in country places; and as a suggestion for the future, it certainly is valuable, as bearing upon the location of manufacturing establishments. The disposition to encourage, and almost to compel, location of manufacturing property away from these great centers, at least outside, in the suburbs of these large cities, ought to be promoted everywhere.

The WITNESS. The elevated railways are doing a good deal to spread the manufacturing population of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Brooklyn Bridge.

The WITNESS. Yes; and the Brooklyn Bridge. Railroad travel has come in, and it has a tendency to scatter the population. They have lowered the rate from 10 to 5 cents on certain trains in New York, and that is inducing a great many people to go out of the tenement houses. But before there can be a great improvement made in that respect many people will have died. The cities, however, should not be places of manufacture, but of trade, of general distribution.

THE TARIFF.

There is one suggestion I wish to make to the committee, because they have not only the labor question but the education question under their eye. The method of taxation has a great deal to do with the prosperity of the laboring people. It has seemed to me that in testing the effect of tariff taxation, or import duties on trade, one item of statistics has been left out. I was impressed in traveling, and have been impressed lately in traveling through the West, to see what a vast amount of machinery was resting, and has been thrown out of employment by the miscalculation of owners of capital in regard to profits that they would derive from an increase of the tax upon the importation of iron, for example. If I were a man of leisure I would devote a good deal of it to finding out the history of the manufacturing establishments that have failed. Many of them I find were encouraged by the hope of profit from the tariff. When I was in England, being interested in iron machinery, I got an introduction to some of the large proprietors of iron works in England, and, when they found that I was not in business, they were very frank and communicative, and some of them laughed at us. They say, "You think you are going to manufacture iron at great profit." One man
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pointed me to a foreman of his puddlers. He said, "I could not afford to lose that man; you could not get that man away from me by anything that you could offer. Education of the eye is a great thing. That is what our profits rest upon. In the conversion of pig into bar iron a bad workman will destroy more than his wages; it takes a well-educated eye to puddle." I could not but see how that was. I had read enough of the iron manufacture to know that it was a very difficult thing to puddle—to make good bar iron—just for the want of education in the eye of the puddler—the man who superintended the work; he is the man who has to say, "Draw this bloom instantly."

On the Cuyahoga River, in my boyhood, there was a furnace established to utilize the ore. There was plenty of wood to make charcoal, and it became easy to make pots and kettles there, easier than to import them from Pittsburgh or elsewhere; and one of our townsman, a very public spirited man, undertook to make a forge so that we could convert pig into our iron. When he got it all done he imported a puddler from Pittsburgh, and the man happened to be a great humbug. He went at the work with a great display, and all the farmers and wood-choppers for 30 miles round assembled there in the evening when the forge was open to see the astonishing results. This man really knew nothing about puddling, except that he had seen others do it. So when he thought the bloom was ready he put it under the trip-hammer and it broke all to pieces. He said it had gone back to the natural state. Now, I understand that since they have got up steel manufacture it depends upon the same principle. Where they burn out the carbon, and they have to stop it at a certain point, they use the spectroscope, a new scientific invention by which the metals are distinguished by their flame. I remembered that thing when I talked with the Birmingham iron proprietors, and they could see how they had the advantage of us, and what had made in Johnstown, and other places in Pennsylvania, thousands of tons of scrap-iron.

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

Q. It is the skilled workman that is necessary to us?—A. It is the skilled workman. The skilled workman has done more, in my estimation, than any tariff tax in favor of our manufactures. In the first place, in our cotton manufacture, and so also in regard to woolens, as soon as they were started we had well educated inventors, who knew all the mathematics of machinery, and they have got up machinery much better than that in the cotton manufactures of England, and the English people had to import our machines, and build their machines over again. When I was in Manchester I found that the greater part of the cotton manufacture was made by machines which must be thrown away; they were working at a loss. It was the new machinery that helped them to go on with their cheap labor. Our inventors were so much superior to theirs that it more than neutralized the advantage of their cheap labor.

Q. So you look to what is called industrial education as one of the great resources of this country yet to be developed?—A. Certainly.

Q. One of the undeveloped resources, as important as cotton or mines or tariff?—A. Oh, yes. The skill of the workman is everything in machinery. Take the machine shops which make all our machines; skill is everything there. I have had some personal experience of that. I have had charge of the South Boston machine-shop in regard to modifying a railroad-spike machine. I had to employ a number of men, and I know that a bad workman, who does not understand both practically
and theoretically the machine he is dealing with, is liable to spoil a vast amount of stock, especially on new work. Where an inventor is at work carrying out an invention you have got to have a workman who knows something about the theory of it. Where you have a piece of work which is unprecedented—nothing having ever been made like it before—you want a workman who sympathizes with the plan on which your machine is to work.

Q. He wants some early scientific education! — A. Yes. The best idea that was ever got up in Boston was by a man who made the Ruggles press. He carried the manufacture of that to a very great point of perfection. After he had accumulated a fortune he offered to the city of Boston that if they would establish an industrial school he would be at half the expense of furnishing the machinery necessary.

Well, now that apprenticeship is almost done away with, it is very difficult for a man inclined to a trade to get an education. You cannot take him into a machine shop and put him to work, because he will do a great deal of mischief. You must have apparatus of the proper kind to instruct him in the principles of machinery.

To show you how very backward we are in this country in knowledge of mechanical principles, I will give you an illustration. A chilled wheel is very difficult to make so as to chill the wheel equally around the periphery. When these wheels break they break unevenly, and that has led to a substitution, in many cases, of compressed paper wheels with steel tire; but the amount of wheels that are used up is very great, as you will see by looking around at any of the railroad depots or shops, where you will find wheels thrown around in every direction, and nobody seems to know why. It is from an uneven wearing off. They wear so unevenly as to make the radii unequal — so as to make the wheel really an eccentric instead of a circle. The depreciation is very great in some cases. In going to New York a little while ago on the Springfield train I noticed that there was a peculiar sound, as of a blow as the wheels revolved; that is, the truck made a certain noise — sung a certain tune, you might say — and this was caused by an inequality in the wheels of the truck. Sometimes this keeps on so that after a time every blow creates heat. When the system of locomotives was first noticed here they had hot boxes all the while, but a Mr. Babbit, of Boston, invented a box of soft metal held in by a flange or lip of hard metal, by which you could have greater speed and yet not hot boxes; that is, so long as your truck wheels are good. But this wearing out of the truck wheels by the brakes is what occasions hot boxes. It is not done by the friction, because if you keep them well lubricated and have them properly Babbitted they ought not to be troubled by that; but the blow will occasion heat enough to set it on fire, almost.

Q. The blow on the circumference! — A. Yes.

Q. It affects the axle! — A. It affects the axle because it affects the whole wheel. The consequence was, on the occasion of this ride to New York that I have spoken of, that at Hartford they had to doctor up for a hot box and keep us there fifteen or twenty minutes, and then when they got to Meriden they had to doctor up again there. Then they had to take out the packing, and they found, on doing that, that they had to leave the car there.

Q. The wheel had ceased to be round! — A. Yes; but it was a gradual thing. There is no need of a hot box even at a speed of 30 or 60 miles an hour. All that you have to do is to have your wheels perfectly true. I have conversed with a great many superintendents of railroads, and they do not yet give it up — they are mere mechanics —
they do not yet give it up, for they do not see how that slight blow can create a heat so as to heat the box when it is well lubricated; but there can be no doubt about the fact, and the well educated superintendents and engineers are beginning to see that, and to see the necessity of avoiding it. Everything depends upon the brake. They have automatic brakes now, and those take a more serious effect than the hand brake; otherwise they would be good for nothing. Of course they use up the wheels faster. If you could only chill a truck wheel so as to be as homogeneous in its hardness as steel it would be very different.

Q. Do any other suggestions occur to you, in the direction of the labor question, particularly?—A. I do not know that there do. As mathematicians say, we can solve any question of two bodies, but when you come to three bodies it is impossible. You can only approximate; and so it is with this labor question. There are so many things to be considered, and all that we apparently can do is to help those who are determined to help themselves. As for those who won't help themselves, I do not know—it is a hard question.

I was on, perhaps, the first labor commission that was got up here. That was a special commission of the State of Massachusetts on the hours of labor, and the condition and prospects of the industrial classes. This report, the principal part of which was prepared by myself, will be found in Massachusetts house document No. 98, for 1866. We labored on that matter as faithfully as men could for some months. I remember that there was a good deal of complaint; a great many people came before us; we went into many factories. I came through East Cambridge one morning early for the purpose of observing the men who came into a glass blowing establishment; and out of twenty-two men I noticed that twenty had pipes in their mouths; and in that place there were only five of them that had had anything in the savings bank.

Q. Do you think the condition of the working people has improved since then?—A. As a whole, yes; I think the class of those who are getting homes for themselves is increasing.

Q. So the world does move?—A. Certainly.

Q. And the industrial classes are better off rather than worse off, and getting better off as a rule?—A. I think they are, in this State; there was a time when they were getting worse rapidly.

Q. When was that time?—A. I think it was a little prior to the war.

Q. As to the effect of the war—that sudden expansion of industrial activity, with all its consequences from that time to the present, and the improvement of machinery, and all things considered, do you think that has been a benefit or an injury?—A. At the South the poor white men seemed to have had no place in society before the war, and the discipline of the war has made men of a great many of them. I have been a good deal at the South since the war. A good deal of my business has been there, and I have found the Southern white men improving very much. The societies for mutual help are increasing a good deal, and particularly in Georgia.

ANTI-SLAVERY REMINISCENCES.

Q. Then you take a hopeful view of the situation?—A. Oh, certainly, yes. I will give you a little instance of how the educated people at the South felt before the war. As I said, I had published a translation of La Fontaine, a book which has done more than any other for the economical prosperity of France. I published that, with very fine illustrations, as a $10 or $12 book. It had two hundred and forty plates in
it. I had introductions to some Southern men such as John C. Calhoun and Senator Preston, of South Carolina, and I went to Washington to see them. They were very much pleased with the book. Mr. Preston was chairman of the library committee, and bought a copy for the library and a copy for himself, and he invited me to his house. He lived in very pleasant style. He was a fine French scholar, and he and I talked over French literature until 9 o'clock, and I rose to leave; and as I rose he said, "But you have done something besides this, Mr. Wright. What have you been about?" "Well," said I, "if you must know, I have been fighting your peculiar institution as secretary of the American Anti-Slavery Society." He seemed to be greatly struck, and his wife looked pale. "Well," said he at last, "sit down and we will talk about that." He said to me, "You do not understand slavery." I told him I had had some opportunities for observing it. I said, "I have been south of Mason and Dixon's line, and I have seen a great many of your young men at the South who were class-mates of mine at college, and I have seen some fugitive slaves." "Well," said he, "you do not understand it." He said, "You go South; I will give you a letter of introduction to some of my friends, and they will be glad to buy your book." I told him I should be very happy to avail myself of the advantage, and I would go down there. Well, we talked until about 12 o'clock, and Mrs. Preston retired, and then he kept me nearly two hours longer. I stated all my objections to slavery, and that the greatest objection, after all, was its effect upon the white people—the laboring white men; there must be laboring white men, and slavery demoralizes them. Finally he said to me, as I left, "Mr. Wright, if I had the making up of Southern society I would give my life to leave slavery out."

I had a class-mate whose friendship I valued very much, and who was one of the largest slave holders in North Carolina, Josiah Collins; some of his sons were afterward in the Confederate army. Mr. Collins used to come to my office in the anti-slavery society rooms, and frequently bought little books and sent them to his friends. He often said to me, "You are right, but what can we do? The law in North Carolina is opposed to educating blacks, and we do not dare to free them." That man spent $400 in putting up a Baptist chapel, in which his purpose was, not to teach religious ideas, but really to teach the alphabet. They put that down, however. Then he persevered in the attempt to secure a repeal of the law against teaching the slaves to read, and got it into the senate of North Carolina previous to the war, but did not succeed in accomplishing anything. I meet a great many men when I go South who were the highest class of educated slave-holders, and all admit that abolition was a good thing, and especially that it was a good thing to enfranchise the negroes; it will make men of them. That is the feeling among the educated men of the South.

The CHAIRMAN. I am glad you have mentioned this, because it will please Southern men to hear so strong an anti-slavery man speak so kindly of them.

The WITNESS. Well, I went into the anti-slavery cause only out of pity for these poor Southern men.

The CHAIRMAN. That remark of Mr. Preston's is likely to become known, very much like Mr. Jefferson's remark that he trembled when he remembered that God is just.

Q. How old are you, Mr. Wright?—A. I was born in 1804.

Q. Did you know Nathaniel Peabody Rogers?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. My earliest recollections are of the heat and enthusiasm and almost revolutionary ferment that the abolition excitement
caused in the community of Campton, Plymouth, and about there. George Storrus used to come there, but I never saw him; I was too young to travel. I was born in December, 1834. Then Thompson, the English speaker, came there and they drove him away. He was to speak, I believe, on the opposite side of the river, close by the village, but they got him out of town in the night-time. It was a community made up of strong men, the early settlers, and they had their convictions of parties. The church and everybody, pretty much, were against the abolitionists at that time. This instance was related of N. P. Rogers: He was a lawyer in active practice there, a very elegant and accomplished gentleman, with the social qualities largely developed, being a fine violinist and singer. He was a descendant of John Rogers, of Smithfield, and the family is a very intellectual one all the way down. N. P. Rogers was sitting by his office window one day when an elderly man, whom I have heard described to be such a man as you are now—a venerable looking man, partially bald, and with gray beard—came in and introduced himself as one of the Scotch covenanters of Vermont—an anti-slavery clergyman, who had been there many years. He said that he had been impressed that it was his duty to come to Plymouth (which must have been 70 or 80 miles distant from where he lived) and see Mr. Rogers and endeavor to interest him in the anti-slavery cause, and that at some time when it was convenient for Mr. Rogers (they were perfect strangers to each other) he wanted a chance to talk to him for two hours. "Well," said Mr. Rogers, "I am very busy, but we will take the two hours now." It was then nearly dinner time. He turned around in his chair and faced this gentleman, who refused to be seated. The stranger preached to Rogers, and delivered his sentiments to him very fully on the anti-slavery question. He had formed a very high opinion of Rogers and thought he was especially adapted to the anti-slavery work, so he addressed a personal appeal to him to abandon everything and devote his life to the anti-slavery cause. It is said that Mr. Rogers listened to him the whole time, scarcely taking his eye from him, and without uttering a word, and when the clergyman had completed his address Mr. Rogers rose out of his chair, shook hands with him, and said he was "ready." That was his expression. And from that time forth he did turn all his energies into the anti-slavery movement. He was the most brilliant writer, I think, that we have ever produced in our State. I have never seen him. I lived at Campton, about 7 miles distant, and did not use to travel; but I used to hear all about him.

The Witness. He married a daughter of George Kent. The Kent girls were geniuses, so to speak. They were very fine women. He had a very happy family, who were heart and soul with him, and as a genius he always reminded me of Thomas Hood, whom I regard as one of the greatest poets in the English language, next to Shakespeare. Rogers's genius was like Hood's, full of wit and humor, and of good feeling, and it was as sharp as a razor. He is a man that never thought for a moment of promoting his own fame. He never thought of himself; he was simply an impersonation of the principle that he advocated, and never took any credit to himself. If he had had a little more of that feeling of self he would have taken a much higher position in the public mind; but people did not appreciate him. His demonstrations carried force with them; but he was just as likely to write anonymously as to sign his name—he rather shrunk from any personal glory. He worshipped principle, and his heart was always full of humanity; he believed that even bad people were sincere. The highest test of the man is to yield consideration to those who are imperfect—to give them credit.
for what they do. The old maxim, "Give the devil his due," is a maxim that comes out of the most sterling part of the Anglo-Saxon character.

The CHAIRMAN. That sense of justice you refer to?

The WITNESS. That sense of justice—that justice is due to the bad as well as the good; but I regard Rogers as one of the greatest men in the anti-slavery cause. There was not a particle of cant about him.

Q. What did you think of the character of his mind, intellectually?—A. I never saw a flaw in it. His reasoning was always good; and I used to take his paper when he wrote. He edited a little paper which was a gem of English.

Q. The Herald of Freedom?—A. Yes.

Q. It was a wonderful paper. What did you think of him as a speaker?—A. He was always intelligible. He had not the gift of George Thompson. I think he always held an audience pretty well, especially a small audience. But he would never make a very long speech; and on great occasions, when we had the greatest crowd, and urged him to speak, it was very difficult to get him to do so.

Q. Did that disposition arise from something like timidity or bashfulness?—A. Well, on such occasions there were always some others whom he regarded as having a higher gift than he had. We had some speakers that could roll off words eternally and never stop.

Q. I suppose you knew Parker Pillsbury well?—A. Yes.

Q. Is he living?—A. He is.

Q. Where is he now?—A. He has been traveling about out West.

The CHAIRMAN. He seldom comes to our State. I know a brother of his, who resides there—an able man—our insurance commissioner.

The WITNESS. Yes; I know him; and he has another brother in Minnesota.

Q. What do you think of Parker Pillsbury, and what was his position or station among anti-slavery leaders?—A. He has got plenty of intellect. Partisanship ran very high between the abolitionists themselves. The movement was first a religious one, and religion takes hold of people very differently; some by a grip and some by a nip, and of some it impresses the whole being. Then it expands the characters of some men, while those of others it dwarfs more or less. It was a high time when the movement was active. You know Mr. Garrison was a Calvinist, in the first place, but broadened out and became somewhat liberal along before the war. There were other religious men, some of them in New York, that never had any Calvinism in them; but the strongest of the leaders were strong Calvinists. They split on the main question. They thought Paul was inspired, and that all he said about women must be taken as gospel, and they were very much astonished when the anti-slavery society was formed in New York that a woman set it going; a Quaker woman. The Quakers always had more respect for women than they had for Paul's teaching.

When the abolitionists assembled in Philadelphia to form a national society they wanted to get some of the leading men of the old Pennsylvania society to be at the head of it for the sake of respectability, and the chairman appointed some of the old members, but they declined and kept back. The next day when the convention assembled Lewis Tappan of the committee reported that fact, and rather advised a postpone ment until they could get up a little better feeling. Mrs. Lucretia Mott, who was then a young woman, rose and addressed the chair. The chairman, Beria E. Green, gave her the floor. She spoke for about ten minutes, and made a very effective speech. She said, "If we mean business we must move instantly. We must not depend upon these old foggies."
I do not know that she used that term, but that was the substance of her remark. It electrified the convention, and especially affected the younger members. Mr. Tappan said no more, but went in at once and helped the work. They made Arthur Tappan president, much against his will, because he was not a man that wanted to be prominent.

From that incident the woman question rose. The executive committee were very cautious about meddling with any of Paul’s principles about women speaking in public, &c. Angelina Grimké, with her sister, Sarah, came out with a public pamphlet in order to induce the executive committee to allow her to speak—she had the gift of speech, but the committee would not allow it. They could not get quite reconciled to it. When she came on to Massachusetts, where they had got warmer on the subject, we got her to speak before the legislature, and she spoke with very great effect. There was a good deal of bitter feeling engendered in regard to that question—in regard to political action too—in which Mr. Pillsbury sympathized with the Garrison side as distinguished from the Tappan side. But the really great man in carrying political abolition, and finally worked the party up to an effective party—to almost electing Fremont, and to quite electing Lincoln—was the man who made the New York canal, Myron Holly. He was a lineal descendant of the great Edmund Halley, the astronomer of England. The names are spelled differently, because the American branch changed the spelling, but the old name Halley was in the old time pronounced “Holly.” Myron Holly was the right-hand man of De Witt Clinton, and but for his effectiveness the New York canal would have stopped at Oswego. He was a man of very great force—the family inherit ability. It is a very distinguished family, three of the brothers making their mark in the world. Horace Holly, who became the president of the Pennsylvania University, was a most eloquent man. Some Kentuckians say he had no equal but Henry Clay. Some said he was his superior.

Q. Was he a clergyman?—A. Yes; he was brought here to Boston to stop off the Unitarians—as being the only man who could cope with Channing, Buckminster, and those men, and he was settled in Boston in a wooden church building. He soon drew such audiences that they had to remove the wooden building; they sold it out; and built a brick edifice known as Pierrepont church here. He was sent by Mr. Pierrepont to preach to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery, and on that occasion aroused the first clapping—the first cheers that were heard in a church. On that Mr. Pierrepont rather held back—he did not like to have applause in the house of God.

Q. Then Myron Holly was the real anti-slavery leader in the direction of political action?—A. Yes; against both parties.

Q. That is, against the Whigs and the Democrats.—A. No; against both the Garrison abolitionists and the Arthur Tappan abolitionists.

Q. Yet he is comparatively forgotten in connection with the anti-slavery movement?—A. Yes; very much. His daughter, a very distinguished and able woman as an educator, has been settled since the war at Lottsburg, Va., down by the Potomac—one of the old-fogiest places in Virginia. She has been teaching school there since the war. A year or so ago a graduate of her college was nominated for the legislature and was elected. Her school is one of the most prosperous in the State. Three or four years ago I took a good deal of pains to look up the history of Holly and made some memorandums of it, and would be glad to send them to you.

The CHAIRMAN. I shall be glad to receive them. Henry Wilson came into the anti-slavery movement; but not until it was well under way, I suppose.
The WITNESS. No; I forget the exact time, but I think not before 1848. I knew Henry Wilson very well. He was a good, solid man, who educated himself, and his work on the history of the slave power has in it a great deal of valuable material.

Q. You knew Wendell Phillips in boyhood, too, I suppose? — A. Well, I knew him from the time he came in with young Edmond Quincy.

The CHAIRMAN. He is still living, however, and I do not wish to ask you particularly about him. But I thought I would like to know about Rogers, and some of those who have passed away. Rogers died in 1846. I have always felt a special interest in him from knowing his family, who have been for several generations in Plymouth. He was a most lovable man in every way.

AMERICAN FORESTS AND FOREST FIRES.

The WITNESS. I would like to mention something about our forests. We depend upon our mountain forests for the preservation of our climate. The trees that grow on mountains are highly resinous — those growing in Maine, for instance, are white pine, and are highly combustible. When the lumbermen cut pine trees they leave the tops in a great mass of débris, lying around; and the settlers sometimes do so when they clear up the land, if it is not too mountainous to be cleared, which of course, it is not out in the West. There are immense forests of pine in some places, and the lumbermen go in there and in the course of two or three years the débris left by these lumbermen gets on fire in some way, and it heats the forests so hot, and there is so much of the débris to be burned that it not only sets the trees on fire because of the turpentine running down, but in addition to that it so heats the pine trees that it distills a hydro carbon from them. When Peshtigo village, on Green Bay, a village of 1,200 or 1,500 inhabitants, was set on by a great fire, the result was most appalling. The inhabitants actually went up to their ears in the river, and what happened then? Why the fire came down on them and singed the hair off their heads, and they had to immerse themselves in the water or be burned to death. Two-thirds of the citizens were thus drowned. Masses of hydro carbon gas came into the river, and by the time it got to the water it had taken in air enough to make it explosive, and it exploded amid these people. That was in 1871. So it did in the great New Brunswick fire, which occurred some years before. Those are facts which are well known.

A forest fire can only be prevented by taking out all the débris of the trees as you take out the trees. They have in Canada a law by which the lumbermen are obliged to do that in the winter season, before this débris gets dry. They either have to destroy it or carry it off. With what they are doing at the West now, and with the great impulse given to the logging trade, it would be terrible if we had another Peshtigo fire. I myself witnessed a fire that would have destroyed every house in Duluth (and there were several hundred of them) if the wind had not changed. The changing of the wind saved the city, and the fire ran round the wilderness back of it, destroying everything for 8 or 10 miles wide, back on the lake. I pursued it, but could not get within a half mile of it, it was so hot, and could not see anything but gas. But I could see to the windward of the fire whole trees that were blazing, and the tops would go off in a roar. This destruction of the forests is traced away back to the Saskatchewan. A gentleman who has been up there, the Earl of Eskdale, has put a very interesting paragraph on that subject into his book. That has interested me because I have a little property in that forest region which I took instead of the bonds that I had put
into the Northern Pacific Railroad. I have been a good deal up there. I had a sister who was a missionary at Red Lake, which is in that upper Mississippi region.

THE BONANZA FARMS.

Q. Have you had any occasion to observe anything in regard to the development of what they call in the papers the bonanza farms—these immense farming establishments?—A. Yes; I was over one of them this fall, the Cass farm.

Q. Do you anticipate any danger to our people or to the smaller farmers from the development of those great establishments?—A. No.

Q. How extensive is the farm—to what extent are the lands being taken up by very large individual ownerships?—A. I do not hear of more than two or three, the Cass farm, and another whose name I forget; but the Cass farm is managed in such a way as to be instructive to settlers who go out there. It is a good thing for them on the whole. Of course it seems to be a pretty hard thing for the hands they employ that own nothing. A good many of those hands use their money and their experience to make farmers of themselves, but some of them have turned out to be mere tramps afterward. They go there and work a little in the harvest time. The harvesting is done by machinery very largely, and will continue to be, and there is but a very sparse population on those very wide plains. But men who have the judgment to settle near a stream where they can get some wood for fuel will get along, if they are properly educated. But as it is they suffer a good deal, some of them. I would not take a farm there as a gift if I had to take my wife and children and live there, and make the place a home.

Q. It is a pretty hard prescription to our laboring people here who have been working in a mill to go out West?—A. Oh, yes; the prairies are terribly hard. It has been terrible on settlers, on the women especially, for there is no society and they get doleful and feel almost like committing suicide for want of society. However, that is rather passing away. One of the nicest places to be in is to be on the borders of the woods. There is a great forest region up in the Itasca region, and there is a plain upon which a colony could settle, where they could reach the river easier than they could on any lands in the cultivated States. The man who does not want to cut trees will find savannas there, grass plots from which the water has gone off, except, perhaps, occasionally shallow lakes, but having fine soil. People are settling there, and they will come to settle there more and more year after year. Cattle prefer the grass there to the grass of the plains. You can always drain those lands and make them cultivable for potatoes, and there are thousands of acres that are covered in the summer season with wild rice, which is better than cultivated rice. One of the main lumbermen up there keeps a sort of lumberman’s boarding house, and there is a woman up there that cooks that rice so that you would like it better than any other farinaceous food.

Q. You think it ought to be utilized?—A. Yes.

Q. I suppose there is an immense mass of it growing there?—A. Oh, yes. There is a great variety of waterfowl there, and they almost live on it—from pelicans down to little ducks that can swim as well under water as above; there are two species of gulls there.

Q. How extensive a place does this cover?—A. From the mouth of the Mississippi, about 500 miles down the Gull River, pretty much all that is woods, grass meadow, and rice farms.

Q. Is it much inhabited yet?—A. Not much. The Chippewa Indians have a reservation in it, but there are very few inhabitants there.
Q. Is it cold there in the winter time?—A. It is awfully cold, but dry. My grandchildren, who live in Saint Paul, and have lived there ever since they were born, enjoy the winters there. The snow is not very deep. The finest fish in the world are to be found in this great inclosure, and that is the way the Indians live there. There are more than ten thousand square miles there capable of supporting as much population as any land in Ohio, and yet leave the pine forests standing. The country is all clay-beds surmounted with vegetable mold. About half of the forests in that region are deciduous forests; the rest is pine. There are two species of pine. The white pine is valuable; the jack-pine is not; but the jack-pine, which covers a great deal of space, makes so little foliage that the sun shines through it, and the buck-grass and huckle-berries, and many other plants grow there, on which cattle can live; and the cattle of the lumbermen, when turned loose in the summer, as they generally are, feed principally in these jack-pine woods, where the buffalo-grass grows, and they get fat on it. So that that territory is capable of sustaining a large population, and a population ought to be put in there to preserve the forests from being burned up. Because when a few more fires occur in that great peninsula, the main part of the forest will be swept away. It is capable of preservation, because there are so many water courses, rivers, and marshes that you can manage a fire if you can only keep the débris from burning up. When one of those great forest fires comes so that it will burn up the trees, the wind will carry it across the river. It almost carried it across Green Bay at the time of the Peshtego fire. You would think if you saw that fire as I did, that it would carry it across the lake.

Q. You saw that fire, did you?—A. Oh, yes; I saw that fire, and saw its blaze away 2 or 3 miles ahead of the fire. Every once in a while a great flare would rise up before the woods really got on fire. I have traveled on the lake shore a great way above Sault Ste. Marie where there have been important forest fires. Forty miles up the lake, on this side of Sault Ste. Marie, there is nothing like a real forest. There are great blackened stumps, forty or fifty feet high, growing out of the underbrush, and the people of Ohio go up there regularly from Cleveland every year to pick the wild raspberries which are found in great abundance. Raspberry jam made from those raspberries is found all over Ohio. Those raspberries grow up at Sault Ste. Marie and on the site of those forest fires. Generally you will not see any trees except deciduous trees coming up. They survive the fire because they shoot up from the roots, while the pine does not.

Q. That forest pine will not be replaced, then?—A. Not without human aid. You can find pine growing all over Ohio now, although there was none there when my father went there.

Q. You planted some?—A. Yes. White pine will grow anywhere where you give it a chance; but it does not sprout from the roots. The way the great Ohio forests got on was by the pine starting from the roots.

Q. Do you suppose these trees know anything?—A. Well, they seem to know a good deal. They know where to throw roots. Just watch a pine tree grow on our hills and see it throw its roots out into every crack and crevice it can find. When they are foiled in one place, they will keep on going around until they find another.

DAMS ON THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI.

I had some correspondence with Senator Hoar about the appropriation to make dams on the Mississippi. Three hundred thousand dollars had been appropriated to make the dams, and the dams are so high as
to overflow a great deal of land, and I objected to that. I allowed them to make one on my own premises on Gull Lake. People had been engaged in lumbering there, and I said I had no objection to their making a dam to keep the water up to the spring level, provided they did not overflow any of the forest land; but that, if they did that, they would produce malaria in the place, and destroy the trees. I corresponded with Senator Hoar about the appropriation, and I invited him to go up with me into that country and look it over. Now they are not making any of these dams except on one lake, and they are proposing to make a dam there over 15 feet above the surface; that will overflow the lake, and will overrun all the rice fields and grass meadows, and desidious woods. I think it will be money wasted. I do not believe they can make a dam stand there on account of the sand that underlies the clay bed. This lake is a very shallow lake and is underlain, according to the geological explorers, with sand. The sand of that country is very soft—even when hardened into rock, as it is at Minneapolis; they have had to spend a vast amount of money to keep the falls from being washed away. This sand-rock is so soft that you can dig under it with a spade; and after they had built their mills there they found the water going out, and they had to build a wall through the sand to keep it there.

Q. To prop it up!—A. To prop it up. In fact, probably, in time it would take off that layer of limestone on which the river now rests, above the sand, and make nothing but a rapids. But that country wants to be studied.

There was a very excellent report made under Dr. David Dale Owen, and Norwood and Charles Whittlesey. They went all over it and explored it in every direction, so that they understand the country thoroughly. It ought to be studied before any more money is expended there. The question should be decided whether they can keep the river unless they keep the forest. At the headwaters of the Mississippi there is not anything that looks like a mountain. In traveling all around there you will find no higher bluff than probably 400 feet; and that is perhaps where the river winds around on the west side of Gull Lake.

The probabilities are that the geological theories are correct, that the Mississippi once headed much higher up, and was a vastly larger river than it is now, and that one great branch of it came down through that plain, another great branch taking the Saskatchewan and Red River valleys—that the water came down and traveled through the lake and then came through the valley of the Saint Peters. The valley of the Saint Peters has the appearance of being an extension of the great Mississippi Valley. It seems to be altogether too big for the river that runs through it, and there could not have been such a very large river as that seems to have been, unless its headwaters were away up higher. You see there has been some shrinkage of the continent—some change of level, which has thrown all the great Saskatchewan waters into Hudson's Bay. The great Red River Valley, on which the Cass farm, and other large agricultural settlements are situated, is 50 or 60 miles broad. I traveled it once on the road from Saint Paul to Breckenridge. At Breckenridge you meet the Red River. It is perfectly level along there for many miles, but still there is no water. The railroad made a boring for water at a station 20 miles, I think, this side of Breckenridge, and they went down about 87 feet, and came up in a bed of lignite coal about 4 feet thick. Lignite coal is partly vegetarian, probably peat, hardened. Then they went down 30 feet more through gravel and clay, and came to a bed of apparently white pine, discolored somewhat, but it was wood, and they were drilling through that when I was there, so
that I cannot be mistaken about it very well. The superintendent of the road was along with me. They account for that by the glacial theory, and we are obliged to suppose two glacial periods—one which overwhelmed the pines bodily and preserved them there under the drift; and another, a long period afterwards, in which a great big bog had had time to grow, and was then overwhelmed with another. It is the greatest drift country in the world; it is all drift there; there are hardly more than one or two spots in 100 miles where you will find any outcropping of rock. And when it does crop out, as at South Rapids, the very rock we have here crops out—the oldest granite rock called, Dyerite now—as at Medford, is the very rock composing that granite. When Captain Eads wanted to make a foundation for his bridge at Saint Louis, he sent all round to get the strongest specimens of granite, of the hardest, primary rock. His first choice was of this Medford granite. I had sent some to Washington. It had the highest specific gravity, and would stand the greatest weight. It was not real granite, but a sort of porphyry—Dyerite, they call it. It is condensed rock which was subject to fire, and became shrunk when solid. But he found it too expensive, and finally found that the soft granite rock was the same thing.

Q. You are very familiar with that country!—A. Yes. My eldest daughter married there long ago, and she has lived up in Saint Paul, and my son has been an engineer there for some time. He built the bridge above Saint Paul, and the bridge at Fort Snelling, above that.

Q. Are the farmers up there getting along pretty well!—A. Wonderfully well.

Q. It is a good country to settle in!—A. A very good country.

Q. Are the people growing to be a strong, robust race there!—A. I think they are.

Q. More so than are the original New Engancers!—A. The trouble with New Enganders is that after they get a sufficiency they probably degenerate a little. I see that the young men out there, like the young men of Maine, are of a better physique. The mountains of Maine are a great thing for its climate. When we have not much mountain air, and we go into cities and towns, we do not keep up the physique. The original population of Ohio were very much injured by malaria. They put saw-mills everywhere, on every little brook, and the consequence was that it overflowed the forests and killed them, and every other day the strong men would shake with ague. When my father wanted to build a barn there he got two of the most stalwart carpenters, in the spring of 1811, and they shook with ague until the chairs that we had bought there, old-fashioned chairs, were shaken all to pieces, and they had to sit on benches, those two men. Every other day they would shake and every other day work on the barn, and they finally got it up. The whole generation of people then furnished only food for the doctors. A doctor who could ride three horses to death and prescribe all over twenty miles for typhoid fever would get rich—if he could collect his bills. A brother-in-law of mine did so, and he had money to invest in railroads, and he got them to build a railroad right through the old homestead farm.

I look at society from a mathematical point of view. The great thing with a mathematician is the unit—the individual. Notwithstanding what the Declaration of Independence says, there is a great difference in men, and society could not exist without a variety of individuals.

I regard such men as Jay Gould and Jim Fisk and Vanderbilt, men who have only the accumulative faculty, as being very useful members
of society; they transfer some property to wrong places; but only think of Europe, and the condition of human labor there. The workmen there never got back anything from their labor, they never got a quid pro quo. It is incalculable what good railroads have done, and what railroads will do in carrying people through the continent and spreading civilization; it is raising up a great multitude of home-making people everywhere, who will grow up imbued with the principles of liberty. I do not want to deal hastily with these railroad men, they are good in their way. The wisest thing that I have seen on this subject of labor, is what George Eliot says of the political molecules, in her Theophrastus Such. They are serving great purposes of society, of which they are not conscious.

I have been very much interested in your committee's work, so far as I have read it; I have followed the investigation in the papers, from the time I saw it announced; but in my statements here, I feel that I have not done any justice to the subject from the merely partial hints which I have given.

The CHAIRMAN. We have had many witnesses, and each has given his own views, and we have written to a number of others to give us some facts in writing, which may be preserved, so that they will be of service hereafter.

The WITNESS. I would strongly impress on the committee the propriety of helping along, if possible, the cause of physical education. I have seen the want of it in my own experience. When I was insurance commissioner they did not furnish me with clerk-hire enough for the business that I had to do; and I had to do much clerking myself. It happened that when I was a lad, I went into a shop and learned to turn out brass cylinders, and found that I could multiply and divide and get out ratios and percentages as fast as six clerks could do it, and I did it, and saved a great deal by it; that has enabled me to fight out the battle that I have been fighting. If I had not been educated by my father to know what the turning-lathe was, and how to keep tools sharp, I could not have done it; I could not have got a machine-shop or a mathematical-instrument maker to make the investigations or experiments that I wanted; I could not have got them in the first place to know what I wanted to lead up to.

Q. So that you are an illustration yourself of what an industrial education is in its application to the highest intellectual pursuits?—A. Yes. Take a man that knows how to sharpen an edged tool and to keep it sharp, and if he is a good-hearted man, neither he nor his children will ever starve.

SYLVESTER MARSH examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where were you born?—Answer. In Campton, N. H.

Q. That is about how far north from here?—A. By the old stage route it would be about 117 miles.

Q. You may state the places where you have since resided, without at present giving any particulars with regard to your residence.—A. I was born in 1803, and resided in New Hampshire until I was nineteen.

Q. At Campton?—A. Yes. From Campton I came to Boston; from Boston I went to Ashtabula County, Ohio; from Ohio to Chicago (I was in Davenport, Iowa, in 1852-53, but did not stay there much); from
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Chicago I came back to Jamaica Plain, near Boston, in 1855—was there six years; went back to Chicago and staid there three years, until 1863. In 1863 I went to Brooklyn, N. Y., and was there from 1863 until 1864. I went from there to Littleton, N. H., for the purpose of building the railroad up Mount Washington. I lived there fifteen years, and then came to Concord, where I now live.

Q. You are the inventor and constructor of the Mount Washington Railroad!—A. Yes, sir.

Q. My object in taking your testimony is, by the statement of your experience during your life-time, to be enabled to give the people of the present day an idea or picture of the industrial life of the American people, and of their development during your life-time and within your recollection. Your father was a farmer, was he not!—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have you first describe life as you found it, when you can first remember it, as to its condition in all respects up to the time you left Campton, and so on down to the present time. Just state the story of your life as you would talk it to your friends, or to your children, and be as minute in regard to matters of fact that would be of general public interest, as you please. I shall interrupt you but very little.

INDUSTRIAL LIFE IN AMERICA SINCE 1810.

The WITNESS. My memory extends back to about 1809 or 1810, when I was about seven years of age. We then clothed ourselves by raising our own sheep, taking our wool to a carding-machine, tied up in blankets on horse-back, and having it carded into rolls. That was carried back to the house, and there the women of the country spun the wool and wove the cloth, altogether by hand-loom, of course. Then as to linen for shirts, &c., every farmer had a piece of flax, and got out his own flax, dressed it as well as he could, and that was spun and woven by the women and made into shirts and sheets. With regard to shoes—almost all farmers killed an ox or cow in the fall of the year—and they were all farmers where I lived then. The skin was carried to a tannery, and it would take a year and a half to tan the hide then. That is quite a difference compared with the present time, when it is done in a couple of hours. After the hide was tanned, the shoemaker came to the houses of the families, with his lap-stone and tools, and made up shoes for the family. Linen or tow shirts were, of course, worn. The country was good for potatoes and for winter grain; winter rye and winter wheat did very well then. It was a poor country for corn at any time. We used to fat our hogs mostly upon boiled potatoes. We would get a hog up so that he would weigh two hundred or two hundred and fifty on boiled potatoes. In about 1812 there was not a four-wheeled carriage in the town. When I was a boy, my mother bought of a carpenter the first fanning mill, for fanning or winnowing grain, that was used in the town, and paid for it in weaving. In about 1811 Edmund Cook, whose family you (the Chairman) know very well, brought a four-wheeled buggy, or whatever you might call it, into town. There were no springs upon it; the body was set on the axle. In 1812 came the war with Great Britain. The stock was then all picked up in that country and driven to Canada, and some of it was for the enemy, too. A common cow would bring $50 in money. I have seen that much paid to my father for one.

Q. That was during the war!—A. Yes; that was during the war.

Q. What would the cow bring before the war?—A. I guess about $12;
not over that. There was scarcely any money in the country at that time. Business was done by "dicker." A yoke of six-feet cattle was considered fair wages for a man for six months' work.

THE SCHOOL SYSTEM OF THE OLDEN TIME.

The schools that we had to attend then were from a mile to two and a half miles off. We had a common school three months in the year. I had to go 2 miles to school.

Q. How much schooling in the year did you get? — A. Three months in the winter.

Q. No summer school! — A. No summer school.

Q. Do you remember what was taught and what text books you had? — A. We had arithmetic and geography and the first rudiments of grammar; reading, writing, spelling, and oratorical speaking. We all had to study oratory and speak then.

Q. You used to practice speaking in the school! — A. Yes.

Q. What were the names of the text-books, if you remember? — A. The oratory book was the "Columbian Orator"; I don't remember the rest.

Q. Do you know what pay teachers got in those days? — A. About $8 a month and their board.

Q. Did they board around them or have any special place? — A. They boarded around in different families.

Q. Do you recollect how large the school was — how many scholars there were? — A. The school that I attended had, I think, twenty-five boys and fifteen girls; that makes forty scholars.

Q. What sort of a school-house was it? — A. We had a little square school-house, about 24 feet square, all in one room, with one big fireplace, and with wooden benches.

Q. Where was the school-house? Was it by the old market? — A. Yes; on the top of the hill. We used to have spelling-schools once a week, in the evenings — spelling-schools where we used to have to choose sides.

THE CHURCH OF FORMER DAYS.

We had a church in my native town, and we paid the minister $400 a year; paid him in produce and in wood — no cash at all, but in such material as he could live on. In 1812 this church was torn to pieces on political questions. Part of the people were Democrats, in favor of the war, and part of them were Federals, opposed to the war, and it created such a division in the church that it broke up the society.

Q. Describe that old church. — A. It was a square church, about 40 feet by 50 feet, I guess, with square pews in it, and with a seat that lifted up when you stood up at prayers, making that much more room.

Q. You mean the seat you sat on? — A. Yes; when you lifted that up you had more room, and when the preacher said "amen," the clapping of seats was astonishing. There was a pulpit and a "sounding-board," as they called it, overhead, composed of light timber made the shape of a top.

Q. The shape of a top, bottom upwards, I suppose? — A. Yes; very much like a top bottom upwards. The church was built in 1800.

Q. Was there any way of heating those old churches? — A. No; there was no fire anywhere near them.

Q. How long did the church service last? — A. The sermon was al-
ways an hour long; they were never short of that, and prayers accordingly.

Q. A good many of them?—A. Yes; the old gentleman preached an hour, and the prayers were pretty long.

Q. Was there singing?—A. Yes, we had choir singing.

Q. Were there Sabbath schools then?—A. No, sir; there was no such thing then. We had a tithing man, with a long pole, to keep order, and when the boys made too much noise they got rapped on the head. The women used to bring to church pieces of sheet-iron in a wooden frame, with coals inside, so that they could keep their feet warm by keeping them on the wooden frame, which would keep them from coming in direct contact with the heat. Every woman almost brought such a thing as that.

**PRIMITIVE METHODS OF LOCOMOTION.**

When there was no snow on the ground the women rode to church on “pillions,” as we called them, behind the men. It was just as important to have a horse-block then as to have now a door to a carriage. No man that had a horse would think of not having a horse-block.

Q. A woman could not get on the horse until the man was first on, could she?—A. No; and everybody had horse-blocks, and after awhile the horses got trained so that they would stand by the horse-block and the women could easily get on. That is the way they went to church. Girls in those days used to have a fine pair of shoes, and they would carry them in their hands until they got near the church, and then they would step to one side of the road, or into the bushes, and put on their shoes, go into church, and then take them off again on the way home, so as not to wear them much. This I know to be a fact.

Q. They would go barefoot?—A. Yes. I guess there were no corns on people’s feet in those days. About 1817 the first cotton cloth came to town—

**THE LOOM AND SPINNING-WHEEL IN EVERY HOUSE.**

Q. Before you speak of that I would like to have you give some particular account of the cloth that was used in families. You have stated, I believe, the kind of cloth, but I would like to know the manner and the cost of making it. Was all that they wore in those days made from the wool that was raised from their own sheep, and from the flax which they raised themselves?—A. Yes.

Q. They had a loom in the house?—A. Every family had a loom.

Q. And the children or girls, I suppose, were all taught to manage it?—A. Yes.

Q. And to spin?—A. Yes.

Q. What way had they of spinning then?—A. They spun the wool on a large wheel, about 5 feet over—a wheel standing on three legs, with a spindle up the front part, carried by a band over the big wheel.

Q. How much yarn could a good smart woman spin in a day?—A. I forget the number of skeins, but there was a regular day’s work of skeins.

**RATES OF WAGES.**

Q. Do you remember what pay they would get a week?—A. We paid 75 cents a week during what we called spinning season.

Q. A woman got 75 cents a week and her board!—A. Yes.

39—C 3—(6 LAW)
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Q. About how long was that spinning season, should you say?—A. A couple of months.
Q. What part of the year was it?—A. In August and September.
Q. Before that they had been carded?—A. Yes.
Q. Made into rolls?—A. Yes.
Q. And always made from flax and wool raised at home?—A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember anything about the price paid for weaving, or how much could be woven in a day, or in a week?—A. No; I do not think I could tell that now.
Q. Do you recollect the common pay of a girl?—A. Yes; the common pay of a girl was 75 cents a week and board.
Q. That was during the spinning season?—A. Yes.
Q. What was it during the other portion of the year?—A. The rest of the year there was no chance for a girl to get any work. I had sisters that could get no work except during the spinning season.

WOMAN LABOR ON FARMS.

Q. What kind of work did women do in those days?—A. All kinds of housework; spinning, weaving, cooking; and, in the summer season, or in hay-time, both boys and girls were in the hay-field shaking hay and raking. They could not mow, of course. I have seen a dozen girls in the hay-field at a time, shaking the hay to make it dry. It was a common thing. There was no aristocracy in those days, and there was no degradation about that sort of work. We all had orchards then. The first thing a farmer did was to set out apple trees when he cleared up the land, and all took apples to the mill in the fall and made cider enough to last the year round. Shall I say anything about rum in those days?

The CHAIRMAN. State any fact about the old times that occurs to you.

RUM AS FREE AS WATER.

The WITNESS. Well, rum was just as common a drink as water. There was no building raised, nor funeral, that occurred nor anything else hardly without rum. A person would not consider himself gently used on going into a house without being asked to take a drink; if a man went into a house without an invitation to take something; he would not consider himself politely treated.

Q. Was there much intoxication among the people?—A. There was not nearly as much intoxication as there is now. Folks did not all necessarily drink because rum was so plenty, but they all had it and carried it into the fields; every boy carried a jug. I knew old men that used to drink pretty hard; every time they went to the “store,” as we used to call it then, once a week, or once a month, they would get pretty well “over the bay,” but such men lived to be old men. I never heard of a case of delirium tremens until 1840.

INTOXICATION LESS FREQUENT FORMERLY THAN NOW. WHY?

Q. How do you account for the difference between that time and this?—A. I think there was a great difference in the quality of liquor drunk. It must be that. Men in those days were good to sit up and watch with a sick person whenever necessary, but they always had to be provided with rum. That was so invariably. Rum was thought to be a necessity of life. A man could go to the store and get trusted for
rum in case of sickness when they would not trust him for anything else, because they considered it an absolutely necessary thing. Old Moore Russell, of Plymouth, sold fifty-two hogsheads of new rum out of his store in one year, about 1815-16. He had a mortgage on almost all the farms around where he lived.

Q. What was the condition of the people around there at that time, as to their having property and as to their property being encumbered?—A. Well, property had but small value compared to what it has now. I don't think that it was any more encumbered.

**PRINCIPAL ARTICLES OF SALE.**

Q. That is, any more encumbered by mortgage?—A. No; not any more encumbered by mortgages. Our principal exports in that section of the country were potash and clover seed. In cleaning our upland we rolled the logs together and burnt them and saved the ashes, put up our “leaches,” got lye and boiled it down. We found a market in the seaport towns and other places.

Q. How did you use to get these products to market?—A. The farmers used to go down once a year, in sleighing time, either here (Boston) or to Portland, with whatever farm products they had for sale, and they always loaded back with rum—that was the first thing always—and tobacco, salt, salt fish, and then they got some tea and coffee, if there was any money left after they got the other things.

**PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS.**

Butter was then worth 7 cents a pound; lambs were worth 75 cents a head; sheep, perhaps $1 or $1.25; and pork about $3.50. Some fine merino rams were imported into this country at that time that were sold as high as $400 a piece. Before that time our wool was all coarse wool. These merino rams gave very fine wool, which made very fine broadcloth.

In 1816 came what was known as the “cold season;” there was a frost every month in the year, and no corn was raised at all. Seed corn in the spring of 1817, being the crop of 1815, was sold for $4 a bushel. We lived during that year mostly on potatoes and milk. What pork we had we fed it on potatoes. That was the bluest time that we had ever seen, I suppose. In 1817 the crops were fair and the country began to prosper again. It was getting over the war of 1812 and its consequences.

Q. What were the wages of men as they worked out on farms when you were a boy?—A. Eight dollars a month during the summer.

Q. Was there work for them in the winter?—A. No.

Q. The summer season would be about six months, I suppose?—A. Yes, six months; and they called a yoke of good, six-feet cattle good pay.

Q. What were horses worth about that time?—A. About $40.

Q. Hogs were worth how much then?—A. Three dollars and a half a hundred.

Q. That was after they were killed?—A. Dressed; yes.

Q. How did cheese sell?—A. Cheese sold for about 6 cents a pound.

**PRICES OF HOME-MADE LINEN AND WOOLEN CLOTHS.**

Q. What was common woolen cloth, as you wore it in the family, worth?—A. About 75 cents a yard, what is called “full’d” cloth, after it had been to the mill and was “dressed,” as we called it.
Q. How did linen sell?—A. It sold for $15 to 18 cents a yard.
Q. That is the home-made linen?—A. Yes; and it would last a long while, I can tell you.
Q. You said the country took a new start after that hard winter of 1816.—A. Yes; the country prospered then for a few years—up to the time I left that part of the country.
Q. When did you leave Campton?—A. In the spring of 1823.
Q. How old were you then?—A. Nineteen.
Q. Where did you go?—A. I came to Boston.
Q. Give us some account of your journey, and of your object in coming.—A. We young fellows used to come down from there to Boston to get work during the summer; all came afoot, as there was no stage route, and if there had been we would not have had the fare money. We used to make a pack of our clothing and walk to Boston. I walked it four times.
Q. How long did it take to come?—A. About three days—100 miles. We could walk that easily enough.
Q. Do you remember what it cost you to come here?—A. It cost me $2.50 the first time I came here.
Q. What time in the year was it?—A. In March.
Q. You came to work, did you?—A. Yes.

WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOR IN 1823.

Q. What work did you expect to get here?—A. Well, I didn't know what. The first summer I was here I worked out at Newton on a farm.
Q. Do you remember the wages you got then?—A. I got $12 a month.
Q. For how many months?—A. For about five months.
Q. You had your board, of course?—A. Yes.
Q. How many hours did you work each day?—A. From twelve to sixteen, just as it happened. I had to begin at sunrise and work until sundown, as a general thing, stopping for an hour at noon.
Q. Do you remember for whom you worked?—A. I worked for Frank Jackson, a very prominent man in Boston, of the firm of S. & F. Jackson.
Q. How large a farm had he and how many hands?—A. He carried on business here in town—a candle and soap business—in the "Neck." He had a country place up there with a large orchard, and he cut perhaps 40 tons of hay. We bottled up his cider for him and brought it into Boston.
Q. Do you remember what cider was worth then?—A. No; I do not.
Q. Do you remember what hay was worth a ton around here then?—A. Ten or eleven dollars.
Q. What was the quality of hay in those days?—A. Well, it was pretty good, because the country was new then.
Q. What sort of grass was there?—A. Herb grass and clover and red top.
Q. The same as we have now?—A. Yes; salt-marsh hay was worth $5 a ton.
Q. Twelve dollars a month was good pay for a hand in those days?—A. Yes; we worked from sun to sun, stopping half an hour for dinner. That is the way we had to work when I was a boy.
Q. That was about the way you worked up in Campton before you left home?—A. Yes, sir. The last year I worked in Campton, when I was eighteen years old, I got $8 a month.
Q. Was that good pay for a first-class hand?—A. Yes.
Q. You were a good hand, I suppose?—A. I was.
Q. You were a pretty strong, active boy?—A. Yes. I have often
pitched off eight loads of hay in an afternoon.
Q. How much would there be in a load?—A. Half a ton to a ton.
You could not get folks to do it now.

BOSTON SIXTY YEARS AGO.

Q. What was the condition of Boston when you came here?—A. When
I came to Boston there were about 48,000 inhabitants. The principal
business street was Elm street, and the principal place of resort for
people coming to Boston was Wild's Hotel, on Elm street. That was
just as prominent then as Willard's is now at Washington. There
was no express wagon in Boston in those days, but there were numer-
sous hand-carts on the corners of all the prominent streets, that did
all the little trucking, like moving trunks, packages, &c., from place
to place—little carts drawn by hand. There was a pump that stood in
Dock Square that furnished water for the whole neighborhood of the
northern part of the town. Board at the best hotels was $1 a day.
Common day labor in the city was, at its highest, $1.25 for carrying
brick and stone and doing heavy kinds of work—and it was nearly all
done by Yankees in those times—though there might have been now
and then an Irishman. Quincy market was opened in 1826, and stalls
rented for $250 apiece for a year. Now they are worth $3,000. I went
into the market the next year after it was done to attend a stall.

ONE POLICEMAN TO 48,000 INHABITANTS.

Q. How was it about the police, and the general order of the city
about that time?—A. The city was perfectly quiet then. There was
but one policeman that I ever heard of in those times, and his name was
Reed.
Q. Did you ever see him?—A. Yes, I saw him often; he was a tall,
sharp man; all bad boys were afraid of him, I can tell you. There was
a crier then that went about the city at night to cry the time, from one
street of the city to the other—'12 o'clock, and all is well.' There was
a noted man in those days named Wilson who was the town crier. If
anything was lost in town he went around the streets with a big bell
crying it out. If a child or any important thing was lost, or if a notice
was required to be given of any important meeting that was to be held
he would go around ringing his bell and crying out the fact. That is
the way we learned about different events. There were no daily papers
then, you know. There might possibly have been some paper, but no
daily.
Q. How was it about the churches in those days?—A. One of the
principal churches here was Lyman Beecher's. The house where he
preached was on the corner of Tremont and Park streets. He first com-
enced preaching temperance in that church and we called it "Brim-
stone Corner."
Q. You were an old-fashioned Congregationalist yourself, and all your
folks over in Campton, were you not?—A. Oh, yes; at that time Hosea
Ballou had a Universalist church in Boston.
Q. Were they the two principal clergymen in those times?—A. Yes.
Q. They were against each other in theology, were they?—A. Yes.
Q. How long did you remain here in Boston?—A. From 1823 to the
fall of 1828.
BOSTON PRICES FOR FOOD.

Q. Can you remember the prices that were then paid for the necessaries of life. You were in the market awhile, and perhaps you can remember!—A. Yes; hogs were worth from 4 to 6 cents a pound.

Q. Do you mean at retail!—A. No, by the hog—those which came in from the country. We used to go out to Cambridge to meet the teams. Dressed hogs were sold as low as 4 cents and as high as 6 cents.

Q. For what price would that be sold at retail to the people to eat!—A. Spare-ribs at about 8 cents a pound, and the side, salted and put up, probably at about 8 cents.

Q. Was any mutton eaten in those days!—A. Yes; a great deal; I don't remember just what the price of mutton was. The highest I ever paid for beef, or the highest that I ever heard of cattie being sold for here in the market, was 6 cents a pound, dressed weight.

Q. Do you recollect about the prices of flour, meal, corn, wheat, oats, burley, and things of that kind!—A. Flour, the best brand, was about $5 a barrel.

Q. Do you recollect about Indian meal—or was that eaten!—A. Yes. Indian and rye meal were eaten a good deal. Every farmer had rye and Indian bread on his table.

Q. That was back on the farms, but was it done here in the city much!—A. No; not much in the city.

Q. Where did the flour come from that was sold here at $5 a barrel!—A. That was made at the mills. There was a mill on the mill-dam between Brighton and here—on the road from Boston across to Brighton—out about a mile on that road, worked by the tide.

Q. Where did the wheat come from!—A. From the surrounding country.

Q. It was not brought on from the West at all!—A. Oh, no.

Q. It was raised here!—A. Yes.

Q. In those times people raised here what they ate here, did they!—A. Yes.

Q. And the food was what! State the principal articles of food—were they the same as now!—A. Yes. Pork and beef, and bread, and crackers, and butter, cheese, and poultry.

Q. Was there a good deal of poultry eaten!—A. Yes; poultry raised around here.

Q. Do you recollect the price of poultry!—A. Poultry was worth 10 cents a pound.

Q. This was from 1823 to 1826, and along there!—A. Yes.

Q. It was in 1826 that you went into the market, was it!—A. Yes. Peaches were just as plenty in the vicinity of Boston as apples are in any apple country. There was not a country-seat around here—in Brookline or Roxbury, or anywhere, but what had lots of peach trees.

Q. Of as good quality as you get now!—A. Well, very good, though perhaps hardly as good as now. Peaches were very common.

NO EXPRESS BUSINESS.

As I have said, there was no express business done then. There was no such thing as an express wagon. The drivers of the stages out of the city did all the express business that was done then, such as carrying money back and forth to the banks, and all that the express companies do now, and they distributed the papers, &c.

Q. Do you remember anything about the cost of travel!
COST OF TRAVEL.

A. The stage fare from here to Concord was $3. They would charge us 25 cents a meal then in traveling through the country. If a man stopped to get his dinner or breakfast he paid 25 cents a meal usually, whether a teamster or a traveler. They had what we called "stage taverns" then, that used to charge $1 1/2 cents a meal.

Q. You may state how long you remained here.—A. I went away in the fall of 1828.

Q. Where did you go to?—A. To Ashtabula County, Ohio.

METHODS OF TRAVEL IN 1828.

Q. How did you get there?—A. Went to Providence by stage, and to New York by steamboat, then up the North River to Albany, then up the canal to Buffalo (the canal had been only one year completed); from Buffalo there was an old boat then run to Dunkirk (45 miles), and we waited three or four days for the wind to go down, and then we went to Buffalo, and from there we got along by stage.

Q. To Ashtabula County?—A. Yes.

Q. How long did it take to make the entire trip?—A. Sixteen days.

Q. From Boston?—A. Yes.

Q. To what place in that county did you go?—A. To Ashtabula.

Q. That was the county seat?—A. Yes. I went there with another man named Nathaniel Pease, and erected a small slaughter-house, and commenced buying cattle and hogs to pack for the Eastern market.

BEGINNING OF THE PORK-PACKING INDUSTRY IN OHIO.

Q. What was the condition of the cattle or hog trade at that time?—A. Ours was the first business that I know of being commenced. There had been no market before for hogs or cattle. The man that I went to work for carried out $7,000 of Boston money, and did not find cattle and hogs enough in that region to use up all his $7,000, and he carried back a part of the money the next season that he had taken out. He bought some horses with it, however. Those were the first provisions that I know of being at the west end of New York and Erie Canal. Buffalo then had 3,000 inhabitants.

Q. What made you think that this that you did was the first of that business that was ever done?—A. Because I never heard of any other.

Q. It was so understood at the time there, was it?—A. Oh, yes; there had been none done on Lake Erie.

Q. Those, then, were the first provisions ever shipped from the West to the Eastern market?—A. Salt provisions, yes. They had shipped from Cincinnati down the Mississippi River, and brought it around that way. Cincinnati had 14,000 inhabitants when I first went West. Cleveland had no harbor at all, and Detroit was a mere Indian trading point.

EXPORTATION OF SHEEP'S PELTS.

Q. What year was this?—A. Eighteen hundred and twenty-eight; just fifty-five years ago. In about 1829 there was no duty on sheep’s pelts, but there was a large duty on wool, so we killed hundreds of thousands of sheep throughout the country and shipped the pelts to Europe. I killed thousand there for other men. However, they very soon put a duty on pelts, and settled that.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Q. They exploded that Yankee trick right away, did they?—A. Yes. Land was worth $3 an acre between Erie and Cleveland, along the lakeshore. That was the regular price.

Q. That was wild land?—A. Yes. Emigration had just begun to set in then, to what we called the Western Reserve.

Q. Do you remember what you had to pay for animals?—A. We paid $2.50 for beef.

Q. A hundred pounds?—A. A hundred pounds, dressed; and about $3 for oxen, and from 75 cents to $1 for sheep.

Q. Dressed?—A. No; sheep by the head; they dressed it themselves. The pelts were then worth more than we paid for the sheep.

Q. That is, you could sell them for more than you paid for the sheep?—A. Yes.

Q. And in buying a sheep you paid more for the pelt than for the meat?—A. Well, the pelt was all there was, except what tallow there would be.

MUTTON AS FOOD FOR HOGS.

Q. What did you do with the meat?—A. We boiled it and fed it to the hogs.

Q. You fed the hogs on mutton?—A. Yes, we fed the hogs on mutton, and it made pretty good pork, too.

Q. Do you know of any animals being fed now on other animals?—A. No. At that time hogs used to be fed on offal, but there are now fertilizing establishments that take all the offal.

Q. But now the mutton is worth more for human beings to eat than it is to give to hogs?—A. Yes; but still it would not be if they killed more of it than the human beings could possibly eat.

PRICES OF PRODUCTS IN OHIO FROM 1828 TO 1834.

Q. Do you recollect anything about the price of grain then?—A. Oats in Ohio were worth from 10 to 12 cents a bushel; wheat, 25 cents, and corn about a shilling.

Q. Do you recollect anything more about the condition of the country?—A. Well, the country improved very fast.

Q. Do you remember the wages paid to people then?—A. We paid $10 a month in "dicker," as we called it; not much money—in clothes, hogs, sheep, &c. You see there was not much money in Ohio, but that country improved very fast after the canal was built in 1826. The Western Reserve put right ahead then, so that five years after that there was a large amount of stock for sale.

Q. Did prices improve?—A. Yes, prices improved. Beef was worth $3 to $3.50 a hundred pounds.

Q. How long did you remain there?—A. From 1828 to the winter of 1833 and 1834.

Q. Where did you go then?—A. To Chicago.

CHICAGO FIFTY YEARS AGO.

Q. In what condition was Chicago then?—A. Chicago then had about 300 inhabitants, besides Fort Dearborn (which had eighty soldiers and their officers, making it amount to about a hundred). There was no business done in the winter. Provisions were all taken from Ohio for them to live on.

Q. What made you go there?—A. Well, I heard of it, and looked at it and saw that it was a good point. I had faith in the growth of the
country, and went there to open a market. There was no slaughter-house there—no place to kill a beef, and for sixty days I led the cattle out to an old elm tree that stood on Monroe street, about where the court-house is, and there I took a tackle and swung them up on the elm after killing them.

Q. What animals did you kill?—A. Beef principally; there was not anything else there to kill the first little while that I was there. They had hardly any sheep.

Q. Were there any hogs!—A. Very few hogs. The hogs had all to come from Wabash—150 miles down. I went into that business afterwards, and went down to Wabash and drove them up.

Q. You killed those animals to ship to the East?—A. No, I killed those for the local market—as much beef each day as was needed for home consumption.

Q. Did you commence the meat business there?—A. Yes, sir.

BEGINNING OF THE CATTLE AND HOG INDUSTRY IN CHICAGO.

Q. You were the first one that established it!—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell us something of its development afterward.—A. Chicago grew very fast, and in 1835 there must have been 2,500 people there. We then went down to the Wabash country, as we called it, and bought cattle and hogs and drove them up for market. We did not ship them then. In 1836 they commenced building the canal, and in that year I packed 6,000 hogs there, mostly for home consumption. They were building the Illinois and Michigan Canal then, and the contractors, in 1837 and 1838, took the pork for their men. The State failed to pay in 1838–39, and work on the canal was stopped. State bonds went down to 25 cents on the dollar, and the State issued what was called canal scrip, to pay the contractors what they owed them for work that they had done. That was afterwards all redeemed, dollar for dollar. In 1836 the old town of Chicago was sold. The Government gave the State of Illinois every alternate section for 15 miles wide to aid in building the canal from Chicago to the Illinois River—Peru, I think, is at the end of the canal—and one section of that canal was right in the heart of old Chicago. It was sold in June, 1836, by the State of Illinois, for a quarter down and the balance in one, two, and three years, and I think there was but one man in the city that made his second payment; that was P. F. W. Peck. The thing all burst up, and there was but that one man made his second payment. They had all paid one-quarter down and given notes, at interest, for the rest. I did so myself, and so did others; but only one man made the second payment.

Q. Why so!—A. Because everybody burst up—the banks and everybody else went up.

Q. What became of the canal?—A. The canal went along for awhile. Contracts were entered into by the State, and work went along until 1839, the State trying in every way to pay, and about that time they stopped. There was an appropriation of $4,000,000 made by the State, for internal improvements, but when the canal and railroad were partly done it all burst up, and these improvements were not again begun until about 1847 or 1848.

NECESSITY FOR A BANKRUPTCY ACT IN 1842.

Q. What was the condition of the people around there then; how were they clad and how were they housed, and what was the condition of their wages?—A. Well, from 1836 to 1842, when the United States
bankrupt law was passed, there was no responsibility. No man had anything, hardly, that he could call his own at the time the law was passed in 1842.

Q. You think that the bankrupt act was necessary, do you!—A. Oh, yes; they never would have started in the world if it had not been for that.

Q. During that time how were prices!

**PRICES IN CHICAGO FROM 1838 TO 1847.**

A. In 1838 I paid $6 a hundred pounds for pork in Chicago. In 1841, with the view of finishing the canal next summer, I bought pork for $2—that is to say, I paid $2 for all pork that weighed 200, and for all hogs that did not weigh 200 I paid $1.50 a hundred. I bought beef there for barreling in 1843 and 1844 for $2 a hundred, for the fore quarters of the beef, if the ox weighed 600 pounds, and $1.50 per hundred pounds if he fell under it. That is the lowest price I ever heard of its being sold for.

Q. That was owing to the condition of credit and of the currency!—A. Yes, and then there was more of this stuff raised than was needed up to about 1846 or 1847, when the famine in Ireland cleaned out the west almost entirely. Wheat was worth 25 cents a bushel in 1844 in Chicago. Produce commenced rising from that time, and you might say has kept on rising since. Cattle and pork rose a good deal from a small price until in 1850 cattle were worth $4 to $5 a hundred pounds, and hogs were worth the same. There has been a steady increase each year. I made money, for the reason that everything was going up.

Q. That comes down to when!—A. From 1844 to 1850.

Q. You still remained at Chicago!—A. Yes.

Q. I suppose Chicago was developing all the time!—A. Yes.

Q. Do you recollect about the prices of wheat or corn in those days!—A. In 1848 corn was worth 25 cents a bushel.

Q. That is, at Chicago!—A. Yes. Freight then was as high as 25 cents a bushel to Buffalo.

Q. And from Buffalo on to Boston, what was it!—A. I do not know what freight was to Boston then. I staid in that provision business until I killed one hundred and eighty-five head of large cattle, and five hundred hogs for a day's work; and that is not, comparatively speaking, more than a teaspoonful to what they have come to since I left the business.

**BENEFIT TO CHICAGO OF THE "RELIEF LAW."**

Chicago had no start, no life, until the legislature passed what we called the relief law; that is, they give us as much of the land as we had paid for. If a man had bought four lots and paid the full value of one the relief law gave us one lot, and then gave us up our notes. That was the first sign of life after the break-up in Chicago. Then, you see, a man who was cleared through bankruptcy, if he could raise only a hundred dollars had credit; but up to that time, when we were all in debt, nobody would trust his brother. In 1851 and 1852 I spent most of my time in northern New York and Vermont. In January, 1851, I received an appointment as agent for the "Ogdensburg and Lake Champlain," and "Burlington and Rutland Railroads." My business was to procure freight and passengers from the West over these roads, for the Boston market. In the fall of 1850 I shipped a propeller load of about 3,000 barrels of provisions to Ogdensburg, which were stored there till
the railroad was completed in January, 1851. I bought 7,000 kegs of nails at the "Keysville Iron Works," on Lake Champlain, as return freight for Chicago. Nails were worth only $2.87 ½ per hundred, but during the next six months they rose to $4 per hundred. These northern railroads were not successful in getting much business for the eastern markets for a few years, as they could not compete with the New York Central Railroad and the Erie Canal.

Q. From Chicago where did you go?—A. I went from Chicago to Davenport, Iowa, in 1852. I was there two years.

Q. Did you follow the same business there?—A. No; I was in the grain business there.

PRICE OF PROVISIONS IN IOWA IN 1852.

Q. How were the prices of provisions there?—A. Well, hogs were $3 a hundred in Davenport, in 1852.

Q. What are they worth now?—A. I don’t know what they are worth now. They vary. They have been as high as 8, 10, and 12 cents a pound, though they are down now, I believe.

Q. You do not know the price of other kinds of meat—beef and mutton—at Davenport at that time, do you?—A. No.

Q. You are in the grain business mostly!—A. Yes.

Q. Do you recollect about the prices of grain there?—A. Corn was worth 20 to 25 cents a bushel; wheat, from 40 to 50 cents; oats, about 12 cents.

Q. Did you ship to the East?—A. I did, from Chicago to Buffalo. I did not ship much from Davenport.

INVENTION OF KILN DRYING FOR MEAL.

In 1852 I went into the grain-drying business, making kiln-dried meal for the West India Islands, from a process of my own invention. I made 500 barrels of kiln-dried meal a day, and shipped it to the West India Islands.

Q. What sort of market did you get for it?—A. A very fair market. The negroes in the West India Islands ate it.

Q. Did you ship it down the Mississippi?—A. Some of it, but most of it by way of New York. I made money the last year that I sent kiln-dried meal there, by my own process.

Q. Is the invention still in use?—A. Yes; much of the article is put up now for the European markets under my same brand, "Mersh's Caloric Dried Meal." I have five patents for drying grain. There is not so much of this kind made as there used to be, because farmers take care of their own corn now, and if the corn begins to heat they will put it into cars. When I began it they would put it in their warehouse and let it stay there awhile, and it would heat.

Q. From Davenport where did you go?—A. I went to Chicago. I did not really move to Davenport.

Q. You went back, then, to Chicago. How long did you remain there?—A. I remained in Chicago until 1855—all the time.

Q. There was no special change in the condition of things in Chicago, I suppose, during that time, that you remember?—A. No.

Q. Where did you go next?—A. To Jamaica Plain, near Boston.

Q. And you went from Jamaica Plain to Littleton?—A. Yes.
HISTORY OF THE MOUNT WASHINGTON RAILROAD.

Q. I wish you would give us some account of the invention and construction of the Mount Washington Railroad?—A. I got my charter from the State in 1858, for a railroad up Mount Washington and LaFayette. Nobody believed in it, and it created quite a burst of laughter when the man in the legislature read the bill for a charter. Another member jumped up and moved to add to it, "a railroad to the moon." I did not commence the railroad until 1866; we were three years building it. The railroad now pays 10 per cent. dividends on its stock, and during the summer of 1882 it carried up eleven thousand people.

Q. You never proposed to build it as far as the moon, yourself?—A. No; I did not propose going any farther than I could find a foundation.

Q. You calculated to keep your head level all the time?—A. Yes. I have got a little book containing scraps of all the editorials that were written upon it for seven or eight years, and you would laugh if you were to read some of those editorials.

Q. The editors are not always right, then?—A. Well, these have been written since the road was built.

Q. After you had got to running it?—A. Yes; since it started, and after we had got two-thirds the way up, and so on.

Q. How came you to build that railroad; what put the idea into your mind?—A. Well, I built it for pastime, and to cure the dyspepsia, more than anything else. I retired from business in 1855, and after living for a few years doing nothing I had the dyspepsia very badly, and was compelled to do something to save my health. I got this idea into my head and worked upon it, and built different models of it until I worked it out. It was ridiculed a great deal and laughed at, but it cured the dyspepsia.

Q. And you and your family have been realizing the effects of that idea ever since, and you have made quite a fortune by it, have you not?—A. Well, I have done pretty well. It is paying pretty well now. It has been a good thing for my native State, and brings a good many people into the State.

REMINISCENCES OF EARLY TIMES IN ILLINOIS.

Q. Do you remember any other incidents that would illustrate the difference between those early times and the present time?—A. The people who at first settled the northern part of Illinois generally put up rough boards for the first building, with one or two rooms, and they did not fence in their fields at all, because there were not cattle enough to do any harm. The cattle ran at large. Up to about 1837, flour, butter, cheese, and so on, were all shipped from the East—from Ohio. In 1837 the tide turned. I never knew of but one bear in Illinois. We certainly killed one bear, in the summer of 1834, in the woods, about three-quarters of a mile south of Chicago. Where he came from I don't know. We certainly killed him and cooked him. I never heard of any other bear being killed there. When he was killed we did all the honors due to such a high dignitary. We had him taken by pall-bearers, and he was carried into town and dressed, and cooked in a big oven, and the whole town came together to eat bear meat.

Q. That was in 1834?—A. In the summer of 1834. Champagne then in Chicago was almost as plenty as water. They drank it freely on every occasion. We drank champagne at the bear dinner, and had speeches and toasts, and eulogized on the growth of our country, and resolved to make a great country of it.
ENTERPRISE OF CHICAGO.

Q. That same spirit was in Chicago then that is there now?—A. That same spirit was in Chicago that is there now, and has been since I went to it. I think Chicago will be the biggest city on the Continent within thirty years. There is plenty of room to grow there, while there is not such room in New York. Chicago is in reality a forced point. All of the country north of the southern bend of Lake Michigan has to bend down around Chicago, and that makes a forced point of it. If you could bridge the lake at Milwaukee, or Green Bay, or Mackinaw, it would be different, but now the whole Northwest, in order to come East, has to come through Chicago. That is why I call it a forced point. There was but one mail a week to Chicago when I first went there, and that was by stage from the East.

Q. Do you mean that a mail came in but once a week and a mail went out but once a week?—A. Yes.

Q. How much was postage on a letter then?—A. Twenty-five cents a letter.

Q. At what time was it that you went to Chicago?—A. In the winter 1833-'34. I do not know of more than two men alive now that were in Chicago at the time I went there. One of them is J. K. Botsford, a hardware merchant, and the other, Philo Carpenter, quite a wealthy man, on the West side.

Q. Where are they now?—A. Those two are in Chicago. There may have been other men around the country there, but those are the only men that I know of that are living there who were there at the time I went there. A great many came in in the summer of 1834. We had two Indian payments after I went there. I had a contract from the Government to feed the Indians in 1835 and in 1836.

Q. Were there any Indians there?—A. Oh, yes; some 6,000 of them about the time of the Black Hawk war. That was in 1832.

Q. Where were they?—A. Out on the Black Hawk Reservation, I believe. They made a treaty, as usual, by which they were to have so many provisions, &c., and they came to Chicago to get their payments.

Q. How long were the Indians about there after you went to Chicago?—A. There were many of them there for about two years—I guess not more than that—until after they got the last payment. The Black Hawk war, as I have said, was in 1832.

THE FIRST PASSENGER RAILROAD IN THE UNITED STATES.

The railroad was partially completed from Albany to Schenectady in 1832. I rode over it immediately after it was done. We went up a half a mile out of Albany by an endless chain and then went level across to Schenectady, about 16 miles; then we supposed we had to run exactly level and straight; we went across 16 miles and went down again with an endless chain to Schenectady. That was the first passenger road in the United State, built in 1832, the cholera season.

Q. That was before the Boston and Lowell road was built?—A. Oh, yes; it was the first passenger road that was done.

Q. You rode over that road?—A. Yes; I remember that the engine had no smokestack at all, and the water for the engine was carried in barrels. Cars hung on leather thorough braces, with seats facing each other.

Q. How fast would you get along?—A. Sixteen miles an hour. We made the trip in one hour and it was 16 miles.
Q. That was good speed, I suppose, everything considered?—A. Oh, yes.
Q. How many passengers were there in a coach?—A. About sixteen.
Q. And how many coaches in a train?—A. About three at the time I went; that would be forty-eight passengers.
Q. How many trains a day?—A. I guess only one, that ran in connection with the stage, though possibly there might have been two. There were then no checks for baggage or anything of that sort. Every man had to claim his own baggage.
Q. Do you recollect what you had to pay for fare?—A. It was about the same as stage fare; I think 4 cents a mile. I recollect now, it was half a dollar for 16 miles.
Q. That would be about 3 cents a mile?—A. Yes.

THE PURCHASING POWER OF MONEY IN EARLY TIMES.

Q. In those days a dollar would buy more than it will now, in money, would it not?—A. Oh, yes. In those days they charged 25 cents a meal at the hotels all along the route where you stopped over night.
Q. Do you recollect what lodging was?—A. No, I do not. It was about a dollar a day, I suppose, altogether.
Q. Now, taking into account the condition of working people then, how would it compare with their condition at this time?—A. The working people then had but very little money. It would be singular to find a man with a dollar or two in his pocket. Very few men would have as much as $2 in his pocket.
Q. That was about when?—A. Away back in 1827.
Q. And, I suppose, it would be the same clear back to when you were a boy?—A. Yes, and more so. After the war of 1812 money was very scarce.

WHAT AMOUNT WAS CONSIDERED "WEALTH."

Q. How much would you say that a fore-handed man would be worth up in Campton when you were a boy?—A. A man that had a farm worth $1,500 or $2,000 at that time was considered "A. No. 1." Colonel Holmes, the richest man in town, was worth some $4,000 or $5,000.
Q. Do you recollect how large a farm he had?—A. He had five barns and five hundred acres of land, from his place to what was called the old part of the town.
Q. That was how far from Campton Hill?—A. It was near by the church.
Q. How far from your house?—A. A mile and a half from Campton Hollow, on the road coming east, instead of going up straight through the town.

LARGE FAMILIES IN OLDER TIMES.

Q. Families were much more numerous then than now, were they not?—A. Yes. The first eighty-six families that settled in Campton, N. H., had on an average eight and one-half children to the family. That is worth remembering.
Q. Do you recollect how large the largest families were?—A. There were seventeen. Our family had eleven, and an uncle of mine had nine, and they are all gone but me.
Q. How about the stock of these old families? Is that disappearing from New England towns—take Campton for example!
OLD NEW ENGLAND FAMILIES PASSING AWAY.

A. Yes, the old stock is all gone. The people that remain there are mostly people that have moved in. All the enterprising and wealthy families have died out or have gone away; none of them are left.

Q. How is that generally with reference to the rural towns of New England, as you have observed them?—A. That is the case with most of the New England people. All the old families have either died out or gone away.

Q. How about their emigrating?—A. A great many of them have emigrated to the West. You will find New Hampshire people wherever you go.

Q. Chicago is in Cook County?—A. Yes.
Q. How came Cook County by its name?—A. I don’t know how that is. The CHAIRMAN. I have understood that it was called after a Campton man.

The WITNESS. They have a town now about 40 miles from Chicago that they call Campton. The great inventor of the cork leg is a Campton boy, and he had a contract for two thousand cork legs after the war.

THE CONDITION OF THE LABORING CLASSES IMPROVED.

Q. But take the condition of the laboring population in the country generally, I understand you to say it is very greatly improved over what it was in those early times?—A. Oh, yes; people live very easily now, comparatively.

Q. What do you think of the effect of invention, and of what we call labor-saving machinery, on the condition of people of small means?

BENEFICENT EFFECT OF INVENTIONS.

A. It has made this improvement: A man can live as well now on four, five, or six hours’ work a day as he could on twelve hours’ work when I was a boy, and can take as much comfort from his life, and clothe himself as well.

Q. Then you do not decry labor-saving machinery?—A. Oh, no; it has been a great thing.

The CHAIRMAN. You had started to say something about the first cotton cloth that came into Campton; won’t you state that now?

The WITNESS. That was about 1816.

COTTON CLOTH WORTH 25 CENTS A YARD IN 1816.

Q. What was cotton cloth worth then?—A. Twenty-five cents a yard.

Q. Do you remember about its price along after that?—A. No; I could not tell.

Q. But you recollect that it began at 25 cents a yard?—A. Yes.
Q. Where did it come from?—A. I don’t know; Lowell, I suppose.
Q. That was before they began manufacturing in this country, was it not?—A. I guess it was.
Q. It must have been imported, then?—A. Well, in 1823, in Lowell, they had begun the foundation for the second factory there. I was there then and stayed over night.
Q. That cloth may possibly have been made in Lowell, then, may it not?—A. It may possibly have been.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

COTTON CLOTH WORTH 8 CENTS A YARD IN 1883.

Q. That same cloth is worth how much now, do you suppose?—A. About 8 cents.

Q. Was the cloth any better in quality then than now, do you think?—A. I rather think it was heavier. It was not as fine.

Q. It would not be called as nice cloth!—A. No; it would not be called as nice cloth.

Q. Do you recollect anything of the operatives of those early days—at the commencement of the cotton manufacture?—A. Yes. The Yankee girls all went from our country to the factories, for work, as soon as they could get a chance to work in the mills, and labor then went up at home so that you could not hire a girl short of $1 or $1.50 a week.

TEACHERS AND THEIR WAGES IN EARLY DAYS.

Q. How was it about the teachers in those days in the common schools; were they men or women?—A. We used generally to have a man three months in winter. In the summer we had women altogether.

Q. But you were a boy and did not get much chance to go to school in the summer time?—A. No.

Q. Do you know what female wages were—what they paid the "school-marm"?—A. My recollection is, that they paid them about $1.25 a week.

Q. And boarded them!—A. And boarded them. The winter teachers were paid as high as $8 to $10 a month. I recollect that distinctly.

Q. How was it in those days about the cultivation of music, both vocal and instrumental, among the country people?—A. Well, we had singing schools and big bass-viol and tuning forks.

PRIMITIVE METHODS OF STRIKING FIRE.

There was no way of striking fire since I can remember, except with a flint and punk. When I was a little boy every family kept a little box containing a piece of punk, that would catch a spark when struck from a flint by a piece of steel. There was no other way to strike a light at all, although I sometimes set tow afire with a gun. The first improvement they made upon that was an invention whereby you could insert a stick into a bottle and pull it out, there being phosphorous or something in it that would ignite. Then the next improvement in making a fire was in putting a stick between two sand-papers, and drawing it; and so it went on up to the time when matches came. When I trained, flint-locks and old muskets were the thing.

Q. The percussion cap was unknown!—A. Yes; the first I knew of the percussion cap was about 1830. It was not the present percussion cap exactly, but was a little "pill" about as big as a shot, and made of this percussion stuff, and when it was struck by the hammer it would explode.

IMPROVEMENTS IN AGRICULTURAL INSTRUMENTS.

Q. How was it before the improvement in agricultural implements, such as plows, rakes, scythes, and all that sort of thing?—A. The scythes were made thick and heavy. It was a good half day's work, which the boys all dreaded, to grind a new scythe. The edge was left at about a thirty-second of an inch to the sixteenth of an inch thick, and a boy would turn a grindstone and grind it down sharp, and that was a
good half day's work. It was difficult to get one that would not break. In plows the last improvement at that time was to make wooden mould-boards, covered over with strips of iron to keep them as much as possible from wearing; they had a wrought-iron nose or "point," as they called it. I remember when the first castings were made. The sickle was a great tool then; it is not used now at all. Reaping then was a great business.

Q. Were cart bodies made by hand then by the common mechanic?—A. Yes; and most people used cart-wheels that had no iron, with fel-loes of wood. A tough stick of wood that would not split was always used for that purpose.

Q. What did those carts cost, if you recollect?—A. I do not recol-lect.

Q. They were very heavy, bungling, and cumbersome affairs, I sup-pose?—A. Yes.

Q. I suppose the hay-cart was made then as now, only not so well?—A. Yes; made as it is now, only with the pieces heavier and bigger. Hoes were heavy and thick, such as they use in the South now. The hoe then weighed four times as much as our present hoe.

Q. It was heavy and cumbersome?—A. Yes; and a pitch-fork weighed four times as much.

Q. But they were really no better for use?—A. No; indeed, not so good, as it required so much strength to handle them. They were so heavy that it was as much as one could do to lift the tool, say nothing about doing any work with it.

MEN AND WOMEN STRONGER FORMERLY THAN AT PRESENT.

Q. Were the men and women stronger, or were they weaker then than they are now?—A. They were stronger. They could endure more then than they can now; a good deal more, because they lived coarser, and were out in the air, and were much healthier and stronger.

Q. And women too?—A. And women too.

Q. But, notwithstanding those hardships and this rough life, were they happy, or otherwise, compared with the way they seem to be now?—A. Well, I don't think the improvements have added anything to happiness. I think that striving now to follow fashion more than off-sets the gain and comfort and convenience of having those things. When we were young and had our dances, and a good time together, there was not that jealousy that there is now. It was then all "Hail fellow, well met."

LESS DIVISION INTO CLASSES IN THE PAST.

Q. Was there less division into classes than there seems to be now?—A. Very much less.

Q. You have referred to dances. There was a little sport, then, in those days?—A. Oh, yes. It was a common thing (and I could men- tion a dozen instances to prove it), for a man that worked for a farmer to marry the farmer's daughter; or, on the other hand, the girl that worked for a man was just as likely to marry his son as anybody else.

Q. Then a hired man was as good as anybody?—A. Yes. Major Baker, of the Baker family that you (the chairman) know by reputation, had a daughter marry a Kenniston. I remember when the Kenniston's first went to work for the Baker family. A man's credit then depended upon whether he was lazy or not. When I was a boy a lazy fellow did not have much credit or character in a place.

40—C 3—(5 LAW)
REPUTATION DEPENDANT UPON INDUSTRY.

Q. Credit depended upon industry?—A. Yes. Wenever any man spoke of a young fellow who was likely to marry his daughter he spoke of him as being an industrious, good fellow for work, or, on the other hand, as being a lazy fellow who did not want to work. Of course he did not want his girl to marry a lazy man.

Q. How was it about the girls?—A. They worked, too.

Q. Did the girls have as hard a time as the boys did?—A. I think so, for they had large families, and had to do the spinning and weaving for the family.

Q. Did they do it themselves, mostly?—A. Yes.

Q. People did not hire much help until their own children grew up, and so never hired much?—A. So never hired much. I think there was as much enjoyment in those days throughout the country, and perhaps more than there is now. We are more intelligent now, however; better educated.

PRESENT DETERIORATION IN MORALS AND RELIGION.

Q. Do you think that the people are any better, morally, than they were then?—A. No; I do not think that they have nearly as high a state of morals. I think the conscience has been lowered very much since my boyish days.

Q. You mean generally?—A. I mean generally.

Q. How is it in regard to the religious belief of the people?—A. The religious belief of the people has become much more liberal, less stringent and bigoted. There may be an improvement in that way, but the rigidity with which our forefathers held to what they did believe is that which has brought us where we are.

Q. That is what helped us through the Revolutionary War?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I have often thought that the old Congregational faith achieved our independence, and I think so now.

The WITNESS. To carry out that idea, let me say that when I was a boy we had a chaplain with us on all “training days;” on the battle field there was always a chaplain to open the day with prayer.

Q. That was under the old training?—A. Yes; under the old training. Now, there is hardly a chaplain admitted to the halls of Congress, and I think they need praying for more than those people did then.

Q. You think Congress needs praying for more than the old militia did?—A. Yes; much more.

Q. Do you think that the old fashioned militia “sham fights” were equal to the fights in the House of Representatives?—A. I think they were of a higher order.

Q. Of a higher order intellectually, or physically, or both?—A. Well, I will say, morally.

Q. Your family was of the old Congregational church there?—A. Yes; of the old Connecticut stock of Congregationalists.

CAUSES OF THE DECLINE OF CONSCIENCE.

Q. Now, to what do you attribute this lowering of the quality of conscience in the people generally, of which you have spoken, while material comforts have multiplied?—A. I believe it is because crime is not held in that disgrace now that it was a half a century ago. There is not that disgrace attached to immorality that there was seventy
years ago. People were not in cliques then to defend each other. If a man was guilty of a crime nobody defended him, as people now stand up for men who commit crime. Whether he belonged to one party or to the other, in those days, he had to suffer the consequences of his crime.

Q. You think that punishment was more sure?—A. Yes, much more sure.
Q. Was it more severe, too, usually?—A. Well, I don't know exactly how that was.
Q. But the penalty was more certain?—A. Yes; the penalty was more certain.

"THE NINETEENTH CENTURY," BY MCKENZIE.

I would like to say that there is a book called "The Nineteenth Century," which is a very valuable book for a young man to read. It is written by a man named McKenzie. There is more information in it than you could read in two months in a general history that you would read all through, of nations long back for five hundred years. There are few men who understand, for instance, when the Corn Laws existed in England, or when they were repealed, and few who understand the sufferings of the people under those laws, when you could not buy a piece of pork or beef, or a bushel of grain, unless it was raised in Great Britain, so that the people suffered terribly until the Corn Laws were repealed. They kept the price of land and everything up, so that land lords could get high rents for their places. Many things that have taken place in this last century every man ought really to know.

THE CURSE OF FASHION.

Q. Do you think of any other point that bears on the condition of our own people in the old times as compared with the present that it might be well to mention?—A. Well, I believe that one great curse of our country now is the arbitrary rule of fashion. That is making more unhappy families and more unhappy people than anything else in the world. A poor man, who works hard at days' work, has perhaps got daughters, and, of course, it is his ambition to have his daughters appear as well as the daughters of other people. I have three daughters, and I am able to dress them, but I can see what a terrible condition I would be in if I had not means to enable my girls to look as well as other girls.
Q. How would you correct that; what do you think ought to be done?—A. That is a pretty difficult question to answer.
Q. Is there any other way than that those who have more means should voluntarily dress more plainly and with the expenditure of less money?—A. That would be a very good plan.
Q. I suppose they spend their money with the idea that a man should do with his money as he pleases?—A. Yes, I suppose so.

MEANS OF CORRECTING THE INFLUENCE OF FASHION.

Q. How would you correct that?—A. I would endeavor to induce those who are able to do so to make a sacrifice of a little of their comfort for the good of mankind. When I was at Littleton there was a family of about the ages of mine. The father got $3 a day wages, and his family were very nice people. Our children played together, and went to the same school. I told my wife that I thought we ought not
to dress our children much better than Mr. Fisher's children were
dressed; that we ought to make a little sacrifice in that matter. I said
to her that it would be apt to make him unhappy to have his little
children going home to him and saying, "Why can't I have this, and that,
as Mr. Marsh's children have"? "So," I said, "let us make a sacrifice
for the good of the little children, and to favor them." We never were
aristocratic, but I always felt glad that I had such a feeling as that,
and I wish there were more folks that had that same feeling.

Q. How did the plan work; did the children play together right
along?—Yes.
Q. And they grew up together?—A. Yes, and some of these children
got along very well. No matter how rich a father is there is a "right
smart chance," as the Hoosier says, for some of his children to become
poor, and that ought to be borne in mind when they are growing up.
Q. Then this correction of some of the evils that poor people suffer
from is one dependent very largely, you think, upon a modification of
fashion?—A. Yes, I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Quite a number of mechanics and poor people testi-
tified in New York that they did not send their families to church be-
cause they were not able to dress them so that the other worshipers
would not sneer at them, and on that account they staid away and did
not go at all.

THE POWER OF CONSCIENCE IN WORKING REFORM.

The WITNESS. I can understand that. A person of mature years
may have nerve and sense enough not to care about that, but children
are not that way. I think that conscience has lost its power a good deal.
If the world could be converted to having conscience enough we could
carry the temperance laws, and that would be a great advance, but
until then I don't know that we shall make much. The reason why we
got rid of slavery was because men believed conscientiously that slavery
was wrong; that it was wrong to hold human beings in bondage or as
personal property, and just as soon as conscience got to work at it the
thing worked itself out. I am willing, personally, to make a sacrifice
for the good of others. If I were out in the cold now and really be-
lieved that a glass of "hot sling" was good for me I would not drink
it, because so much depends on example, and so many are ruined by
drink. I would sacrifice my comfort in such a case if I believed it to
be one for the benefit of mankind, and when you persuade enough of us
to think that way we will carry temperance, and then things will im-
prove very fast.

THOMAS WEBB EXAMINED.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In Fall River, Mass.
Q. How old are you?—A. I am nearly seventy years of age.
Q. How long have you lived at Fall River?—A. About thirty-five
years.
Q. Where were you born?—A. In Ireland.
Q. How long have you lived in this country?—A. Thirty-five years
and some months, more or less.

The CHAIRMAN. I received a letter from somebody at Fall River
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whom I don't know, referring to a Mr. Thomas Webb who would testify before the committee. I suppose you must be the person referred to. Won't you go on and state why you appear before the committee?

The WITNESS. My object in appearing before the committee is to do what little I can for the purpose of helping the workingmen to a proper view of their own position. The reason why I appear is because I have been requested by a few men, seeing that I had other business up here, to call upon the committee.

Q. At whose request do you call?—A. I have been requested by some men who work in the mills and some few laboring men.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not need to give the names if you do not wish to.

The WITNESS. You can have the names if you want them.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed to say anything you wish the committee to know.

The WITNESS. Had I been in Fall River at the time that the committee was there I would have appeared before them and given some evidence and pointed out some of the defects in the mills, or rather in the tenements belonging to the mills, but it has been enough talked about to know that it is bad enough any way. For that reason it is not worth while talking much about it. There are abuses, many of them, that are, I think, hardly within the scope of the United States Government to handle.

The CHAIRMAN. You need not trouble yourself about that. Tell us any facts or anything that you think ought to be rectified. The State governments will hear of this investigation, as well as the United States Government, so you can state your views freely.

The WITNESS. One of the things I have been urged to say to you here to-day is this: that among the number of evils as well as blessings connected with the mills, is this concentration of manufacturing in particular spots. In Fall River it has been peculiarly unfortunate for workingmen. We are living here almost on the borders of another country, and a large number of men come here with their families from that country. They have a perfect right to do so and they do nothing wrong. I see nothing wrong in what they do, but the effect on the labor of the people of Fall River has been very disastrous. A man living in another country may have four or five or six children, and in order to provide work for them, he comes down to Fall River and the children get work immediately, and he depends on them to sustain him while he looks for work. If he cannot get work for himself he is sure of something to eat, and he becomes one of the extra men and that reduces the value of other men's labor. It is the man that is out of work that regulates the price of the labor of the man that is working. I have counted as many as one hundred and sixty and more of these men going to work in the morning. They have come there to Fall River and learned in a short time to do this work, and they compete with people who have been specially employed in this sort of labor and their fathers before them and their children now.

This is especially unfortunate in Fall River, for the reason that it is such a central point, and the access to this part of the country from Europe and other countries is so easy. I don't know how this can be remedied with this influx of people from Europe. I don't know a State in Europe that could bear what we bear in this country with people coming into it, and there is no place in America of the same population that so many people pass through in a year as pass through Fall River. A large number of them stop there. Now, imagine this great number
of people pouring into a country every year; imagine such a number of people for instance, pouring into England; how could she maintain herself at all with her present landlords? These men would be desirous of some outlet besides manufactures, which they are even now desiring in England. They want another outlet for this labor, and the only natural outlet is the land of this country. When any man comes here and says that the people of Fall River are so reduced that they are not able to work on the land, I think he is mistaken, that is, as to such a number of them as would serve to relieve the labor market, which is all perhaps that would be able to go or would care to. Until such an outlet is provided for them, our labor markets must be overcrowded with people. And I do not well see how we can remedy it, although we are told that free trade would give us all these advantages. The parties that are most desirous of giving us free trade are the only parties on the face of this earth that declare to us in America that they are afraid of our competition. To speak plainly, England is the country that wishes us to adopt this system of free trade; England is the country at the same time that says she is afraid of our competition. During the time that your sessions of Congress were held when the tariff was discussed, the manufacturers of woolen cloths in Bradford, England, had a meeting, and when the news came to them that the American tariff was not changed to suit them they went back home crest-fallen. Now, I am always doubtful myself of a man who gives me the weapons with which to beat himself, and if England is so very desirous of giving us free trade I am very doubtful of her motive.

England never was a free-trade country until she had the shops and the machinery and until she had everything. I remember in my early days, when machinery could not come to this country, there was proscription enough; but now that they have the machines and shops and have their business concentrated and their climate suited to this particular business they want us to adopt free trade in order that we shall beat them in the markets of the world. Are we in a position to do that? In Fall River the very poorest coal that we burn will cost a poor man $4 a month, and then he has not much of a house or place to live in or much heat. His victuals cost him more. The climate compels him to use more clothing than people have to use in England. He is not in the same condition in any way. His rent is three times as much as it would be in England. And when we put these things together is it possible that we can enter into competition with England?

As to this question of short hours, it is one that is very desirable. None of the mills work full time at any time. Sometimes they stop. They have stopped in my time at all events several times, because they had too much cloth on hand. They stop for different purposes occasionally; therefore perhaps an eight-hour law would be desirable, and I believe it would be for the benefit of the whole community that wages were regulated according to what has been said by a gentleman here—so that people could live comfortably on fewer hours' labor. We have a ten-hour law here and we have tried to enforce it. The blame for its not being enforced doesn't rest altogether on the officials that should enforce it. The manufacturers are to blame for that. It is a criminal thing for a man in the position of a wealthy, comfortable manufacturer to say, "I will fitch a few minutes' labor from these poor men." It is a mean thing to fitch a turnip, but a meaner thing to fitch a few minutes' time from a poor man.

We have in Fall River a union which claims to have great strength—a union of men who are operatives. If they used half their power, or
wished to use it, for the purpose of stopping this by prosecuting the mills, they could stop it, and they, and they alone, are the men that can do it effectually, for the reason that their own children and their own wives are working in those mills; and although some may say that they are afraid—and they really are afraid frequently—of being punished, yet they are bound into a union to protect themselves and their wives and families, and why do not the men that belong to the union and work in the mills get the evidence and present it and prosecute the mill-owners that are permitting these offenses against the law? There can be no doubt that they could do it.

TEMPERANCE.

I have watched the progress of this investigation largely, and I have noticed that sometimes it has turned on the question of temperance. Now, the working people, that is the factory operatives, have really not a great deal to spend at the best of times, and to say that is a fault of the system here in America is a misrepresentation of facts. It is not so. It is an old custom, introduced by old-country people like myself. In England, where I was reared, the habit was for a man, when he drew his pay every Saturday night, to go in and enjoy himself. He was not considered a drunkard; neither do I consider the people of Fall River drunkards. They are nothing of the kind. They go in and get their glass of beer as they do in the old country. In this country there has perhaps been some spirits introduced, but the people are not anything like drunkards. Neither is their poverty to be attributed to it.

Speaking of this ten-hour question, I could show you, if it was necessary to do it, that we really could have enforced that matter if the parties that had the means at their disposal would help us in doing it, but they did not do so.

THE LANDS.

In order that this country should be able to absorb the large flood of population that is not only now coming, but is likely to continue to come into it, the lands of the country should not be given as they have been given—sold for speculative purposes—but held for bona fide settlers. I would not be so severe as to say that large corporations for railroad purposes should not be given privileges. I think they ought. I think it helps to develop the country. But when they are given them they should be given them conditionally—that the lands should be held for the people, for the citizens of the country—to be divided into such lots as they shall need as the country grows in strength and population, instead of being farmed out to men for speculative purposes. That is another of the views that I wished to state here. It is a feeling that is prevalent with men of very different opinions on other questions.

FREE TRADE.

Another word on free trade. We are told that free trade only benefits labor, and that it seems inconsistent that there should be free trade in labor but not in the interchange of goods. I say this, that even if it is the fact that the only benefit that a tariff confers upon anybody in this country is upon the manufacturer alone, then I prefer that the American manufacturer should have that benefit rather than let it go to a manufacturer in another country, because the people here generally will get it indirectly if they do not get it directly. The manufacturer
develops the country. He starts new enterprises, he encourages the people in labor, but if you send it to France, Germany, England, or any other country, they will do the same thing for their country. So that taking either horn of the dilemma I cannot see that free trade is any benefit at the present time to the American people.

There is one thing I wish to draw your attention to in relation to the condition of things at Fall River. There was a statement made here the other day by some person of the condition of the people in Fall River. Now, sometimes a man gets out of work who has a large family, and occasionally he does get into terrible difficulties—he is in hunger and want; that I know; but in a long lifetime in Fall River I have never known such a condition of affairs as that which has been represented here by one of the men—that is, that there was a thousand persons in that very destitute condition.

Q. Do you mean the statement by O’Donnell?—A. I don’t know; I think his name was O’Donnell.

Q. Do you know the man?—A. No; and I don’t mean to say that he has not suffered, but I say that in my long experience in Fall River I never knew of such an instance before, and for the credit of this country I hope I shall never see it; and there are a great many people who doubt it; but there are people, as I said before, particularly people who draw their pay monthly, who, if they are turned out of work, sometimes can’t get work for some time.

The CHAIRMAN. No doubt a great deal of suffering comes that way.

The WITNESS. For a man to be six or eight months without tasting meat of any kind is something I have never known. If he has been so, he has been more unfortunate than others.

Adjourned.
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MRS. L. B. BARRETT examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:


WOMAN’S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

Q. Are you connected with the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union—the national organization?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what capacity?—A. I am secretary for the State organization of Massachusetts.

Q. How long have you been in that position?—A. Since the organization of the State association.

Q. That is about how long?—A. Nine years.

Q. Who is the president now?—A. Mrs. Mary A. Livermore.

Q. Her presence to day being prevented by other engagements, will you please state the general nature and objects of the work which is being done by the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, and the nature of the agencies you employ for doing the work—giving an idea of the organization of the State—first describing the State society, then the sub-societies, and the number of them, and the manner in which they work in different parts of the Commonwealth. You may state this in a brief way, in order to show the general features of the organization as a working force.
NATURE AND OBJECTS OF THE TEMPERANCE UNION.

A. The object of our society, as distinctly set forth in the constitution, is the destruction of the liquor traffic.

Q. Tell us how you propose to do it, or how you are doing it.—A. We propose to do it, and are doing it as far as we can, entirely through educational work in its various branches. We might say that it is done principally through the education of the women of the churches; the education of children; through the distribution of literature, and also by personal effort. We have our committees for distinct work in the churches, and they are educating the women of the country up to the work.

THE PLAN OF ORGANIZATION.

Q. State how you are organized?—A. First there is the general society; then we have county divisions and county vice-presidents, who take charge of the work in their respective counties, and who preside at meetings and conventions held in their counties. These meetings are held every year, more or less, in the counties throughout the State.

Q. What are the duties of these county vice-presidents in working up the counties that they preside over, respectively?—A. They receive invitations for the holding of meetings in the various towns of the counties, and they apply to headquarters for help when necessary—they apply to the executive committee for such assistance as they may need in organizing or carrying out the purposes of these meetings, and this is frequently arranged for them. We propose to hold one meeting a month in each of these counties during the present year. We have no particular supervision of the local unions, but our State is so very small that nearly all apply to headquarters for instructions with regard to plans of working in their particular unions.

NUMBER OF SUB-SOCIETIES IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Q. How many are there in the State?—A. Since the commencement of our work we have reached two hundred and fifty of the towns. But I think to-day that we could not say we have more than one hundred and fifty, or perhaps one hundred and eighty, real working unions in the State. We have three hundred and thirty-four towns in the State, and we have already reached two hundred and fifty of them.

Q. Do you count in this the whole number of unions?—A. Yes.

Q. In some cases are there more than one union in a city or town?—A. Yes, in a few places.

Q. How many are there in Boston?—A. In Boston proper only one. But there are seven connected with the city; as, for instance, Neponset, Bunker Hill, and Dorchester unions.

Q. Then, seven of these two hundred and fifty are in Boston, or its neighborhood?—A. Yes.

Q. In places like Worcester is there more than one?—A. Yes, we have two in Worcester, but that is the only city, I think, besides Boston, that has more than one.

Q. So that the number of unions indicates substantially about the number of municipal organizations or townships that are reached?—A. Yes.

Q. Does Chelsea have a union?—A. Yes.

Q. And East Boston?—A. Yes, and South Boston.

Q. Are they included with the seven?—A. Yes.

Q. But no more than would belong properly to so large a population as is here?—A. No.
METHODS OF PROMOTING TEMPERANCE.

Q. In what way is the work performed—what is done in each of those local unions—what do they understand that they have to do, and how do they set about it?—A. They have certain lines of work that they all adhere to. One is increasing the membership, another is aiding the distribution of temperance literature, another is juvenile work—that department takes in three distinct branches of juvenile work. Then, there is the department of the press, the department of legal work, and of petitioning, &c.

Q. Petitioning the legislature?—A. Yes. Various other things come under that head.

Q. Something in the way of insisting upon and petitioning for the enforcement of law?—A. Yes. During the past year very much has been done in that line, for the enforcement of law and order here, likewise for the enforcement of what law we have in the towns.

Q. Is that work supervised largely by the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union?—A. Entirely so in many towns.

LAW AND ORDER LEAGUES.

Q. Then the associations are formed by ladies largely?—A. Oh, no. I mean the formation of those law and order leagues is supervised by the ladies. In Somerville, for instance, there are five hundred citizens leagued together to enforce the law.

Q. They are voters of the place?—A. Yes. Very few of the members of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Unions are directly connected with the law and order leagues.

Q. Their function is what their name implies, I suppose—to detect violations of the license or temperance laws, and do what they can to remedy matters, by acting through the district attorneys or otherwise?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you a license law here?—A. Yes.

Q. But in some portions of the State there is prohibition?—A. Yes; in a large portion of the State.

Q. The cities generally adopt license, I suppose, do they?—A. Yes.

THE TEMPERANCE UNION FAVORS PROHIBITION RATHER THAN LICENSE.

Q. Is the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union in favor of a prohibitory law, or of a license law?

The WITNESS. Have you any need to ask that question?

The CHAIRMAN. I thought I would like to put the fact in the record. Those who may read it may not know you as well as I do. There are 54,000,000 of people in this country, and perhaps 49,000,000 of them do not understand this matter very well.

A. The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union is in favor of a prohibitory law. I hardly think our women would be ready to do for a license law what they are doing for prohibition.

Q. In the way of educational effort, or reform, do you have anything to do with the schools?

TEMPERANCE TEXT-BOOKS IN THE SCHOOLS.

A. We are introducing temperance text-books into the public schools, and have already succeeded in putting books in thirty-seven towns in
the legitimate way through the school committees. Then we have the subject before at least twenty or thirty other boards in the towns, and the books will probably be introduced in some of those this year. We have a petition now ready for citizens to sign this fall, asking for compulsory legislation in the direction of temperance education.

WHAT IS ASKED OF THE LEGISLATURE.

Q. You propose to apply to your legislature this winter?—A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any idea of asking for a prohibitory law?—A. Yes, we are going to ask for four things: a constitutional amendment, a simple prohibitory law, this compulsory education, and municipal suffrage.
Q. From your stand-point what do you call "municipal suffrage"?—A. The right to vote with regard to the officers of the town.
Q. The ladies are asking for that?—A. Yes.
Q. That I suppose is with special reference to the maintenance of law and order as against the effects of alcohol?—A. Yes, it is a very important measure with regard to the introduction of temperance text-books into our schools. If we could have the selection of school committees, it would be a very easy matter then.
Q. What you are reaching for is the minds of the young, so as to aid in the formation of their personal habits as well as the training of their minds?—A. Yes.
Q. Are there any other observations that occur to you with regard to the actual working of the unions in the Commonwealth? You have spoken of your efforts in the direction of the enforcement of such laws as you have, and the position you occupy with regard to the different forms of law, as by prohibition (whether constitutionally, or by legislative enactment), and you say that you are doing what you can to influence the education of the young, through the schools, the press, the platform, &c., and by the distribution of proper literature?—A. Yes.

DEMAND FOR MUNICIPAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Q. What is your real object in this effort to secure municipal suffrage? It is, of course, a means to some end, what special end?—A. To secure the right to vote as to the granting of licenses, and for the officers who are to enforce the laws regarding the sale of liquors.
Q. You have already in this State the power to vote so far as the choice of school officers is concerned, have you not?—A. Yes.
Q. Does female suffrage extend any farther than that in this State now?—A. No.
Q. You do not find that a very efficient and important right as yet, do you?

IMPEDEMENTS TO WOMEN'S RIGHT TO VOTE FOR SCHOOL TRUSTEES.

A. Well, it is so hedged about with difficulties that it is very hard for it to have any effect in the towns.
Q. And you propose to make the right worth something if you have it?—A. It would be better, of course, if we could exercise it.

CRUELTY TO CHILDREN INDUCED BY DRINKING.

Q. All this work is, of course, directed at a great evil, that of intemperance. We are anxious to know what you can tell us as to the extent of that evil, especially among the common people—the masses of
working people—those who, by their labor, form the producing force of the community. Can you give us an idea of that, or perhaps you can say something to us as to the extent of the evil among all classes of society?—A. I cannot give you anything statistical with regard to it; but you can find that almost everywhere in Dr. Dorchester's reports, which are as near perfect as anything that we have in this State or elsewhere. But there are very few of our towns that are not suffering very seriously from this evil. Last Sunday evening I listened to the report of the secretary of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. It stated that nineteen hundred children have been taken during the past year from places where they were suffering very much, and in almost every case it was from the effects of drunkenness.

Q. Do you mean nineteen hundred in one town?—A. No; nineteen in the whole State. Nearly all of them were taken from drunken homes and drunken parents who were abusing them.

Q. What has been done with them?—A. To some extent they were given back to the parents upon the promise that they should be well treated. In other cases they were taken to the State primary school at Monson. In some cases where they were older, as of girls as old as sixteen, homes were found for them. Some girls, it was proven, had been shamefully beaten by their parents.

Q. These, I understand, are cases where the difficulties were brought about by intemperance?—A. Nearly every case, I think, that I heard, was ascribed to drunkenness.

Q. And those are from all parts of the State?—A. From all parts of the State; and those are only, of course, what you might call the very worst cases of abuse, where it was necessary to interfere between parent and child.

Q. Of course, the State will never do that until the hardship is very great?—A. No.

Q. Do you travel through the State considerably yourself?—A. Yes, I do.

Q. You come in contact, then, with this evil everywhere?—A. Everywhere.

Q. You have been in the work, now, nine years connected with the union?—A. Yes.

Q. Had you any experience or knowledge on the subject before that time?—A. None at all.

Q. Have you given much time to the work since then?—A. I have given every moment of my time.

Q. For nine years?—A. Yes, sir; every hour.

EFFECT OF PRESENT TEACHINGS ON THE NEXT GENERATION.

Q. Well, what do you think, on the whole, as to whether you have made headway against the evil, or has it made headway against the union?—A. When we are sowing the seed in the minds of little children, teaching them to become intelligent total abstainers, it seems impossible that we should not be gaining, but it is a gain that we do not see to-day, perhaps.

Q. You are capturing the next generation?—A. Yes.

Q. What do you think of the present generation; have you about given it up?

SLOW PROGRESS WITH PRESENT GENERATION.

A. No. I said it was impossible that we should not be making an advance. But, looking at Boston to-day, and looking at it nine years
ago, it would not seem that we have made much gain in the matter of the number of liquor saloons, or of the destruction of the liquor traffic, which we have organized ourselves to accomplish. It does not look, I say, as if we had succeeded; but in several important respects we have made great headway. Taking, for example the pastors of the State; I come in contact with them frequently, and I can see that they have greatly changed.

Q. You have reformed the pastors?—A. Well, I do not know that we have reformed them.

PASTORS AIDING TEMPERANCE REFORM.

Q. I mean you have reformed their position with regard to this subject?—A. I think there is a great gain in that respect, and I think there is some gain in the churches. I do not know whether it is as large as it ought to be; but the pastors, I am sure, are looking favorably upon our cause.

The Chairman. An old gentleman who was before the committee yesterday said that when he was a boy a person did not consider himself well treated unless he was treated to rum when making a social call; and I recollect an elderly gentleman in Nashua telling me that he remembered that, when young, an eminent Congregational clergyman came to see his mother, who was about to join the church, and he insisted upon having a drink before he commenced the examination as to her religious condition. That is an illustration of what the custom in society was forty or fifty or sixty years ago. During the last nine years, you say, you have succeeded in changing the attitude of the clergymen towards the temperance reform?

The Witness. I would not like to say that we did it; but I am sure that there is a change. I go into towns constantly; and the first thing I do is to call on the clergy, and I cannot help seeing the difference between things now and things as they were nine years ago. I am quite confident there is a great gain; but I do not say that we have done it.

Q. You would not say that you have prevented it?—A. Oh, no; of course not.

The Chairman. Still, it is proper to state the effect of the organization, as a working force in society. Perhaps you may be disposed to feel that if you should speak of it fully it might be taken as a piece of Massachusetts "glorification;" but it cannot be taken for anything of that sort. We have a country of about 54,000,000 of people, probably, to-day, and this organization has done much good in many States of the Union, and has, indeed, already become international in its extent; but its introduction into new territories depends very much on what it accomplishes in the sections where it has been organized; and testimony of this kind going to other parts of the country might be expected to do some good. So I want you to put the Temperance Union "in evidence." Your statements will be printed and will be read in various parts of the country by people who want to accomplish what you have accomplished. Does anything else occur to you to state in regard to the working of the society?

EDUCATING PUBLIC SENTIMENT TO FAVOR TEMPERANCE LEGISLATION.

The Witness. I think we have done much in the towns throughout the State with regard to creating a feeling favorable to temperance legislation; there is a better sentiment in the smaller towns toward it
than there used to be. Of course we can reach smaller towns more readily than we can the popular mind in the cities. We have tried to improve matters in the way of choosing legislators and Senators, and, in some cases, have had a good deal of success.

Q. You do not make effort in what would be called a partisan sense?
A. Oh, no. To illustrate: Before the primary meetings and caucuses, the ladies generally sent out appeals urging them to make good selections of men. In our town meetings, especially; and before our "no license" vote, the ladies were very alert in that matter, and sent out notices to the voters, and to the wives of the voters, urging them to speak to their brothers and fathers, and voting friends on the morning of the vote, asking them to vote for "no license."

Q. Has that done much good?—A. We have had a vote of almost two to one in towns for a "no license" law.

Q. When you have a "no license" law in your town, and a license law in the next town, does it embarrass you in your town?—A. That is the reason why we are so careful in urging the unions to work for "no license."

Q. How is it when it comes to one town having "no license" law, and another town having a license law?—A. Well, we know how it is in Maine.

Mrs. Cone. The union invited every pastor throughout the State to preach in favor of temperance, and it has been largely done.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Q. In moving about the State during those nine years, among the country towns, do you observe a change for the better in the matter of the use of intoxicating liquors?—A. I do not think that I could judge about that very thoroughly, because nearly all the unions in the the State complain so bitterly that the law is not enforced, though they have a prohibitory law. As a general thing liquor is sold in the towns even if they have a "no license" vote.

APATHY AMONG THE BETTER CLASS OF VOTERS.

Q. What is the reason that, with all your effort and with the law such as it is in the State where the Pilgrims started things, you cannot get ahead as against the liquor tariff; or cannot get much ahead?—A. I believe it is owing to the apathy of the church. There were 60,000 voters in the State who did not vote at last year.

Q. Who were they?—A. Well, we know that the Democrats mostly voted; we know that all the rum sellers voted and all the tramps voted.

Q. Well, who did not?—A. I say the good people—the members of the churches.

Q. Why do they not vote?—A. That is what I should like to know. There is our trouble.

Q. Do you think it is simply indifference that keeps them at home—indifference to the performance of their duties as citizens?

THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION AS A POLITICAL ISSUE.

Mrs. Gordon. I think it is lack of an issue. Very few people see much difference between the two parties.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it is because one party is as much of a rum party as the other?

Mrs. Gordon. I do. There is as much Republican whisky sold as Democratic whisky.
The CHAIRMAN. In other words, the temperance issue is not in politics yet?

Mrs. GORDON. No.

Mrs. CHENEY. I was at the polls four or five hours last December, and was very much surprised to see the class that did vote. I was in some of the precincts that had some of our “best people,” as we call them, and it would be hardly just to say that I could count them on my fingers, but in the four or five hours that I was there I certainly think that not more than twenty or twenty-five persons who had the appearance of being gentlemen came to the polls to vote. The voters there were largely what we call the foreign population, and people from the slums of the city; those who, it would seem, could hardly intelligently cast a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. That was in this city?

Mrs. CHENEY. That was in this city.

The CHAIRMAN. In what ward?

Mrs. CHENEY. In the Sixth ward, I think.

CHURCH MEMBERS "ON THE FENCE" ABOUT TEMPERANCE.

Q. (To the witness.) Then you attribute these results, or rather, perhaps, we should say the lack of results, to the indifference of what are called the better classes of society, including the church members; you do not mean that they are positively on the wrong side, but that they are what?—A. That they fail to vote.

Q. That they take no interest in the matter?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you think they fail to vote because they care nothing about the result, or because they prefer to sit on the “fence” and stay at home?—A. The latter, I should think.

Q. It cannot be that they do not comprehend what is really in issue in these elections?—A. I think Mrs. Gordon touched the point in saying that last year they did not consider that we had any issue. It seems to me it must be the better portion of the community that do not vote.

Q. You will find that to be very much so whether temperance is the issue or not, will you not?—A. Yes.

WHY THE LOWER CLASSES ARE DOMINANT AT THE POLLS.

Q. Is not that one of the objections that has been made by some very substantial people to the exercise of the right of suffrage, and do you not think that that objection has been entertained for several years?—A. Perhaps so. It certainly cannot be that with all the people voting we should be outvoted by the lower classes. It does not seem possible to me that we could be outvoted if the good people could or would cast a vote.

Q. What effort do you make to reach the people that are affected more or less by the drinking habit; do you see them personally?—A. I think that Mrs. Gordon could answer that question better than I could, because that comes into the work of the local union. I have myself assisted at meetings in North street when we first commenced, and worked very hard for some months, every evening in the very slums of the city.

Q. What did you accomplish?—A. The salvation of a good many people.

Q. Have the meetings been continued?—A. I think so, more or less; all these nine years they have kept up their meetings.
Q. As you have been around among them do you not think that the use of alcohol, as you have observed those people, is an injury to them—the working people!—A. It certainly is.

Q. In what regard; what mischief does it do among them?—A. In the first place I should say it injures their physical system to such an extent that they are unable to work a great deal of the time; and then the poisoning that comes into their system goes on until they are hardly men, and become almost beasts by the continued and excessive use of liquor. We have a great many instances where men are really not much better, it would seem, than beasts—young men, too—after long and excessive use of alcoholic liquors. They become entirely demoralized, physically and mentally.

Q. To what extent do you think the habit requires the use of their wages?—A. I cannot say as to that.

Q. You simply know that money is easily expended?—A. Of course I know that in many instances it takes the entire wages; but I could not say as to the amount generally taken.

Q. Have you any information as to the extent to which use is made of any form of intoxicating liquor—ale or beer, or the stronger forms of stimulants, among the working people; that is, what proportion of them use it?—A. I think Mrs. Gordon could answer that question better than myself.

HOW THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW IS PROCURED.

Q. You may state anything that occurs to you, showing the efficiency of your work in securing the enforcement of the law in any part of the State.—A. In a great many towns much progress has been made through the efforts of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union; and in case they have a “Law and Order League” in the towns, nearly all cases of prosecution are convicted. If there is no “Law and Order League” to carry out the designs of the women, the prosecutions generally fail, and there are no convictions. But where there is a “Law and Order League,” then, in almost every case, we secure convictions.

Q. Have you any information as to the number of convictions that have been secured, or the extent of work done in that way?—A. I have at my rooms a report of the “Law and Order League,” and that gives the number of convictions; but I could not tell from memory.

Q. Most of the work described in that report has been accomplished, I suppose, by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union?—A. Well, we send immediately to the “Law and Order League.” For instance, if we know of a place where they are selling liquor in Somerville we immediately notify the “Law and Order League.” Before that time we used to send to the headquarters, No. 9 Pemberton Square, Boston, and they sent out detectives.

Q. To different parts of the State?—A. Yes.

Q. From this central point?—A. Yes.

SABBATH-SCHOOL CONVENTIONS AND THE TEMPERANCE CAUSE.

Mrs. Gordon. You remember, Mrs. Barrett, that when we first commenced the work, you went up to Worcester to the Sabbath-school convention, and asked them to say something for temperance; but they
said to you that they could not say anything for it. Now there is not a Sabbath-school convention held in the State that they do not ask some temperance woman to read some paper, or do something for temperance.

The Witness. Yes. Nine years ago I went to the Sabbath-school convention, and was not allowed even to offer a resolution on the subject of temperance; but now I could have any resolution I wanted passed by such a body.

---

BOSTON, MASS., October 23, 1883.

Mrs. A. J. Gordon examined.

By the Chairman:

Question. You reside in Boston?—Answer. Yes.
Q. Are you connected with the Woman’s Christian Union?

WOMAN’S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION, OF BOSTON.

A. I am president of the Boston Woman’s Christian Temperance Union.

Q. The union of the city?—A. Yes; the city proper. As Mrs. Barrett has told you, there are unions in every one of the suburban towns.

The Chairman. You may go on now, if you please, and tell us about the work that has been done—anything that occurs to you as pertinent to the work and as bearing perhaps especially upon the condition of the people in an economic point of view, but not confining yourself to that.

The Witness. I suppose Miss Willard gave you, at New York, the plan of the organization and an idea of its twenty different departments. Every State takes up the same lines of work, and advises the different local unions as far as they are able to follow them up. So that what is true of the national and State unions is equally true of the local unions.

THE GOSPEL UNIONS.

One of the most important departments of our work is the Evangelistic. We either sustain or assist several missions in the city, holding ourselves in readiness either to conduct them ourselves or to assist in them. On the base-ball grounds they have a meeting every week during the summer, and we have supplied them with literature for their meeting. At the north end of the city there are mission stations, and we are in constant demand there, so that there is an opportunity for persons who wish it to speak temperance to those poor deluded ones. We consider that that is what awakens our own hearts to the awful iniquity of liquor-drinking. We do not appreciate it unless we are able to see its legitimate fruits, and from this we can judge of its effects upon men. Yesterday, as I walked through the street, I noticed that on one side was Young’s Hotel; “There is where the ruin of many young men begins,” I thought; taking who wear good clothes and have plenty of money. Then on the opposite side of the street is the Tombs; and I could not avoid the recollection, “There is where their career ends.” I noticed that on Monday there were 107 cases called up. The liquor-dealers say that if you prohibit the sale of liquor there would be more sold than ever. So, the law forbidding sales on Sunday, there are a great many more persons brought up for trial on Monday morning than
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on any other day of the week! The result of these trials generally is that a man is fined, perhaps a dollar, and his poor, hard-working wife, who looks as though she might be scrubbing her knuckles off to keep the family together, comes up and pays the husband’s fine.

THE BRUTALIZING EFFECTS OF DRINK.

I said to such a woman one day, “Why do you pay your money for such a purpose? Why not let your husband suffer the consequences of his crime?” “Why?” she said, “he would beat me if I didn’t pay it.” She did not dare to refuse. That was the case with more than one there. I noticed one woman there who had with her two little children and she was waiting in the hope that her husband would be discharged. Another case was one in which a woman had complained of her husband. He had first disabled one of her arms, and then he had turned her out on the street. A policeman had arrested him, and they were going to send him for four months to Deer Island. When he comes out, won’t he be mad? And his poor wife will suffer all the more. That is the reason why more women do not complain. You see how difficult it is, when we have a law, to have it executed, when the women will not complain, because they are afraid that if they complain their drunken husbands will wreak vengeance on them. It is by observation and inquiry in this way that we are able to learn of those things ourselves and our hearts are stirred. The gospel idea is necessary to thoroughly arouse these people to a sense of their condition. Of course we are very glad to have aid from every source, but that is the fundamental idea which underlies our work. When everybody is aroused to it, we will shut up the dram-shops. So long as the city takes a revenue from this dreadful liquor traffic, just so long will these poor, weak people be tempted to drink, and we want to stop it.

THE LICENSE QUESTION.

At the time this State first allowed its citizens to vote on the question whether there should be “license” or “no license,” there seemed to be no effort making to secure a large vote, and we did not expect that there would be a large vote in Boston on the side of “no license,” because this is of course a liquor place. We called together some members of the temperance societies, however, and some representative men—about one hundred of them—at our headquarters, and told them what we wanted to do. We wanted to organize a “no license” movement, and wanted to have women at the polls to distribute “no license” ballots.

INFLUENCE ON TEMPERANCE OF WOMEN AT THE POLLS.

I believe that most of the good that has been accomplished in this State for “no license” has been accomplished by having women at the polls. The ballots might have been sent to the polling places but people there would whisk them out of sight. Through our efforts, however, there were ladies and gentlemen there that held on to them, and the result was that there were 12,000 votes against license.

Q. In the city?—A. Yes. We gave out literature to meet all kinds of objections. If one man said that “prohibi ion did not prohibit,” we gave him one tract; if another man said that he liked his beer, we gave
him another tract. We took each upon his particular idea and gave him
literature to meet it, as far as possible. We were determined that no
effort of ours should be spared to accomplish the result. We also had
prepared German literature, and engaged lecturers to speak to the Ger-
mans and to work in and through the churches. We know that there
has been a good deal done in that way.

FEMALE SUFFRAGE ON SCHOOL MATTERS.

In regard to school work we have the privilege of voting for members
of school committees. I remember three years ago going to the first
census of the registered women voters—that was before I dared to open
my mouth—but some poor temperance woman did say, upon hearing
some nomination made, "Is this man in favor of temperance?" and
some of the leaders answered, "That is not a question here at all; we
are just getting the most available candidates." But at the last meet-
ing every single name proposed was challenged as to whether the man
used liquor or tobacco, and we think that is a great gain. We are de-
termined to have pure men in our school committees. At any rate every
man whose name is up will have his character thoroughly canvassed,
and we will know it. There are distillers and others on school commit-
tees and we are making a very active effort to get them off. We are
watching them; we know when their time expires, and as far as our
efforts are concerned we are determined that they shall not be on the
school committee again.

SCHOOLS MOVED TO ACCOMMODATE SALOONS.

Let me illustrate the disadvantage of having such men on school com-
mittees. There are five men on the school committee who voted to move
a school in order to accommodate a saloon. We have a law which states
that there shall be no saloon within 400 feet of a school-house. Of
course there are many saloons which almost touch school-houses. There
were actually five men here who voted to have the school moved. That
happened in the case of three different school-houses in the city.

Q. You mean that three schools have been moved in this city to ac-
commodate the saloons?—A. Yes; here in this city.

Mrs. Cone. One was moved before the license was granted, and then
the school moved back.

EVASION OF THE LAW AS TO SALOONS AND SCHOOLS.

The Witness. Yes, the schools were moved just in time for the men
to get their licenses and then moved back again. That is, the scholars
were moved from the school-house and it was decided that that house
should not be used for a school any more. Then, when the licenses
were given, the school was moved back again.

Q. And the license was not revoked?—A. No.

Mrs. Cone. Not only was the license not revoked, but that operation
was repeated next time.

Q. The same thing was done over again?—A. Yes.

Q. And that was in this city?—A. Yes, by the school committee—five
gentlemen who had charge of that district, and who had the right to say
where schools should be located.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a criminal fraud on the city itself, for which
these committeemen are indictable.
THE TEMPERANCE UNION AN "EXTERNAL CONSCIENCE."

The WITNESS. We had 5,000 leaflets printed and circulated broadcast in which we related these facts, and some good men said: "Is this really so; can this be really so in the city of Boston?" Most of the good people of the city do not keep their eyes on the temperance question at all. So I think that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is a kind of "external conscience" for the people. Even in this election that is coming on now the politicians are pleased to say that such and such candidates are "perfectly acceptable to the temperance people," but of course we are immediately obliged to come out and say that they are not acceptable to the temperance people. We do not believe in any license candidate, but nevertheless the fact that the politicians say this, is something to indicate which way the wind blows.

Mrs. Cone. Mr. Edward Everett Hale was moved to write a letter on this question sometime ago, and the editor of the Transcript wrote a burning editorial on the question.

The WITNESS. You asked if we saw any of the fruits of our work. We do not see that the liquor traffic is at all lessened. We see daily that it is growing. It cannot be otherwise with this license law.

FUTILITY OF THE LICENSE LAW AS A LIMITATION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

It shows the perfect futility of any attempt to limit the liquor traffic by license laws, when you look at the energy and enthusiasm that go into the temperance work. What the liquor traffic would be if there were none of this great opposing force you can imagine by looking at what it is when there is all this opposition which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union creates. But we have a history behind us. We know that in the slavery agitation there never was the first glimpse of light, or of progress, until the war was declared. Of course you are familiar with every stage of the Missouri compromise. When they took a colored man here in Boston back to his bondage, and the antislavery people objected, everybody laughed and said, "What do your objections amount to?" Garrison said that what he wanted was "immediate and unconditional emancipation," and he never receded from that, and that is what he finally got. He called for the right thing, and never retreated a step, he finally got it. That is exactly what we are doing.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION.

We want constitutional prohibition of the sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors. We know we are right, but we know that we have to work hard in order to get it; and we are willing to work, and we are going to keep the work up. "God works in a mysterious way his wonders to perform." I saw in a report of the proceedings of this committee at New York, when the temperance women appeared before the committee, that the reporters said that all the women wore waterproofs and carried big umbrellas, and that they didn't give a single argument in support of their cause, and some of the editors said that it was a grand work, but that it was a pity that some of the energy put into the work did not result in something.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, and the criticism was made that they quoted too much poetry. The fact is that there was not a single line of poetry quoted by any lady except one, and she gave a very appropriate line
from Whittier. The weather on that day was particularly bad, and it
would have been difficult to get anybody but an old sailor to venture
out of doors. The temperance women, however, came to the committee
room, and testified as forcibly and intelligently as anybody who has
been before the committee. They stated some very important facts, and
I think our stenographer will tell you that he took down more substan-
tial facts in the course of that forenoon than in a like time upon any
other day of our sessions.

The Witness. We know they can state facts, and that it is their cus-
tom to do so when opportunity offers.

We are very much interested, as Mrs. Barrett has told you, in the
schools.

**TEMPERANCE EDUCATION.**

We find that permanent reform in this matter depends, after all, on
the education of the children. For fifteen years the children have been
educated to believe that a license is the way to deal with this liquor
question, so you will hardly find a young man who does not believe that
prohibition does not prohibit. Still our work is bound to result in a
correction of this evil. Every once in a while we send to every teacher
in our public schools some little pamphlet or another, containing per-
haps the opinions of eminent physicians in regard to the liquor or the
tobacco habit, or perhaps giving directions as to how to teach temper-
ance principles to the children.

**Mrs. Cone.** Mr. George S. Hale, a trustee of Phillips-Exeter Acad-
emy, was so influenced by the work of the ladies that he sent for us to
confer with him about the tobacco question. After consultation with
us, he laid the matter before the parents of all the pupils and got an-
swers from most of them.

**TOBACCO PROHIBITION.**

The question was whether they were willing to have tobacco prohib-
ited to their children there. The majority were willing, and so the use
of tobacco is prohibited to the pupils of Phillips-Exeter Academy. The
same thing was taken up at Andover, and there the majority of parents
preferred freedom of use, so that there it is not prohibited.

**MEANS OF PROMOTING TEMPERANCE.**

We have also endeavored to influence manufacturers to require the
total abstinence of their employés, and that is becoming more and more
an object. In response to the petitions of the Woman's Christian Tem-
perance Union, some employers have also changed the time of paying
their men; instead of paying them on Saturday nights, which has a
tendency to tempt men to spend their money for drink, they now pay
them in the middle of the week. Then, in order to instruct the people
who will not come to temperance lectures and who will not read any-
thing but large print, we have sometimes put out large posters, two feet
long, with little arguments in regard to prohibition and also in regard
to total abstinence. Thousands of these have been put into large man-
ufacturing establishments.

**INFLUENCE OF TEMPERANCE TRACTS.**

**Mrs. Cheney.** People have an idea that a tract given to a person is
merely crushed in the hand and thrown aside without being read, but
that is not the inference that I would draw from my own personal observation. I have seen tracts or leaflets on temperance given to parties and I have seen them read them. At the polls, particularly, I noticed that in many instances where the leaflets were given to men they read them with interest, and afterwards made remarks concerning them, sometimes withdrawing to another part of the room and reading them and asking questions in regard to them—showing that the seed had been sown.

TEMPERANCE AND GOSPEL TENTS.

The Witness. We have utilized the national holidays also for temperance meetings, by having a tent on the Common and having speakers to succeed one another almost all day on the questions of prohibition and total abstinence. We have had gospel meetings, and have sometimes had a brass band and all the accompaniments that would be apt to gather the people together. That is something that was never attempted before. We secured the best gentlemen speakers that could be engaged to give gospel testimony and discuss prohibition, and kept our meetings up from 10 o’clock in the morning until 5 o’clock in the afternoon. We endeavor to work “by being all things to all men,” by all means to save some.

TEMPERANCE FOUNTAINS.

I would also say that at a cost of some $265 we have put up in this city a handsome, polished granite, ice-water fountain, which has been a great blessing to the thirsty crowds who, all through the summer months, pass by the corner of Berkeley and Tremont streets—right opposite two immense saloons and in the center of a saloon district.

Mrs. Cone. And we know that laboring men have sent there for ice-water by the pailful instead of sending for beer—and that is done from within a radius of half a mile.

Mrs. Cheney. I noticed a teamster, one very hot day in summer, starting toward a saloon, and then looking toward the ice-water fountain. After an instant’s hesitation, he finally crossed over and took a drink out of the ice-water fountain. I said to him, “That is good water, isn’t it?” He said, “Oh, yes; this is a blessed institution.” Then I said to him, “Weren’t you on the point of going into that saloon?” “Well,” he said, “I did think of it—I thought to get some beer, but I concluded to come here and get some water instead.”

Mrs. Cone. The street-car conductors stopped there every day, and I became convinced that many laborers would be satisfied with ice-water if there was not so much of this liquor constantly before their eyes and so little water to be found.

The Witness. We are continually organizing and holding public meetings all through the city. Just before the last election we had meetings in some church in every ward, so as to reach the different people; and we engaged good speakers to address the meetings. Then we always put everything that we can into the newspapers, so as to advertise our cause as much as possible.

EFFECTS OF LIQUOR AND TOBACCO ON CHILDREN AND ADULTS.

Mrs. Cone. At the time that we prepared a paper on tobacco and sent copies to the public school teachers, I met the professor of physiology at Harvard, and he told me that he never taught his pupils anything whatever as to the results of tobacco and alcohol; that in fact he
had made no special study of them at all. He looked at the authorities from which I quoted, and he wrote me a note saying that they were very authoritative. We were speaking only of the effects on children, but he said it bore also on adults—but still, although we would perhaps call it cowardly, he would leave the subject alone, as he had done before.

EXPENSE OF PAUPERISM AND CRIME THE RESULT OF LIQUOR.

The WITNESS. In regard to the cost of the liquor traffic I went to the City Hall yesterday, to the city treasury, and got some figures. I find that it has cost the city of Boston this year $50,000 more than it did last year to support the pauper and criminal institutions, and it is costing more and more every year. You know the great cry is that the licenses are the revenue, and that the city affairs could not be carried on without licenses, but I have seen it stated that where you receive $1 in license you pay out $10 as the result of granting the license. During the first eight months of last year the city received from the liquor traffic $266,754. This year in the same time it has received $299,254. That is about $30,000 more. The pauper and criminal institutions of the city cost about $500,000. The expense for the police force is about $900,000. The Massachusetts State board of charities says that eighty per cent. of the criminals are from the drinking classes, and eighth-tenths of the cost of pauperism is the direct consequence of indulgence in alcoholic beverages. Eight-tenths of $500,000 is $400,000, being the direct outlay for the results of the liquor traffic, in crime and pauperism, to say nothing of the cost of police and criminal courts. That does not look like a very good investment for the city of Boston. If it were not for those liquor stores we should not need a police force.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't know about that.

The WITNESS. We would not need so many police, at any rate.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Marsh testified yesterday that in 1823 they got along with only one policeman here in this city, and that "all the bad boys were afraid of him."

The WITNESS. It costs about $900,000 every year in this city for policemen, and that is aside from the force which the police commissioners have to enforce the license law. It cost $30,000 last year to enforce the license law, and they did not enforce it.

EXPENSE OF EFFORTS TO ENFORCE THE LICENSE LAW.

Q. That is, for the prosecution of the men who are selling without licenses?—A. Yes.

Q. This "Law and Order League" was stimulated somewhat by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, I suppose?—A. I do not say that it was, in this city, exactly. Of course, the women cannot work much where they have no licenses.

Q. Who is interested to enforce the law against the sellers who have no license; is it done by those who have licenses?—A. No, indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. It is generally claimed that the licensees will prevent the sale by those who have no licenses.

The WITNESS. I know that is one of the arguments, but there are in this city 2,500 licensed places and 1,500 unlicensed places. Suppose the first class should attempt to prosecute the other, why, they would turn around and say that the licensees themselves were disregarding the law, and that the others were doing no more, only that they did not pay for it. That is all the difference.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

DISREGARD OF PROHIBITORY PROVISIONS OF THE LICENSE LAW.

I heard a good many saloon keepers, last year, say that it was absolutely impossible to sell liquor and regard the prohibitory provisions of the license law. One of those provisions is that they shall not sell to minors. This man said, "How am I to know whether a young man is a minor or not, if he has a beard?" If he is twenty-one years and over they can sell him all that they please. Another provision is that they shall not sell on Sunday. The way they get around that is, the majority of those little places take out an inn-holder's license, and say they keep inns, and they have perhaps one bed in a back room, in order to keep up the pretense, and then they sell liquor all day Sunday and Sunday night, and in that way they evade the law.

Q. Do you think it is any more difficult to get all the drink you want on Sunday than on any other day?—A. No.

EVASION OF THE LAW AS TO OPEN BARS.

Then the license law says that there shall be no open bars. I asked the police commissioners why they did not regard that. They said the supreme court had not decided what an "open bar" was. I saw, however, the other day that the supreme court has said that it is a place where people stand up to drink, and where there is no food sold. They get around that by having a few raw oysters and a few crackers. One of the police commissioners told me that these laws are expressly made to drive a coach or a pair of horses through, and if the license men prosecute the others, those others turn around upon them and say that those who live in glass houses had better not throw stones.

Q. Those having licenses do not, then, help to enforce the law against the others?—A. I never knew of any that did. Then, again, a man who gets a license has to give a bond of $1,000, but there has never been a cent paid in.

Q. Has any one forfeited his license?—A. Oh, yes; they take, occasionally, a license from a man, but there has never been a cent paid in to the city treasury on account of a man forfeiting his license.

Q. Do you know of its ever being done in the State?—A. I don't know about the State. I only know about the city.

Q. How long has the license law been in force?—A. I don't know how many years—perhaps ten or fifteen years.

A PROHIBITORY LAW RENDERED USELESS BY AMENDMENTS.

We had a prohibitory law, and there was a wine and a beer clause in it, which exempted them. That weakened the whole thing, and finally they got the present law. The governor told me that he thought it had outlived its usefulness. The only use of a license law really is to show the utter uselessness of anything but an absolutely prohibitory statute.

Q. They had a prohibitory statute before this, did they not?—A. Yes.

Q. Was that enforced?—A. It was at first, but, as I say, the wine and beer clause was inserted—there was a petition that it should be. The wine and beer clause was an entering wedge for everything else. It was only a step toward the license law. I think it was in 1874 that the license law was passed.

Q. Have you been among the homes of the working people?—A. Yes.
POVERTY CAUSED BY DRINK.

Q. Tell us about your experience there.—A. Well, I know a family in which the woman goes out washing, and the husband works and earns $9 a week and brings home perhaps a dollar. The rest of it goes into the saloons. She has to work at washing all day and do the best she can to keep the house. The children do not have fire, or milk, or shoes, unless it is given to them by charity. I know another family that is all broken up. The wife has had to leave her husband because he never brought anything in. Why, I know scores of such cases—it is like repeating anything that is familiar in daily life.

HAPPY RESULTS OF CHRISTIAN WOMEN’S WORK.

Then on the other hand, I know families where the men have been converted, and where the money, instead of going to the saloon, goes to the home. I could tell you where the wife has all she needs for the care of the family, and the husband comes home of evenings, through the influence of the Christian women’s work. If we did not have that seal for our work, I do not believe it would be worth while working; indeed, I do not think that we could keep on in the work, because I believe it is God’s seal that is with us.

Q. You are aiming principally at the rising generation, I suppose—A. Well, we do continuous work with men and women too, though, of course, we are not so hopeful of that.

Q. You are doing the best you can with all, I suppose—A. Yes; it is like four parallel lines; you cannot say which is most important; all are essential. The four lines represent, one, the educating of the young in the principles of total abstinence; the second, the forming of a better sentiment in regard to the use of liquors; the third, the reclamation of the drinking classes by Divine grace; and the fourth, the removal from the streets of the dram shops, by law. All other departments of work will range themselves under those.

EFFECT OF LOCAL PROHIBITION.

Q. In the line of your legal work, do you think that any prohibition law confined to the borders of Massachusetts will ever be an efficient remedy for the removal of this liquor traffic that you are trying to destroy—A. I think if Boston were regulated, New England would be greatly improved. Boston men send packages all through New England. I received a letter from a woman in Vermont a while ago saying that a man there (a very excellent man when not in liquor) periodically received packages from Boston which cost $5 each, and that from that time he was under the influence of liquor; that his wife was a very good woman and doing the best she could to bring her children up nicely. As long as this liquor kept coming from Boston, it was impossible for the man to do anything. The name of the liquor dealer was given to me, and I went to see him, and showed him the bill of sale, which had been sent to me, and I said, “That is from you place?” He said, “Yes.” Then I explained to him the position of things in that family, and he said he would not send any more liquor there. I said, “Shall I write and tell them that you will not send any more?” He said, “Yes,” and I did.

Q. Suppose the man could not get it from Boston; New England is
not a great way from from New York, is it?—A. No; but Boston is the center of iniquity in New England.

Q. You do not think that Boston is any worse than New York, do you?—A. No; I suppose not.

Q. And there is not a great difference in the express charges?—A. No.

Q. Suppose the people wanted it here in Boston, and could not get it; how much difficulty would they have in getting it from New York?—A. Well, of course every place being purified would help all others. Still I believe in national prohibition.

THE TEMPERANCE UNION IN EVERY STATE.

Mrs. Cone. We think that one State will follow another, however.

Q. Your union is in every State?—A. Yes. We send in petitions every year, and shall continue to do so, asking that Congress, so far as it has the right to do it, will prohibit the liquor traffic in the District of Columbia and the Territories.

Q. You propose to amend your constitution here, do you?—A. Yes; we propose to do so.

Q. If it is worth while to have any Congressional action at all, what objection is there to amending the National Constitution as well as the State constitution?—A. Oh, we believe in it with all our hearts.

Mrs. Cone. Of course we want to see our State right.

INFLUENCE OF TEMPERANCE LEGISLATORS.

The Witness. Iowa sends good temperance men to Congress now, and so do Kansas and Maine, and the more good men that are sent to Congress, the better and the sooner we shall have the right sort of legislation on temperance.

Q. Do you see any difficulty in having a “four-in-hand team” to act upon the National Congress as well as upon the State legislature?—A. Well, we believe that the National Congress is only the reflection of the States, and when men are sent to Congress from the States they reflect the sentiment of the States.

FEMALE SUFFRAGE: ITS INFLUENCE ON TEMPERANCE.

Q. You expect to exercise some influence on the State, do you not?—A. Oh, yes; and with that view I believe in all sorts of suffrage for women as well as municipal suffrage, for, as things are now, suppose it should be decided that there shall be no liquor sold; the men would elect a sheriff that does not care whether they drink or not, and if the temperance women could vote they would look after the characters of the men that are elected.

Q. But you would want to try to do something about it, even though you should not have the vote?—A. Yes.

The Chairman. Suppose you look after the position of your Representatives in Congress in the matter. I do not ask you why you do less in one direction, but why you do not at the same time exert yourself in the other?

The Witness. Well, we are interested in it. The question is how to get at it.

Mrs. Cone. The effort in the State is to influence the legislature; but Boston men over-set all good laws.
LIQUOR-DEALERS MAINLY FOREIGN-BORN.

Q. Does the foreign element in Boston embarrass you any?—A. Why, the majority of the liquor-dealers are foreign-born.

Mrs. Cone. There are American men—for instance, prominent lawyers—who seem to fear the result on their business of starting a movement against the liquor forces, and that I think is more unfortunate than the Roman Catholic or foreign opposition, because they have more influence.

THE LEGAL PROFESSION OPPOSED TO TEMPERANCE REFORM.

Mrs. Cheney. I tried to get a lawyer to oppose the license vote, and his answer to me was, "Why, I am a criminal lawyer." He said it would spoil his business, and I told him I presumed it would.

Mrs. Cone. I was at an election myself in one of the wards, and I noticed universally through that ward that the business men and lawyers were unwilling to vote for the "no license" law. They came up so leisurely that we had time to talk with them.

Q. You say you found the lawyers against you generally?—A. Yes; we did.

The Chairman. That is a pretty serious thing. You had better begin upon the lawyers, because they have more to do with the framing and the passing of the laws than anybody else.

The Witness. Well, you know we cannot teach these lawyers anything.

Mrs. Cheney. Yes; they tell me that. They say, "I know all about it; you can't teach me anything about it."

Mrs. Cone. I think one reason why many women do not work more in the cause is because they are hopeless about it. A pastor who has a large church in Chelsea told me that out of several hundred church members only six of the gentlemen went to the polls last year.

BOSTON, MASS., October 23, 1883.

Mrs. C. H. Spring examined.

By the Chairman:

Question. You are connected with the Woman's Christian Temperance Union?—Answer. Yes.

WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

Q. In what capacity?—A. I am vice-president of the city union; I came in connection with it through the gospel work; that is my principal work.

Q. Give us a description of that, and your observations and experience in the prosecution of the work.—A. I would like to say, though I do not care to have it reported, that I differ a little from Mrs. Barrett in the statement that the blame should be laid upon the churches, because I believe that all good work emanates from the church, and that a majority of the good women of the 70,000 that have come into the Woman's Christian Temperance Union have come from the evangelical churches, and that they were brought in through the hope of lifting up
the lowly. I came into the work nine years ago, when Mrs. Barrett did, and there has been a great increase of thought among the good people since that time. They have been guilty more of sins of omission than of commission. They have not seen that they owed a duty to their kind in that line outside the limits of their family. There is another reason why it, perhaps, seems to some that the churches are not working with us. We have so many lines of work in our churches, and we cannot all work in the same lines.

**Gospel Meetings.**

Q. What do you do in your line?—A. I attended gospel meetings when I first came into the work. We did, at first, do temperance reform work—lifting up the drunkard wherever it was possible; but it was very hard, up-hill work, and we were not supported. Those who had means did not feel that we were doing the work that ought to be done for the money that it was costing, and so we gave up that line of work, and have confined the gospel part of the work to evening meetings.

Then we have the children's work, by which we try to exercise an influence upon the little ones, and in fact we try to work on all possible lines as the opportunity comes.

**The "Abatement" Law.**

So far as the legal point is concerned, we have a law which says that the owners of adjoining property could protest against premises being used as a saloon; that has been pretty well enforced. It is called the "abatement law." I have inquired as to the enforcement of that law, and I have known others that have inquired, and I have not known of any person who has been refused the aid of that law when they have asked for it.

**Necessity for an Educated Public Sentiment.**

Q. Do you not think that the real difficulty is less with your city officials than that they feel that public sentiment behind them will not sustain them in the enforcement of the law?—A. I think that is it.

Q. So that any criticism that you make is not made to impugn them officially or as men?—A. No.

Q. You think that they will go as far in the enforcement of the law as the citizens will sustain them?—A. Yes. Of course there are various classes of people in the communities. Among the good people there is every year getting to be a more decided regard for temperance work.

**The Church an Ally of the Temperance Movement.**

We can more easily secure the aid of the churches, and the pastors are more actively with us now than they used to be. It was very hard work for them at one time to commit themselves in any way. They did not want to push temperance for fear of offending some of the people in their churches.

Q. You had first to convince the church itself?—A. Yes; or rather it was more necessary that women should see that they were called upon to do something in this work. I had to be converted to it myself. I was a Christian, and worked in all lines of church work; but I did not
feel called to do any temperance work until I was convinced that I ought to do it, and then I felt that I had been remiss in my duty; and so it has to be with every woman that comes into the work. She must be convinced that she has a work to do.

WOMEN EXTENDING THEIR INFLUENCE BEYOND THE HOME CIRCLE.

Q. The drinking habit had been so much a matter of course that it did not occur to you, I suppose, that it was wrong or hurtful. Is that what you mean?—A. No; I do not mean that, as far as myself was concerned, because I was always a prohibitionist. My father taught me that when I was but a child; he was one of the first that led in the "Washingtonian" movement. I felt, however, that my own home was my place—that I had nothing to do with outside matters. So it was with the other ladies of the church. They said to themselves, "We have no trouble with intemperance in our own homes, and we have nothing to do with it." I have even heard my sisters in the church tell me that. I do want to say one thing, however, about the remark you made as coming from the old gentleman who testified yesterday [Mr. Marsh]. I respect his opinion, of course—

The CHAIRMAN. He did not give it as an opinion; he believes just as you believe; but he stated it as the practice of society many years ago.

ACCOUNTS OF DRINKING HABITS OF OLDEN TIMES EXAGGERATED.

The WITNESS. Well, sometimes people put that pretty strongly. I am not so old as he is, of course; but my father lived to be eighty-three, and his mother lived to be eighty-five, and my life has "lapped over," I may say, on to their lives, and I know the customs of those old times. And while I know that the decanter was always on my father's sideboard in his early life, until he went into this "Washingtonian" movement—and he had always offered the minister a little something when he came, and it was expected that he would do it, in times when the minister had a long way to go, and it was cold—but the amount that was drunk, it seems to me, has been exaggerated. Looking over my father's books, and seeing how much they paid in those old days for rum and sugar, I think that there is an exaggerated sense of the amount of drinking that was done in those old times; and that hurts me, because I was brought up in the Connecticut Valley. Of course, after people had been sitting in a cold church for two and a half hours without any fire, if they then did go home and have a little punch, it did not affect them as it does people in the warm and comfortable homes of the present.

CO-RELATION OF TEMPERANCE AND LABOR QUESTIONS.

The CHAIRMAN. You touch now upon a point that has been often before us, with regard to the laboring people, who suffer much and work long hours, and are exhausted by their labors—almost stupified by the clatter of the machinery and the character of the atmosphere they work in. It has been testified by medical men that it produces a condition of body and mind which incapacitates people for social enjoyment, and that that leads to the drinking habit as inevitably as water runs down hill—that the physical and atmospheric conditions, as you may say, of those people, tend to the drinking habit, so that, away behind the efforts you are making is another reform that ought to be effected—that is, with regard to the
physical inflictions that go under the name of labor—abuses of industry that ought to be removed before we can expect to reach and finally eradicate this evil, which is the natural physical outcome of those conditions. The labor question, you see, is a very large question, involving temperance work and everything else that goes to the reformation and improvement of the physical, mental, and moral state of society.

The WITNESS. I understand that, and it is very wrong that the rum that is used is so much of a stimulant. I do not wish, however, to be understood as upholding the old-time customs.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that. I am alluding to all the existing conditions of factory labor and other systems of labor.

SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE OF ALCOHOLIC EFFECTS.

Mr. CHENEY. But you know we learn that alcohol is not a stimulant, and really has no heating property. So we must try and teach the public the scientific facts that enter into the temperance question.

The CHAIRMAN. No doubt it is a poison. The vast preponderance of medical authority is to that effect. It is like strychnine or prussic acid, or any other poison, attended with agreeable effects in some of its early stages, but creating an appetite for itself.

Mrs. CONE. The army reports of all countries show that.

The CHAIRMAN. But nevertheless it is a fact that for the time being it creates a pleasant delirium, and the great mass of the workingmen have yet to learn that it is a poison rather than a food. Many of the medical books have held that it is a food, although the latest and highest decisions of science are that it is not a food, but a poison. I do not think that anything could do so much good to the laboring classes as the general spread of your views in the direction in which you are engaged. I only say what I have said, because I think there is large room for the exercise of humanitarian views toward these poor people who are the victims of drink, and the fault is generally with those good people who, not seeing the benevolent effects of these things in their own homes, and not understanding the scientific relations of the question, give it very little attention. Things will improve when they wake up.

NEWSPAPERS AND THE TEMPERANCE CAUSE.

Mrs. CONE. The newspapers of Boston do not do as much for the temperance cause as they might. They could not do it, they say, because those who advertise with them would not like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The reporters, no doubt, bring the facts to the attention of the managers; but newspapers are business enterprises very largely, and, like most of us in these later times, they are thinking as much of the dollar as they are of the manner of getting it.

Mrs. CONE. The editors are much kinder than the financial managers, but the editors do not believe generally that prohibition is to be successful.

Mrs. GORDON. Twenty years from now they will be just as much ashamed of the position which they now occupy as Dr. Fuller and those who took the position that slavery was a divine institution. In twenty years from now the editors will be reading with astonishment their own editorials that ‘prohibition did not prohibit,’ and they will be ashamed of them.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.
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MRS. E. M. ALLEN EXAMINED.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You reside in this city, I suppose?—Answer. Yes.

WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

Q. What is your connection with the Woman's Christian Temperance Union?—A. I am simply a member of the organization.

Q. Will you please state any thoughts that occur to you on the subject of the work in which that organization is engaged?—A. Well, I have so many thoughts that I hardly know where to begin. My first thought is that something should be done to put away the great evil of intemperance, and done as speedily as possible; the quickest way to go about it the better.

Q. Then I suppose you would go about it in every way?—A. In every way that it is possible—I cannot speak of any special way. I think it should be brought into politics however, and every man should cast a vote against liquor.

THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION IN POLITICS.

Q. Do you find many men of that opinion?—A. Not so many as I should like. It was my privilege to go about this year and last with the petition for prohibitory constitutional amendment, and I was very glad to find people more favorable to it this year than last. They seemed to be more interested in it. It was just after the election of Butler, and everybody was stirred up because Butler had got the office of governor, and perhaps that was one reason why I found a great deal more interest in this petition than I had found before. I have gotten perhaps a thousand signatures this year.

Q. Of voters?—A. Principally voters.

Q. And without reference to party affiliation?—A. Without reference to party affiliation at all. I took the business part of the city and canvassed it for signatures.

Q. Among the business men?—A. Among the business men.

Q. Then, these thousand signatures would represent, I suppose, a very substantial part of the citizens, would they not?—A. I thought so at the time.

Q. When was this?—A. Last winter.

Q. Was the petition presented?—A. It was presented to the legislature and laid by.

Mrs. Gordon. There were 54,000 names to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The names of voters very largely?

Mrs. Gordon. Yes, largely; and of women over twenty-one years of age.

The CHAIRMAN. It was presented late in the session, I suppose?

Mrs. Gordon. No, indeed; it was put in the very first thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that this was as important as the Tewksbury matter?

Mrs. Gordon. Almost.

The WITNESS. I think that is just what we need in order to put away the trouble of the Tewksbury matter. It is this great liquor evil that produces such institutions as Tewksbury, and all the institutions akin to it. Every gentleman in the city of Boston knows that.
Q. What is the reason, do you think, of the apparent reluctance to attack the evil, when it is admitted to be so great? Nobody undertakes to deny your statistics, or your general position. It is the greatest evil, perhaps, that assails society. What is the reason that society appears to be afraid to attack it, and that it does not attack and destroy it?—A. I think that one thing is the money interest, and another the political interest. We have all these powerful interests to contend against. We have party power to fight, as well as the money power, and the social element of society. If we could only get people to vote right, we should have no more to do.

Q. I suppose you would anticipate as much opposition politically from the party not in power as from the party in power?—A. Oh, yes; neither party touches this very important matter.

Q. That is only an exhibition of the indifference of society, because both parties together comprise the mass of society. Is not that so?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that the question comes right back again to us—why is it that society, in either of its political organizations, refuses to attack this evil?—A. They seem to be indifferent to it; they think that it is no affair of theirs.

**INTERMENPERANCE THE ROOT OF ALL EVIL.**

Q. Do you suppose that the evil is so great as you imagine, after all—do you not think that there is a chance for you to review your conclusion as to its being a great evil?—A. I think, sir, that it is the greatest evil we have to contend with in the world; it brings all other evils with it.

Q. If that is so, and if it is the greatest evil that afflicts society, why does not society remove it?—A. I cannot say.

Mrs. Gordon. We are going to remove it. We are a part of society, and we have enlisted for life in the cause.

Mrs. Cheney. Oh, yes; we have “come to stay.”

The Witness. I do wish that people would take hold of this matter with more interest than they do, especially those who have the power.

Q. Does any other suggestion occur to you?

**EFFECTS OF LIQUEUR DRINKING.**

A. You ask what we could see as to the effect of this liquor traffic. I have in my mind now a family composed of father, mother, and child. The father is a hard-working man. They keep liquors in the house, and I understand from good authority that if the mother refuses her child a glass of beer the father will beat the mother. That is only one case; but other instances like that could be found.

Q. I suppose they would not drink liquor if there was not any made, would they?—A. No.

Q. But the appetite is there?—A. Yes.

Q. Why is wheat raised and manufactured into various other things, do you think?—A. Well, I do not know; it should be for what it was designed for—for the good of the people, and not to be converted into something that is going to create insanity and pauperism and death and destruction, killing both the bodies and the souls of men.
Q. You think there is a much more imperative demand in the natural appetite for food than in the unnatural appetite for liquor, where it exists?—A. Well, I cannot say about that myself; I know there is a great demand for liquors.

REMOVING THE SUPPLY PREVENTS THE DEMAND.

Q. If it were not for that demand there would not be any supply, would there?—A. No, sir; and if there were not the supply there would not be the demand.

Q. Then, the appetite existing, how are you going to prevent its being gratified unless you remove the supply?—A. We should remove it; that is the way to do it.

Q. Can you do that except by removing the manufacture of it?—A. No.

Q. If they make it in Kentucky it can be got in Boston?—A. Yes; but we are going to work in Massachusetts first.

PROHIBITION MOST EFFECTIVE BY CONSTITUTIONAL ENACTMENT.

Q. The General Government has control of inter-State transportation. Massachusetts cannot prevent its being brought here in the original packages, can it?—A. I do not know that it can.

Mrs. Gordon. We can prevent its being opened and sold here.

The Chairman. Can you? Here are 300,000 people that want it when it comes here. Set a keg of liquor down in a saloon—whether in a shanty or in a magnificent hotel—within range of the appetite, and do you not suppose that American genius will in some way contrive to get at it.

Mrs. Gordon. Oh, yes; they would do that in Maine. They have water coolers there so arranged that if you turn one faucet you get whisky, and if you turn another faucet you get water. The initiated always turn the whisky faucet, and the uninitiated the other.

The Chairman. That shows what American genius is equal to; and, if the appetite exists, unless the United States takes control of legislation on the subject and prevents the manufacture of whisky everywhere within its territory, and enforces a law against either its manufacture or its importation, as they now enforce the laws against smuggling, how are you going to keep it from the people?

Mrs. Gordon. We have one man in the United States Senate, from New Hampshire, who is interested in the work, and he will help us.

The Chairman. But one man does not amount to much.

The Witness. Have you ever stopped to think of all the evil that one man can do? If one man can do a great deal of evil in the world, one man can certainly do a great deal of good.

The Chairman. The greatest good, however, can only be done when there comes to be an association of effort.

Mrs. Gordon. Every man's opinions help to create public sentiment.

The Chairman. I only make the remarks that I have made, not that any less should be done in Massachusetts than in any other State, but only to intimate that the work must be pushed in a larger way if you are going to succeed.

THE DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE PROHIBITION.

Mrs. Cone. Yes; like the movement for the abolition of slavery—the demand for immediate emancipation.
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The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Garrison demanded immediate emancipation, and kept demanding it for over thirty years. We abolished the slave trade when we adopted the original Constitution of the United States, by a provision to take effect twenty years in advance. But that provision been such as to go into immediate force, the slave-trade interest—with the people of New England so largely interested in that trade—would have secured the rejection of the Constitution of 1789.

THE OPPOSITION TO IMMEDIATE PROHIBITION.

Now, there is a class of temperance people who simply assail all liquor men as vagabonds and criminals; but you know that many of the men in this country who are in one form or another interested in liquor are substantial men in the communities in which they live, and are pillars in the churches and in society. Those people are all willing enough to dispense with liquor but for the effect it would have upon their immediate pecuniary condition and the sustenance and education of their families. Those are motives that we all act upon. They are all willing that the traffic shall disappear. There is not a liquor dealer, even, that would be willing to have his boy grow up in the liquor business.

UNIVERSAL DISAPPROBATION OF INTEMPERANCE.

The masses of those who are interested in the liquor business of this country would be glad that some measure should take effect which would destroy the trade, provided it did not thereby destroy their own immediate pecuniary sustenance. The liquor dealer does not desire to turn his family out in the street, for, if that is done, how is he to educate his children? The liquor business is a business like farming or manufacturing, or any other business, and you naturally excite the opposition of the liquor interest because you take the bread out of their mouths, and they are therefore much more likely to fight you, and more efficiently when you are asking for a national measure which is to take immediate effect, than they would be by your giving them an opportunity of turning their attention and their money into some less hurtful pursuit. Take a man, for instance, of forty-five to fifty years of age; he cannot go into any other business. I have been a lawyer and a farmer, and I can go on to a farm and work; and, if I could not get work at farming I could dig post-holes.

Mrs. GORDON. People could soon learn how to get along in trade without whisky.

Mrs. CONE. Certainly, none of them want their children to be brought up to the business.

THE MOST EFFECTIVE METHOD OF ABOLISHING INTEMPERANCE.

The CHAIRMAN. You must not misunderstand me. I am speaking of the proposal of a measure in a certain way, which would make it more likely to be enacted sooner; and, as the question concerns the abolition of a trade, you want a measure which would disarm the opposition of that trade. You must remember that there are, in this country, over a billion of dollars invested in the liquor trade, and that is a heavy opposition to fight. So that, when you propose to destroy it instantly, you have a tremendous undertaking on your hands.

Mrs. GORDON. Every distillery has been shut up in Kansas, and some
of the distilleries and breweries have been turned into conservatories, and some into starch factories.

The Chairman. But you can roll a barrel of whisky into Kansas from another State. The State line is only an imaginary line. You are not accomplishing the real end you have in view until you have obtained an amendment to the national Constitution, to work harmoniously with your State constitution. Just one other point: the man who is drinking liquor, wants it, but he does not want his boy to drink it. Any measure that will allow him to use it for five or ten years, but which will see that his boy is protected against it, he does not so much care to oppose. Any measure that takes care of the rising generation, and does not meddle too much with the present traffic, or the present consumer, you can interest all the people better in.

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC DETRIMENTAL TO ALL OTHER BUSINESS.

The Witness. I would like to ask you whether you do not think that if the liquor business was put away other businesses would not progress so much the more? There would be more money. The mechanics and others would have something more to spend on other things.

The Chairman. Conservative men say that intemperance produces at least four-fifths of the crime, and two-thirds of the pauperism and insanity, and the evils that society is suffering from.

Mrs. One. If these distilleries in Kansas could be turned into starch factories, why could not these whisky makers turn their attention to something else if they are good business men?

The Chairman. Well, they might make more starch than was wanted; but there certainly might be found some other direction in which capital could be readily invested.

BOSTON, MASS., October 23, 1883.

Mrs. M. E. Cheney examined.

By the Chairman:

Question. Do you reside in this city?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. You may state anything you have in your mind on the question of temperance.—A. Like some of the other ladies, I have so much in my mind that I do not know where to begin.

GOSPEL WORK OF THE TEMPERANCE UNION.

Q. Well, suppose you begin in medias res.—A. My connection with the Union is as chairman of the Gospel committee; so my work has largely been in that direction, although I have been a sort of spare hand, working almost anywhere, in many of the lines. In regard to the Gospel work, Mrs. Spring has spoken so fully that it is not necessary for me to say much. I will say, however, that we held for some time a meeting in Portland street, which is known as one of our worst localities, and directly opposite our meeting place is one of the largest saloons of the city. We were informed by the policemen in that portion of the city, and by gentlemen in business, that the effect of our meeting was very beneficial upon that portion of the city, and that there was less drunkenness than before. It was made much more respectable by
our efforts there. I would like to have it understood, too, that in all these mission stations—in Portland street and at the North End Mission—it is not altogether those that are the very lowest classes that stray in there.

THE EFFECT OF DRINK ON THOSE OF HIGH CONDITION.

There are those who have been brought down to that condition from a higher condition by reason of drink. I have met there young men who started out at Parker’s and at Young’s—who started out with the best prospects in the world—young men who were engaged in business and lost their positions through drink, and were finally brought down there—perhaps some of them in less than ten years—through the effects of drink. I have also seen, during the length of time that we held our meetings in Portland street, men who were there in the beginning of those meetings, and who signed the pledge and were converted by the grace of God, and made new creatures through the power of Christ. I saw them at the later meetings clothed, and in their right mind, and bearing testimony to the strength that was given them to overcome the appetite and to live as respectable citizens. This is entirely due to the work of Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. Although other work was carried on before their work, yet work in that direction has grown out of their efforts entirely, and what was really going to waste has grown to be respectable and of use to society at large.

GOOD CITIZENS MADE OUT OF HUMAN "WASTE."

I was at the Institute fair a short time ago and saw a machine for taking up the cotton waste and working it over; it could not be handled with the hands, but it is put into little bags, and through the operation of this machine it is wound on spindles and made so that it can be used. Now, it seems to me that our gospel work has been in that direction—gathering up the "waste" that we could not handle with our hands, some of it so polluted, but by presenting the gospel to these poor people, through Christ’s influence, we have brought whatever was waste into such form as that they may become respectable members of society; and they are now living upright lives, and giving to their homes the money which before they had been giving to saloons. This is the case with hundreds and hundreds of them. I could go on for a day and give instances of that kind.

"MODERATE DRINKING" UNDERMINING SOCIETY.

I would like to say here that perhaps I have had an experience that some of these other ladies have not had. I came out from society having believed in the drinking customs of society. I believed it was perfectly right and proper for everyone to drink if they chose to drink, and that it was right for me to have liquor in the house and to offer it to my guests, and that a man must be a fool if he drink too much. So while I detested the drunkard, I may say I had rather an admiration for a moderate drinker who could drink several glasses of liquor without showing it. I came out from that class of people and came among temperance workers. I came to believe that it was wrong to have anything to do with liquor—that society was being undermined by it, and that I, as an individual, had no right to aid in that work of undermining.
SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS CONDEMNED AS MEDICINE.

I had also taken it before as a medicine, believing it to be such, as it was a thing prescribed by prominent physicians in this city. I have learned, after being connected with this organization, to look at the thing in a different light—after investigating it and reasoning for myself, so that I could say to my physician, "If you cannot give me something to take in the place of alcoholic stimulants, I must find a physician who can."

EDUCATION OF CHILDREN ON THE EVILS OF INTEMPERANCE.

I have been interested very much in the juvenile work of the Union, believing that we have no right to send our boys out into the world ignorant of the facts concerning alcohol, and believing that the girls, also, as the future wives and mothers of society, shall be equally well instructed; believing that the influence of home, and whatever sanction is put upon it in the home, is felt outside of the home very largely. I have been interested in the young ladies' work also, because I think through them a large influence is brought to bear upon our young men, and that it is almost impossible for us to meet a certain class of young men in society except through the efforts of the young women—through the efforts especially of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Unions which have been organized. Through their efforts young men have been influenced to sign the pledge, and to give sober thought to this question, and they are the future fathers and the members of our future society. To them we must look, to a certain extent, for a better state of things than now prevails.

FEMALE SUFFRAGE: ITS INFLUENCE ON INTEMPERANCE.

In regard to the question of suffrage, which we have put in our resolutions, I would like to say why we ask for municipal suffrage. The resolution reads:

"Whereas woman's ballot is recognized as a power that makes for righteousness, our enemies themselves being the judges; Resolved, that we will petition the legislature of Massachusetts for the privilege of using it, and, as a means to that end, we exhort the temperance women of the State to avail themselves of the opportunity already offered in school suffrage."

Now, I believe that if it is right for us to vote on the school committee question, it is right that we should vote on all questions, and I see no reason why we should not. We certainly believe it is right to vote there, and we think that as intelligent women we are capable of learning the duties of voters, and of voting for the best interests of society. We think we are able, too, to sift men's characters pretty clearly.

Q. But won't you want the offices yourselves?—A. I have not the least desire for any office.

The CHAIRMAN. If you will guarantee that women will not ask offices, I will see what I can do to get the women the right to vote.

The WITNESS. I am perfectly willing that the men shall hold the offices.

Q. But do you not think that the other women will want some?—A. I do not know.

Q. Do you know that the secret of the opposition, as much as any-
thing else, is power?—A. I do not know but what it is. But I am just as capable of judging as to right and wrong as my husband is.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is a grave assumption. I do not know your husband; but that women know enough to vote is a violent assumption, isn’t it?

UNIVERSAL OPPOSITION OF WOMANHOOD TO INTEMPERANCE.

MRS. CONE. The liquor people know that women’s votes generally will go against their business. Good people fear that many women would vote on the wrong side; but that is not so. In circulating the petitions in the streets I found that the Roman Catholic women, and even some who drank a little, would themselves be only too glad to have it prohibited.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that the work that you are engaged in may have another direct benefit. You find that Roman Catholics are human beings just as the rest of us are.

MRS. CONE. The Church does not allow its communicants to take it, however.

SUFFRAGE APPRECIATED BY NATURALIZED, NEGLECTED BY NATIVE, CITIZENS.

Mrs. Cheney. A gentleman who was in our house shortly after the last election, and who employs, perhaps, 35 or 40 men, many of them foreigners, said that many of them came to him and spoke about the privilege of voting. They were eager to vote, and were delighted that they were naturalized. I looked at the gentleman and said to him, “You are a respectable member of society and an intelligent man, and yet you cannot leave your business long enough to go to Pemberton Square and get registered, and simply because your name has been taken out of the registry list by reason of your absence from the city, you cannot find time to go and have it put on again.” That is one of the great troubles that we have to meet with among the gentlemen—this indifference to what they should feel to be their duty. It is also among many ladies in regard to voting. Many ladies say, “If I had the right to vote on all questions, I should be perfectly willing to vote, but I am not going to bother about voting on this one point alone.” So we have a great deal to do to get the ladies up to a proper state of thought on this matter.

BOSTON, MASS., October 23, 1883.

MRS. RICHARD W. CONE examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You are a resident of Boston?—Answer. Yes.

WOMEN’S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

Q. And connected with the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union?—A. Yes; I am chairman of the literature department. I first came into the work because I had a large class of working boys for some years at the North End mission in this city, and as they kept growing
older some of them began to drink. I used to caution them against it, but they felt that they were only drinking "tonic" beer, which was not strong enough to intoxicate, but one by one they would get to drinking the other and stronger beer. Then they would find themselves sleepy in the mornings, and so would oversleep, and, when spoken to about it, would become impertinent and then they would lose their places. It was found, too, that it interfered with their health, and in some cases they broke down entirely. Then I began to bring single cases before the authorities to see what could be done.

SELLING DRINK TO MINORS.

One boy, for instance, was so overcome by what he supposed was only beer, that they had to take him to the city hospital, and when he came to his senses, he told me the name of the man who sold him the liquor, and we had him called before the commissioners and questioned. The assistant ward-master of the city hospital, who had charge of him, came, and the city missionary who was interested in the case also came, and these rum-sellers from the North End were called up, and they said frankly that they were obliged to "fortify" the beer to make it strong enough for the tastes of the men who drank it. They supposed that this boy bought it for his parents. They said this was the custom of the dealers at the North End. The commissioners wanted some testimony from the mother of the boy, so that it could be used to take away the license of this liquor dealer who had sold him the liquor. But it turned out that he was a very large dealer and had a very fine brick block that he had built in the neighborhood of his business and as a result of his business, and the woman declined to testify, because she said he was her grocer, and he would make things very uncomfortable for her if she testified against him.

THE LAW PROHIBITING THE SALE OF LIQUORS TO MINORS.

One of the gentlemen who was commissioner at that time was Mr. Thomas Gargan, and he was very much impressed with the fact that boys could be induced to drink by getting liquor for their parents. At the next session of the legislature he introduced a bill prohibiting the sale of liquors to minors, whether for their parents or otherwise, and that bill was passed and is still the law of the State. We became convinced that there was very little use in educational work unless we had prohibition first.

INFLUENCE OF POLITICS OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM.

It is impossible to get text-books into the public schools here. We have argued with the supervisors and with the school committee, and a gentleman told me the other day that we might do our work as well as we pleased, but that no man who would press the subject of temperance being taught in the schools could possibly be elected on a Boston school committee. He was one of the city Republican committee last year, and he said that this school committee question was one which was made entirely subordinate to politics; that the Republican committee, when the question came up, sent out for the Democratic committee to come in, and they consulted together on the matter, and agreed that this school committee question should be made subordinate to all other matters. One supervisor does not wish temperance principles taught in the schools as part of the regular course of education be-
cause, he says, the scientific aspects of the case are not settled yet. Another thinks it would make children rude at home in the display of their knowledge, especially before parents who are moderate drinkers.

LIQUOR DRINKING AS A SOCIAL EVIL.

Dr. Dorchester, the other evening, spoke of the old-fashioned habit of respectable drinking. "Now," he said, "only the lower classes drink." I do not think that is so. I think that the trouble is that the people who drink are not now in the churches. I was speaking to an editor on the subject, and he said to me, "I go into society a good deal, and I do not know any place where it is not used; I mean," said he, "in the houses of people who make any pretense to polite hospitality."

LIQUOR DRINKING IN BUSINESS CIRCLES.

I have been told that on State street, a few years ago, there were three very fashionable brokers who provided liquor for their customers, and I am told, now, that there are very few brokers who do not provide liquor continually for their customers.

Q. At the present time?—A. Yes; a junior partner of one of the large firms on Summer street told me lately that he thought prohibition would be a great blessing if it would take wine and beer out of the respectable eating saloons where the young men lunch—where they take their Southern and Western customers to lunch and to drink. He said it was ruinous to the young men; that, of course, they did not wish to rebuke men with whom they wished to be on good terms. I know that is the case with a very large number of business men, especially men who keep restaurants. One restaurant keeper told me that he could not get along in his business without having liquor, as many men desired it when they came to get their dinner. He said he should lose their custom altogether if he did not give them liquor, as other saloons would give it to them if he did not. A gentleman who keeps a large hotel here, and who is a member of the church, says he prays the Lord daily for a prohibition law.

The CHAIRMAN. As I said awhile ago, if their own personal interest is not interfered with, they might be secured as allies.

The WITNESS. But most men want to make money by it.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

The CHAIRMAN. I know. I am speaking in relation to a national amendment. There are so many States, and there is so much ground to go over that it seems to me very difficult to accomplish it without an amendment to the national Constitution.

The WITNESS. You mean, if a law were now passed, that twenty years from now there should be prohibition?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not mean by State action. I believe that such a measure could be worked up so as to secure national acquiescence. It takes a good deal of time to work up one State. Massachusetts has been a battle ground for temperance for fifty years.

The WITNESS. Do you think that Congress would now listen to a bill prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor after a date twenty years hence?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think such a bill would pass now, but I think in twenty years something of that kind might go through, and I
am not indisposed to think that the Republican party will have to take some position on the question in the next campaign.

Mrs. Gordon. When an avalanche begins to move, we know that it moves only an inch or two at a time, but when it gets regularly on its way it becomes an irresistible force.

**TEMPERANCE EDUCATION.**

The Witness. My specialty is in educational work, but I see how impossible it is to get ordinary people interested in this matter. They do not come to temperance lectures. Some time ago Mr. Bicknell offered a certain number of prizes for essays on temperance subjects, with a list of references to books that could be used for writing the essays, the prizes ranging from $25 down—the intention being to get the pupils to look into this matter. He did not consult the board of education, I think, but the thing was published in the educational journals as an offer of prizes to be given—not as prize work in the schools, but as prizes to the students. It was to be done in the normal schools. But the board of education forbade the normal school pupils receiving the circulars from their teachers, though Mr. Bicknell said that if he had been two minutes before the school board, he could have convinced them of the wisdom of it. There are several gentlemen interested in education who can help the cause. Dr. Miner was on the board of education, and we called him to account for not doing something for it. He said he did not think it worth while to waste time about it, because there was no hope for it until prohibition was obtained.

The Chairman. You are at the foundation, and the work you do is the direct act, because you have to raise up a generation of voters who will believe that alcohol is a poison, so that when they hear it mentioned, they will feel and think just as they would if they heard strychnine mentioned; in other words, so that their first impulse would be against it rather than for it.

**OPPOSITION TO TEMPERANCE.**

The Witness. But I am afraid that meanwhile the example of parents and teachers will have a great effect upon them. A good many young men think that wine is such a necessity that they must have it at their clubs, or wherever there is a dinner going on.

The Chairman. Keep Dr. Miner as busy as you can. It will all turn out to be very useful and efficient work, but the voter, with his fraction of the sovereignty, is the man that makes and enforces the law. The action of men in the primary meetings is, after all, that which makes the law, and wherever there is a voter it is not so much the ballot that he puts into the box on election day, as that which he uses at the primary meetings that tells best. So that what you want in voters is that they shall initiate the right policy in the primary meetings. It does not take a great deal of time to raise a new generation of voters. Ten years will do it.

The Witness. I know the wife of one of the largest sellers of liquors in Boston, and she told me that she hoped for prohibition, although her husband has made a large fortune out of liquor.

The Chairman. If I were going to start out as a professor of temperance, I should go right to the liquor dealers. You will find that there is a vast amount of real goodness among these men.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

THE "ABUTMENT LAW".

The Witness. This abutment law might work well if it were not almost impossible to get the citizens near by to be willing to sign a petition. I found that some of them were willing, but I also found one gentleman who was especially recommended to me, who, it was said to me, I should be sure to get at the head of my petition. I found that he was a dealer in fish and oysters. When I spoke to him about signing a petition, he said, "I can't bite my own nose off. I can't sign this petition." He had transactions with liquor people, and many of them owed him money which he could not collect, and which it would be more difficult for him to collect if he were to sign petitions of this character. Another gentleman who read the petition a second time was almost paralyzed with horror at what he had come near doing—he had come near signing the petition. He said, "We have a contract to supply a large quantity of china and glass ware, and we can't sign this petition." Those were members of churches too.

HOW TO BRING ABOUT TEMPERANCE.

Mrs. Cheney. May I inquire if you believe that the majority can have whatever they ask, in this country?

The Chairman. After awhile.

Mrs. Cheney. Then what would you suggest as to the best way to bring sentiment to bear upon the majority of the people of the country on the subject of temperance?

The Chairman. Just what you are doing. You can only accomplish that through the agencies which you are employing. When you look over the ground, what agency is there that is not being employed by your union? The press, the pulpit, the politicians—and you are working yourselves with all your personal effort. You are working to educate the children; you are ingrafting your ideas upon their minds; you are influencing the common school-system. I think, myself, that is the most hopeful part of your work, this introduction of text-books setting forth the scientific aspects of the case into the schools. That, I think, is probably the most important thing that you are doing. But it is difficult to tell what is the most important, so closely are all the links associated together. It is an immense field of action, and you are busy everywhere, and in the fighting of a great battle it is difficult to tell which particular private soldier or officer is the most important to the general result. You cannot sometimes tell whether the result has been reached by reason of holding a certain position or otherwise. It is a big fight all along the line, and has to be maintained everywhere. The giving away of either extremity might result in the breaking of the center and the losing of just so much advantage as may have attached to the main position.

I am glad that you have come here today. I think that you have done much honor to yourselves and to the country. Some of your statements will reach the press immediately and will ultimately reach the country at large. It is not a fight to be discouraged about simply because you do not succeed immediately.

INFLUENCE OF THE PULPIT AND THE PRESS.

The Witness. A pastor here said he had not read anything bearing on the temperance question for many years because he had seen wine
drunk moderately all his life and did not feel that there was a great deal of harm resulting from it; but after reading a book that we had sent him he came to quite a different conclusion, and he has preached a sermon since maintaining total abstinence to be the only Christian standpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. If you could only influence the newspapers of your own city and of the country at large, you would secure a very strong ally.

The WITNESS. But the papers are financial establishments.

The CHAIRMAN. But, nevertheless, they are going to be more and more independent as they make money, and are going to do and say just what they please. When the men of the press have strong convictions on the subject, and you can get your ideas before them, they will reach the public mind, and in that way you are gaining a great deal; and in time it is going to be so that the secular press, political and otherwise, cannot afford to disregard what you say. A good-natured conciliatory sort of work is the most effective, and if you get the subject into the leading papers you will find it will be an immense benefit to you. I think a delegation of ladies like you could make a great deal of impression upon any of them, and the advocacy by them of your ideas will help to a valuable patronage.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND TEMPERANCE.

The WITNESS. I would like to ask what your opinion is about the woman's vote being brought into this temperance work. Do you think it will help?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I am in favor of female suffrage. I think the women know how to vote intelligently as well as the men. Taking the women of the country as a whole, I think they are, as a rule, more apt to vote right than the men. The conscience of the race is certainly better represented by the women than by men, and all these great questions are more or less questions of conscience. They turn on moral and humanitarian views. The slavery question was a question of conscience, and this temperance question is a question of conscience. So it is with the labor and industrial question to-day, and so it must be for this generation a question of conscience. Take the tariff issue; it is a question of right and wrong more than anything else. But setting that aside (for these other questions underlie even that), when men reflect that we gave the ballot to six or seven millions of colored population who could not read or write and had had only the standing of slaves for generations, and that to-day we permit everybody to vote who comes from across the water and remains here five years, it is absurd to say that the women of this country, who are the mothers of the men, do not know enough to vote right. Many questions of education, of temperance, and of moral reform generally would be settled very soon if women had the ballot.

LIQUOR THE CAUSE OF FEMALE DEGRADATION.

The WITNESS. I think many good men hesitate about giving the ballot to women for fear that those poor ignorant women and bad women would vote wrong, but I am not afraid of that. The most of them will say to you themselves, that they could not lead the lives they are leading if it were not for liquor. Almost every woman who comes
to the "Sherburne Orison" or to the Woman's Home in Boston, says that she comes there from liquor. At the North End Mission we have a home for reforming women, and in every case we find that liquor is the thing that begins their trouble, and it is that which enables them to keep up this life of theirs.

Q. From your idea of what are called the lower orders or bad women, such as your reformatory work has brought you in contact with, do you believe that if they had the suffrage they would vote for the liquor traffic, or would they vote against it?

DEGRADED WOMEN AND INTEMPERANCE.

A. I believe they would vote against the liquor traffic provided they were not made drunk just at the time when they must vote. I suppose that would have to be looked after.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know any more reason for a bad woman voting wrong than for a bad man voting wrong.

The WITNESS. There are not so many of the women as there are men among the foreigners here. There are many more men among them.

The CHAIRMAN. If all women had the right to vote, the fact that some of them voted wrong would not affect the question of the wisdom or propriety of giving women the right to vote. I do not know whether women would vote generally on small matters, but I do think that women would come to constitute a great reserve voting force on questions of right.

ROMAN CATHOLICS AND TEMPERANCE.

The WITNESS. I have, in speaking of this matter to some Roman Catholic women, said to them that their priests perhaps would not let them vote, but they said they would not ask the priests about it. They cared more for their children than for the priests.

The CHAIRMAN. I have taken some pains during this investigation to become somewhat acquainted with Catholic priests—something that I had not done before—and I think that priests are not, many of them, inclined to assert that political influence that they once did.

The WITNESS. One of the priests who has been very influential, and has been holding missions here, refused to take from a liquor dealer a magnificent case of candles for decorative purposes. He sent them back and said he would not take them from such a source.

The CHAIRMAN. I should be glad to see the time when Catholics will be considered in the same light as the rest of the population. I think the more people mingle together, the more they will think alike. I do not belong to any church or denomination, although my early affiliations were Congregational, and I attend the Methodist church now. My affiliations are principally Protestant, but it is not a bad thing to associate a little with people of all opinions. The principles of right and wrong are the same all the world over, and I think they can be reached everywhere.
Memorandum of a visit of a sub committee of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, consisting of Messrs. Aldrich and George, to the houses of cotton-mill operatives at Fall River, Mass., September 4, 1883.

The committee was accompanied by Mr. Robert Howard, secretary of the Mule Spinners' Association, and by gentlemen interested in the mill property.

The first houses visited were in the Bourne mill block, and consisted of tenements having two stories and an attic each. The committee visited the dwellings of—

A spinner (French-Canadian). The household consisted of nine members of the family and three boarders; the number of rooms six, of which four were bedrooms. Two children of the family worked in the mills, making about $2.50 per week each.

A spinner (French-Canadian). The family consisted of six, of which the father and two children worked in the mills. The apartments consisted of six rooms, of which four were bedrooms.

An overseer (American). The family consisted of mother, and two children. There were six rooms; rent $8 per month.

In the Shove mill block the committee visited the dwellings of—

A weaver (French-Canadian). The household consisted of six persons; the number of rooms five, of which four were bedrooms and one a room answering the purposes of eating-room, sitting-room and kitchen.

A weaver. The household consisted of eight persons, of whom six were boarders. The head of the household worked eight looms, sometimes making as much as $10 per week; never more than that. The price for board was $4 each per week for men and $3 each per week for women, which included washing. The number of rooms was five, of which four were bedrooms, and one answered the purposes of eating-room, sitting-room, and kitchen. The family was at dinner when the committee arrived. In reply to a question as to what sort of fare they lived on, they said that on some days they had for dinner potato pie, on others sausages, sometimes beefsteak and onions. The beefsteak cost them 24 cents per pound. As they did not have any children they thought they lived better than operatives having a family. Milk, they said, was 6 cents a quart; coal, $7 a ton.

In the Shade mills block the committee visited the dwellings of—

A spinner. The household consisted of seven persons, of whom two were boarders. The father of the family had worked in a mill since he was nine years old; was making now about $10 per week; said he had saved no money and could not save any; did not know any spinner having a family who had saved any money. He thought he could save some if he had only himself to care for, or perhaps if his children were big enough to work in a mill. The boarders were women operatives and paid for their board each $3 per week, which included washing. The number of rooms was five, of which three were on the ground floor and two on the third floor (the attic), the second-story rooms being occupied by another family. They could not afford to buy coal in larger quantities than a barrel at a time, for which they paid $1, which made the coal cost, they said, something over $6 per ton. There was no water in the buildings in this block, except, as this tenant told the committee, some “green, stagnant” water under the building of which he, said there
was enough to make anybody sick. The rain beat in under the building and the water became stagnant there.

A weaver (French-Canadian). The family consisted of seven persons, father, mother, and five children. The father and two daughters worked in the mills. The rooms consisted of five, of which three were bedrooms, one a kitchen, and one a sitting-room. The family had come to Fall River from below Quebec three years ago. They had had a small farm in Canada, which they sold when coming to Fall River, and were now trying to save money to go back to Canada and buy another farm. The mother said, in answer to questions, that she would be contented on a farm there. The health of the family, she said, was fair, although the ground on which the houses were built was low, there were no cellars, and the water gathered under the buildings.

A print-works operative. The family consisted of husband, wife, and three children, the eldest child being seven years of age. The husband and wife both worked in the mills, he in the print works, she as a weaver. His wages were $7.50 a week; hers generally about $8.40. The wife worked, she said, because her husband was not strong, and was sometimes obliged to lie idle; and if she did not work they would, in idle time, have nothing on which to support the family. Owing to the difference in the character of their work, she could earn more money than he could; and as long as she was able to work she was willing. The working hours were from 6.30 a.m. to 6 p.m., three-quarters of an hour being allowed for dinner.

In the Chace-mill block the committee visited the dwellings of—

A weaver (an Englishman). The household consisted of five members of the family and nine boarders. The wages of the head of the family were $1.15 per day. The couple had been married forty-three years. The price paid for board was, by men, $3.50 per week each; by women, $3 per week each. They were strong, hearty people. "My husband never drinks," the wife said. "We have been here ten years and he hasn't taken six glasses of anything in that time." She said they worked like slaves, of course—he in the mill and she keeping the house and the boarders. But she thought they lived very well—the household consuming, she added, 8 quarts of potatoes per day and having meat never less than once a day, most of the time twice a day and sometimes three times a day.

A picker-room operative (French-Canadian). The family consisted of father, mother, and eight children. The father and two of the daughters worked in the mills. The father's wages were $6.60 per week; the wages of the girls $3 or $4 each, depending on the amount of work done. The family had come from below Quebec. They said they had been in Fall River a year, and had not found very much difference between conditions there and conditions in Canada; and if they did not succeed better in Fall River they would go back to Canada, where they had owned a little farm. The difference between the two places was that in Fall River they had the advantage of a better school for such of the children as could not work in the mill, and they saw more of life than they could see on a farm in the back country of Canada. The wife liked it well enough in Massachusetts, and would as lief remain, but the children preferred Canada, and she would go wherever her children would be happiest. In reply to questions, she said they had not had such good flour in Canada as in Fall River, and generally had not lived quite so well in Canada. Here they had meat at almost every meal; they did not have it so often in Canada.
Memorandum of a visit made September 6, 1883, by a subcommittee of the United States Committee on Education and Labor, consisting of Messrs. Aldrich and Pugh, to mills at Woonsocket, Ashton, Albion, and Lonsdale, R. I., and South Manchester, Conn.

At Woonsocket, the committee first visited the Privilege mill, a woolen mill owned by the Harris Woolen Company. This mill employs five hundred operatives, and manufactures $1,500,000 worth annually of woolens. Of the operatives 75 per cent. are French Canadians, a considerable number of whom have become citizens, and several of whom own their own houses.

The committee then visited the Social Company's cotton mills. The mill has over 50,000 spindles, 1,200 looms, and about 250 cards; turns out 80 miles of cloth one yard in width each week. It does a finer class of work than that done at Fall River, and has a class of operatives of higher skill. About 75 per cent. of the operatives are French Canadians, and about 25 per cent. of the whole population of Woonsocket is of that nationality. The hours of work at the mill are from 6.30 a.m. to 6.30 p.m., with an hour at noon for dinner, making eleven hours' work per day. A spindle will spin about a pound of cotton a week, so that 50,000 spindles will each spin about 50,000 pounds of cotton into thread in its own house.

In working cotton from the crude condition into the fabric it is found that 20 per cent. becomes waste, owing to dirt, &c., getting into the cotton. In working wool similarly, a much larger percentage becomes waste (40 to 60 per cent.), owing to grease, dirt, &c.

The overseer of this mill is Mr. E. A. Mongeon, a French Canadian, who was at one time an operative. He has been a member of the town council of Woonsocket.

At this mill girls of about seventeen years of age tend 6 looms apiece, each of which looms produces from 15 to 42 yards per day according to the kind of work done upon it. For this work the girls are paid for each loom from 18 to 20 or 22 cents per day, according to the quality of work.

The wages of spinners are about $1.25 per day; each spinner tends about 240 spindles, or threads. These spindles revolve at the rate of 12,000 revolutions per minute.

From Woonsocket the committee drove to Ashton, R. I., a factory village of about seven hundred or eight hundred people. The factory is owned by the Lonsdale Company, who employ at Ashton about five hundred persons and run 42,000 spindles and 700 looms. The operatives are about one-half of English and one-half of Irish birth or parentage, there being only three French Canadian families among them. The houses are substantial brick edifices and are owned by the company. There are about 128 dwellings, each renting at from $4 to $7 per month. In one or two of the houses parlor organs were found.

The working hours are sixty-three per week (ten and one-half per day—the usual average in Rhode Island being eleven hours per day). The hours run from 6.30 a.m. to 6.30 p.m., with three-quarters of an hour being allowed for dinner, and work being shut off on Saturdays at 1.15 p.m. The operatives prefer the longer hours for five days in a week, in order to have the half holiday on Saturday.

The committee were informed that the average wages at this mill
were $40 per month. The employees are paid by the piece. There are about one hundred and fifty weavers, divided into two classes—the 4-loom weavers, who make $36 to $40 per month, and the 5-loom weavers, who make from $45 to $48 per month. On Mr. Aldrich stating that at Fall River there were 8-loom weavers, the superintendent, Mr. Sparhawk, said the work at Fall River was coarser than that at Ashton. The price charged for rent, he thought, would not be over 5 per cent of the investment. People in that vicinity who bought lots to build houses on had to charge more than the company charged for the same amount of space; that is to say, the mill company charged less than outside landlords did.

There is a free bath house, containing a large number of baths, connected with this mill, fed with hot and cold water by the pipes which supply the mill. Every employee is allowed a half hour per week out of the company’s time in which to take a bath, and is required to take it. There is also a free library containing about 700 or 800 volumes for the use of the employees.

The mill works up 10 bales of cotton each day, averaging about 480 to 490 pounds to the bale. In the spinning room a young girl tends eight "sides" of spindles, averaging about 90 spindles to the side, making 720 spindles in the care of one girl. These girls are paid by the side and when they become efficient workers can make $16 to $20 per month, which would be about three-fifths of a cent per spindle per week.

The new law of Rhode Island allows the mills to hire children when they reach ten years of age, provided they can write their name, age, and place of birth legibly, and from the age of ten to fifteen the mills are obliged to allow the children to go to school at least twelve weeks in the year. Under the old law it was forbidden to employ children under twelve years of age.

There is a good school here and children attend school as long as their parents can afford to permit them to do so. There is a Catholic church with a priest, and an Episcopal church with a minister, in the village. There is also a public hall capable of accommodating two hundred and fifty persons. There are bar rooms accessible, which are frequented evening and Sundays by some of the operatives, but the mill company shows no "quarter" to those that get drunk. Everyone is obliged to be sober and ready for work, and no excuses are taken on the ground of sickness caused by drinking.

In reply to questions asked by Mr. Pugh as to how much the manufacturers were helped by a protective tariff, Mr. Sparhawk said that a mill, run as his was, could, he thought, compete with English manufacturers, but there were mills doing the same character of work that could not compete. "We have brought our machinery and work to great perfection," he said, "and I think we are pretty well able to compete with English manufacturers. I don’t know what, if free trade were established, some other considerations might enter into the question, but, as things are, with the perfection of our machinery I think we could compete pretty well."

This mill employs a great proportion of young people, and dividing the amount of the monthly pay-roll ($15,702.84) by the number of persons employed (500) the average amount paid to each would be $30.86 per month.

The committee then visited some of the dwellings of the operatives, among them those of—

A weaver (an Englishman). The household consisted of eight per-
sons, of whom six worked in the mills. Their apartments consisted of six rooms, of which one was a sitting room, one a kitchen, and four were bedrooms (two being down stairs and two in the attic). The rent of these quarters was $5.75 per month of four weeks, making thirteen months to the year. The rooms were ventilated by pipes and registers built for the purpose by the company. The members of the family expressed themselves better pleased with life in America than in England. “Even grandmother would rather be here,” they said. They received more money here than in England and could live better, having more meat and more of the comforts of life. Rents, they said, were cheaper in England, but on the other hand many articles of food were cheaper here. In England the head of the family had made $8 per week working on 3 looms; here he worked on 4 looms and made $10 a week.

A weaver (also an Englishman). The household consisted of six members of the family and three lodgers, the latter “finding” themselves and paying $4 a month each for sleeping accommodations. The rent of the house was $7 a month of four weeks. A parlor organ stood in the sitting room. The head of the family said he had been in this country eleven years and was quite satisfied with it. He had worked at the same business in England, but could not save anything out of his wages, which were 2½s. a week. Here he was making $10.50 a week—just double. The working hours here were about ten and one-half per day; when he left England they were ten per day, though he believed they had since reduced the working hours in England to fifty-six per week. He thought the English operatives here were more contented than they had been in England; they seemed to take more pleasure in life. Upon being asked whether he thought all operatives would be satisfied if they were treated as well as the operatives of this village, he said he didn't suppose that all employers were alike, but he spoke only from his own experience; he was better satisfied with his condition here than he had been with his condition in England. His health was better here. He had come from Ashton-under-Lyne.

The price of board in this village, the committee were informed, was about $1.13 per month for women and $1.60 to $1.80 per month for men, the month being of four weeks.

From Ashton the committee drove to Albion, R. I., another factory village, and visited the mills of the Albion Company (Messrs. James H. and Jonathan Chace).

The working hours at these mills are from 6.30 a.m. to 6.45 p.m., with three-quarters of an hour for dinner at noon. About one-half the operatives are French Canadians.

The pay of the operatives averages as follows: Men, $1.59 per day; - women, $1.17 per day; children (aged from twelve to fifteen), 90 cents per day. There are one hundred men, one hundred and forty women, and ninety children employed. The prices charged for board are, for men, $3.50 per week; for women, $3 per week.

There is a school in the village; also a church and a reading-room, furnished with the leading daily and weekly papers. There was until lately a rum-shop in the village, but the proprietors of the mills bought out the rum-seller and closed the place up.

The committee next drove to Lonsdale, and visited the library and reading-room of the Lonsdale Company's mills. The library has some 3,000 volumes, and such periodicals as Harpers' Young People, The Youths' Companion, The London Graphic, and the leading New York, Boston, and Providence dailies. Over head is a pretty hall, capable of accommodating one thousand four hundred persons.

43-0-3 (5 LAW)
On September 7, 1883, the committee visited the silk mills of Cheney Brothers, at South Manchester, Conn. The mills employ twelve hundred persons at this place. The manufacture of silk has been carried on in these mills for forty years. The land forming the settlement covers some 600 acres, upon which there are three hundred houses. The rent of operatives’ homes range from $5 to $10 per month. The number of working hours per week is sixty. The mills run out about 1,200 pounds of silk thread per day, using about 2,000 pounds of cocoons per day.

The wages paid are as follows: For a certain class of men weavers, $2.25 per day; a simpler class, $1.25 to $2 per day; women, $1 to $1.50. Wages of spinners: boys and girls (of high grade) about $5 to $6 per week. None of the children make less than $3 per week.

Three-fourths, perhaps more, of the operatives are of foreign birth, more being of Irish than of any other nationality. Besides these there are English, Scotch, Germans, and Swedes; not many Frenchmen. The Messers. Cheney said they had tried to get Frenchmen, but Frenchmen were not contented in America.

In reply to questions, the Messrs. Cheney said they believed that taking everything into account the best and most intelligent help was the most profitable to the employers. Their best help had grown up with them. Many of the present operatives are descendants in the third generation from operatives that formerly worked in the mills.

The library in this village contains some eight hundred volumes for the use of the operatives and a reading room containing leading newspapers and a hall which will accommodate twelve hundred persons.

In conversation with the Messrs. Cheney they expressed the conviction that, starting with the cocoon, the American silk is as good as any in the world; but the Americans do not know how to “reel.” The same cocoon could be taken and made worth $2 per pound or $12 per pound, depending on the skill in reeling; but there is no reeling done in this country. We cannot compete with China, Japan, or Italy in the matter of reeling. In China men will work for 4 cents per day and in Italy for 2 francs; so that from the mere point of price it would be impossible for Americans to compete with Chinese and Italian labor.

In reply to a question as to how long it would take an intelligent person to learn to become sufficiently skilled to earn $2 a day, one of the Messrs. Cheney said, “As long as it would take a girl to learn to play a piano,” that it differed with the individual. A man might make a fairly good weaver in six months, and a smart man ought to make a first-rate weaver in a couple of years. In reply to another question as to whether three years’ training would enable the majority of the people who were learning the trade to earn $2 a day, he said that as to men it probably would, but that very few women got up to $2 a day, because they did not have the physical capacity to do as much work as men; it was not a question of intellectual, but of physical ability. So far as manual dexterity went, the women got along as well as the men; in fact, their fingers were more supple. But men and women here, he said, all worked by the piece, and were all paid exactly the same price per yard or per pound; and the failure of the women to earn as much as the men was solely because of their inability to do as many yards or pounds of work. Women looked forward to marriage for their future, and so did not give their minds to the work with the same intensity of application as men did; and a point of some difficulty was, considering the physical power of achievement of women, to so adjust the scale of wages as that while giving women enough, the men did not get too much.

The value of the silk goods used in this country each year was stated
by the Messrs. Cheney to be about $100,000,000. Of this, about two-thirds is imported and one-third manufactured in America (about $35,000,000 worth). Of the latter amount, the Cheney mills manufactured about one-fifteenth part, or about $2,500,000 worth.

As to overproduction, while the Messrs. Cheney said they sometimes suffered from that cause, yet their mills had never shut down or come to a full stop. They had occasionally run on half time. They had never had a strike of any considerable moment. None of their people belonged to trade unions.

They sell land to operatives, and it is part of their policy to interest the operatives as far as possible in that way, in order to induce them to become land owners. They thought that of their operatives about two-thirds of the heads of families owned their own homes.

There are no stores connected with the works; the Messrs. Cheney did not believe in owning stores. Excellent flour is said to be worth from $8 to $9 per barrel here. The company sell coal to operatives when they wish it, but do not, as a rule, "lay out" to supply it.
APPENDIX A.
[From the Journal of the American Agricultural Association, Nos. 3 and 4, 1881.]

THE RAILROAD AND THE FARMER.
By EDWARD ATKINSON, Boston, Mass.

The close relation existing between these two great factors in society can be made evident in the most striking manner only by an appeal to the eye.

Since the end of the civil war in this country our railway mileage has increased from 34,000 to 94,000 miles. The figures in the following diagram show the miles of railroad in operation on the 1st January in each year, and the black lines show the proportionate increase. Railroad begets railroad, and where we had one mile before slavery ended we now have three.

Miles of railroad in operation on the 1st January in each year and the miles added in the year ensuing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Miles in Operation</th>
<th>Miles Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>33,908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>35,085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>36,801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>38,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>41,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>46,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>52,514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>60,293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>66,171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>70,278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>72,838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>74,696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>76,808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>79,089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>81,775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>86,497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The construction of 1831 will probably exceed that of any preceding year.

During the same period the grain crops of the country have increased in the proportions pictured in the next diagram, the figures on the left showing the number of bushels of maize, wheat, oats, rye, barley, and buckwheat produced in each year. It will be observed that the curve of the increase of crops follows substantially the curve of the increase of railway mileage, proving the mutual relation of each to the other.

**Grain crops of the United States.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bushels</th>
<th>Maize, wheat, rye, oats, barley, buckwheat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1,127,400,187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>1,243,627,883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1,239,726,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1,450,736,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1,491,415,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1,629,627,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1,528,778,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1,664,331,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>1,533,588,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>1,455,180,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>2,622,223,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1,982,821,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>2,178,834,646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>2,392,254,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>2,434,884,141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>2,448,478,161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authority: Department of Agriculture, United States.

The *production* or leading forth of the fruits of the earth consists of three inter-dependent movements; first, stirring the soil, planting the seed, and reaping the harvest—carried on by the engines known as plows, planters, reapers, and the like; second, the movement of the grain, and its subdivision by means of the stationary engines known as elevators and flour mills; third, the movement of the food by means of the locomotive engine or the steamship to the point nearest its place of final conversion or consumption.

Each part of the work depends absolutely upon the other, and the common condition of success is in ratio to the removal of obstructions to all these movements. The farmer is free to plant and free to reap; the miller is free to grind and free to sell his service; the owner of the elevator is free to use the *vertical* railway on which he transfers the grain from the farmer’s wagon or from the canal-boat to the bin that is to hold it for a time; but the manager of the *horizontal* railway may not move his locomotive engine without being threatened with the obstruction of meddlesome statutes imposed by Congresses and legislatures in which there may not be a single man who could himself conduct with success the complex work even of a hundred miles of railway.

The world—especially the legislative world—is slow to perceive that
all interests are harmonious. If the wheat-grower does not prosper, no grist will come to the mill; if the miller does not obtain an adequate toll, the traffic of the railway will cease; if the dealer cannot obtain his profit, neither the bags of grain or the barrels of flour will be moved from the station where they have been discharged; if the consumer, perhaps in some far distant land, can obtain his food with less labor than he must exert to obtain the means of purchase with which to buy the grain, the whole movement will cease.

Like some of the new processes in grinding, by which the attrition of the particles of grain upon each other works the best results, so in the distribution, the attrition of each apparently conflicting interest with the other defines the service that each has rendered, and thus all are saved from the arduous drudgery that still retards human progress in the places that the beneficent service of commerce does not reach.

Commerce, or the exchange of services among men, promotes abundance; if obstructions are placed in the way, it matters not where, all alike suffer. The railroad removes the obstructions of time and distance. Statutes have been required to enable men to combine for their construction; in order that the utmost freedom should be given, even general acts have been passed. It is now proposed to reverse the acts that have enabled railroads to be built, and by other statutes to obstruct their use.

If we desire to know what class has reaped the greatest benefit in this free and vast progress of our railroad system another appeal may be made to the eye.

Chicago being the great market of the world for grain and meat, what has been the cost of moving these staples to the principal port of export, New York? The following tables give the increase of tonnage and the decrease in the charge upon one of the great lines that unite the two cities.

This line has been selected for the purpose of comparison, because it has not only performed the greatest service to the community, but also because it has been very profitable to its owners. Its traffic also consists mainly of products of agriculture and general merchandise, and very little of coal.

The Lake Shore and New York Central Line has also been taken as an example, because the line has remained substantially the same from 1869 to 1880, while other lines have greatly extended their mileage. The same rule may, however, be established if the same comparison be made of the traffic of the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Erie, or the Baltimore and Ohio lines. The same relative reductions may also be proved from the accounts of all the great lines in the West, if the comparison be made on the main sections between principal points that were in operation at the two respective dates.

Between 1869 and 1879 the traffic of the Boston and Albany Railroad increased 105 per cent., the charge per ton decreased 54½ per cent., and the earnings decreased 7 per cent.

Between 1872, the year before the panic, and 1879, the traffic of the Pennsylvania Railroad increased 80 per cent., the charge per ton decreased 43 per cent., and the earnings increased less than 3 per cent.

The graphical tables showing these reductions are not repeated, because one example will suffice.
## Lake Shore and Michigan Southern.

### Actual Tons Moved.

| Year | Miles | Tons moved | Increase of tons moved, measured by ratio of time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>2,978,725</td>
<td>Consolidated in this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>3,754,525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,463,092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>5,173,641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>5,221,287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>5,022,490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>5,635,167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>5,513,398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>7,548,445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>7,548,294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tons Moved One Mile.

| Year | Tons moved one mile | Increase of traffic, tons per mile.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>574,935,571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>733,670,696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>924,340,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1,653,297,169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>950,342,041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>943,328,161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1,128,224,826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1,600,905,561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1,360,467,836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1,733,423,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Charge per Ton per Mile.

[Average upon all classes of merchandise.]

| Year | Freight-receipts | Charge | Decrease of charge per mile | Comparison of results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>9,748,136</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>10,341,218</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>12,524,822</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>14,192,399</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>11,918,350</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>9,590,032</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>9,405,629</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>Traffic increased 223 per cent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>9,476,608</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>Decrease charge per ton 57½ per cent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>10,048,952</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Earnings increased 22½ per cent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>11,200,261</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


 ACTUAL TONS MOVED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>3,100,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>4,155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>4,152,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>4,153,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>5,022,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>6,114,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>6,001,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>6,002,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>6,437,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>8,175,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>9,441,213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 TONS MOVED ONE MILE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>589,385,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>783,987,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>588,287,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1,020,988,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1,345,658,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1,291,569,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1,404,088,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1,674,447,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1,619,948,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>2,042,755,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>2,393,827,387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 CHARGE PER TON PER MILE.

[Average on all classes of merchandise.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Decrease of charge</th>
<th>Comparison of results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>14,066,568</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>14,489,217</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>14,647,580</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>15,250,647</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>19,618,618</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>20,345,725</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>17,988,707</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>17,452,285</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>16,424,317</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>19,045,590</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>18,970,250</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That this great line offers no exception to the general rule will also be apparent from the following tables:

_Tons moved upon all the railroads in the State of New York._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>29,572,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>22,739,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>27,427,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>34,258,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>33,555,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>32,468,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>34,163,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>34,464,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>38,320,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>47,300,174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled by G. R. Blanchard.

_Receipts, expenses, and profits of all the railroads in the State of New York in cents per ton per mile._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Profits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1.7016</td>
<td>1.1471</td>
<td>.5545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1.7065</td>
<td>1.1459</td>
<td>.5555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1.6640</td>
<td>1.1499</td>
<td>.5155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
<td>1.0894</td>
<td>.5135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1.4480</td>
<td>.9730</td>
<td>.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1.3029</td>
<td>.9587</td>
<td>.3452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1.1604</td>
<td>.8561</td>
<td>.3043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1.0590</td>
<td>.7749</td>
<td>.2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>.9094</td>
<td>.6900</td>
<td>.2094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>.8082</td>
<td>.5847</td>
<td>.2285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled by G. R. Blanchard.

It will be observed that the rates of charge pictured in these tables cover all classes of merchandise, and that the charge on grain and meat is, customarily, from one-half to two-thirds the average rate on all the traffic; the less rate being possible owing to the great distances over which these staples are carried.

When we compare the steady reduction that has followed the consolidation of the great lines of railway between east and west (which are but examples of a rule that has affected every great line in the United States) with the prices of the great staples moved upon them, in the markets of Chicago or New York, we shall see that the benefit of very great reduction in the rate charged has been secured by both producers and consumers of the products moved—largely by producers—the reduction in the prices of leading staples being much less than the reduction in the cost of transportation.

By the kindness of Mr. Joseph Nimmo, jr., of the Bureau of Statistics, Mr. E. H. Walker, of the New York Produce Exchange, and Messrs.
Mauger and Avery, wool merchants, I have been enabled to compile a list of the prices of staple farm products in the market of New York City, from which I have deduced the tables given hereafter.

At the average price of the year, it appears that in the year 1869 20 barrels of extra State flour, 10 barrels each of mess beef and pork, 100 bushels each of Milwaukee Club wheat, western mixed corn and oats, 100 pounds each of State dairy butter, lard, and medium-washed clothing wool, nine articles in all, could be purchased in New York City for the sum of $845.58 in currency. The average value of the paper dollar in 1869 was 74.8 cents. The above sum is therefore equal in gold to $632.68.

In 1880 the same quantities of the same articles could be bought for $631.32 in gold, a variation and reduction of less than $2 on the whole.

When we compare the vast changes in all other matters affecting the exchange of products, the stability in the gold value of farm products will be brought into sharp contrast.

Between the 1st of January, 1868, and the 31st of December, 1880, the following changes occurred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The railroad mileage increased from 39,250 to 94,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grain crops increased from 1,450,729,000 bushels in 1868, marketed in 1868-69, to 2,448,079,181 bushels in 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prices of the above-named staples decreased in currency between 1869 and 1880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In gold the prices were practically the same.

I am unable to make comparisons between the railroad traffic of 1869 and 1880, because the detailed accounts of the latter year are not yet available. I believe the accounts of the railroads show a very small increase in the cost and charge per mile as compared with 1879, but the prices of products moved increased also.

By a comparison of the traffic of 1870 and 1879, as given in the preceding tables, of the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern, and 1869 and 1879 on the New York Central and the Hudson River Railroads, it appears that——

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The actual tons moved on these two sections of the consolidated line between Chicago and New York increased on the average of the two lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tons moved one mile increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The earnings from freight increased only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The charge per ton per mile decreased on the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And on the New York Central</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same changes have occurred in substantially the same degree upon the Pennsylvania Central, Baltimore and Ohio, Chicago, Burlington and Quincy railroads, and all others that constitute the alleged monopolies. On the other hand, all the short lines, and all the disjecta membra of lines that ought to be consolidated and are not, show far less reduction in the charge for their service and little or no profit to the corporations that own them, where their profits depend in any degree on a share of the freight brought from long distances.

Let us now compare statistically and graphically the changes in the prices of leading farm products and the decrease in the cost of moving them. We can then gauge the effect of each change upon our foreign export. It must be remembered that the average price of each product named in this table, except wool, is established at what our excess will bring for export.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yearly average prices at New York.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Yearly average of gold          | 132.22 | 148.36 | 204.06 | 157.73 | 141.55 | 136.62 |
| Wheat, Milwaukee club           | 1.2014 | 1.5341 | 1.9714 | 1.6961 | 2.0714 | 2.4114 |
| Corn, western mixed             | 0.637  | 0.7114 | 1.5161 | 1.1954 | 0.9146 | 1.0414 |
| Oats, per bushel                | 8.3414 | 8.7714 | 9.2161 | 7.4414 | 5.5414 | 7.7514 |
| Pork, per barrel, meat          | 12.2811 | 13.3414 | 23.1814 | 29.2114 | 29.6414 | 22.1314 |
| Lard, per pound, meat           | 0.7841 | 1.0514 | 1.7714 | 2.1714 | 1.7114 | 1.2914 |
| Butter, per pound, state dairy  | 12.5911 | 11.7914 | 17.5814 | 12.3914 | 16.3114 | 17.1314 |

| Yearly average of gold          | 132.94 | 132.70 | 114.92 | 111.90 | 112.47 | 114.05 |
| Flour, extra state              | 8.1141 | 6.7714 | 5.5514 | 6.6214 | 7.6514 | 6.9014 |
| Wheat, Milwaukee club           | 2.1414 | 1.5114 | 1.2914 | 1.5114 | 1.5614 | 1.5914 |
| Corn, western mixed             | 1.1914 | 1.0514 | 0.9214 | 0.7614 | 0.8714 | 0.8414 |
| Oats, per bushel                | 8.3214 | 7.7714 | 5.5414 | 6.6014 | 4.9614 | 4.5914 |
| Lard, per pound                 | 0.1841 | 0.1814 | 0.1714 | 0.1014 | 0.6914 | 0.6414 |
| Butter, state dairy             | 0.4414 | 0.4114 | 0.3414 | 0.3014 | 0.2714 | 0.3314 |

| Yearly average of gold          | 111.24 | 114.90 | 111.65 | 184.80 | 100.90 | 100.10 |
| Flour, extra state              | 5.9914 | 5.3714 | 5.1814 | 6.2414 | 4.4914 | 4.5014 |
| Wheat, Milwaukee spring         | 1.8514 | 1.2214 | 1.2114 | 1.6614 | 1.4614 | 1.2414 |
| Corn, western mixed             | 0.5914 | 0.6214 | 0.6614 | 0.5914 | 0.4914 | 0.4814 |
| Oats, per bushel, western mixed | 0.5314 | 0.4114 | 0.4214 | 0.2314 | 0.3714 | 0.4214 |
| Lard, per pound                 | 1.1014 | 1.1314 | 1.1114 | 0.6914 | 0.6714 | 0.9714 |
| Butter, per pound, state dairy  | 0.2114 | 0.2414 | 0.2514 | 0.2214 | 0.1514 | 0.2214 |

The prices given are during the suspension of specie payments, currency prices.

E. H. WALKER,
Statistician of the New York Produce Exchange.

New York, February 26, 1881.

Average of January, April, July, and October prices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDIUM WASHED CLOTHING WOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1869…………………………………………………………...… 43
1876…………………………………………………………...… 46
1877…………………………………………………………...… 55
1878…………………………………………………………...… 70
1879…………………………………………………………...… 55
1880…………………………………………………………...… 55

[Magner & Avery's Report.]
Cost of 20 barrels of flour, 10 beef, 10 pork, 100 bushels wheat, 100 corn, 100 oats, 100 pounds butter, 100 lard, and 100 fleeces wool, in New York City, at the average of each year, compiled by months, in currency and gold; compared graphically with the decrease in the charge per ton per mile on the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, during the same period.

(Graphically represented.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost in currency.</th>
<th>Cost in gold.</th>
<th>Decrease in the charge per ton per mile, New York Central and Hudson River Railroad (in currency).</th>
<th>Decrease in the charge per ton per mile, New York Central and Hudson River Railroad (in gold).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>$845 58</td>
<td>$822 68</td>
<td>2.38 cts.</td>
<td>1.78 cts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>891 88</td>
<td>776 02</td>
<td>1.88 &quot;</td>
<td>1.64 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>821 60</td>
<td>735 33</td>
<td>2.49 &quot;</td>
<td>2.11 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>790 94</td>
<td>675 92</td>
<td>1.59 &quot;</td>
<td>1.41 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>758 68</td>
<td>662 60</td>
<td>1.57 &quot;</td>
<td>1.38 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>831 68</td>
<td>746 54</td>
<td>1.40 &quot;</td>
<td>1.31 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>800 28</td>
<td>696 40</td>
<td>1.37 &quot;</td>
<td>1.11 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>727 40</td>
<td>661 74</td>
<td>1.05 &quot;</td>
<td>0.94 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>786 29</td>
<td>731 95</td>
<td>1.02 &quot;</td>
<td>0.97 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>575 41</td>
<td>569 81</td>
<td>0.93 &quot;</td>
<td>0.92 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>588 54</td>
<td>568 84</td>
<td>0.79 &quot;</td>
<td>0.70 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>631 92</td>
<td>631 92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above quantities of produce weigh within a fraction of 13 tons of 2,000 pounds each.
The New York Central and Hudson River Railroad being the principal target at which all charges of alleged monopoly have been aimed, and it also being in possession of the most level grade between Chicago and the seaboard, let us now make a comparison based upon its charges in 1861 and 1879 respectively, but we will apply their rate to the whole distance from Chicago to Boston, a distance substantially of 1,000 miles.

It will be observed that the through line consisting this thousand miles consists of the Lake Shore, New York Central, and Boston and Albany Railroads. The actual charge on the Lake Shore was lower than on the Central; but on the Boston and Albany it was higher, because the grades are heavier. The New York Central rate is a fair average of the three parts of this line.

Assuming the through rate at the average charge on the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, the cost of moving 13 tons of merchandise from Chicago to Boston, 1,000 miles, would have been—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the year 1869</th>
<th>$300.40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the year 1879</td>
<td>102.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming grain and meat at three-fifths the average rate on all merchandise, which is a fair approximation, the rates would have been—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the year 1869</th>
<th>$135.64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the year 1879</td>
<td>61.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the year 1880 we exported 8,400,000 tons of grain and a little over 1,000,000 tons of meat and dairy products. Deducting the grain of California and Oregon, the flour of Virginia exported to Brazil, and the dairy product of the East, there remained not less than 8,000,000 tons of grain and meat gathered from the prairies of Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Texas, Illinois, and Indiana. This produce centered chiefly in Chicago, and the average haul to the seaboard must have exceeded 1,300 miles—as the distance from Chicago to New York is 950; to Boston 1,000 miles.

The reduction in the railway charge, computed in gold, that has been made since the panic of 1873—that is to say, since January 1, 1874—as compared to the average charge from January 1, 1866, to January 1, 1874, has been more than half a cent a ton a mile; as compared to the four years, January 1, 1866, to January 1, 1870, inclusive, the reduction in gold has been fully one cent a ton a mile.

Half a cent a ton per mile on 8,000,000 tons moved 1,300 miles measures a saving of $52,000,000.

One cent a ton per mile on 8,000,000 tons moved 1,300 miles measures a saving of $104,000,000.

The declared value of the grain, meat, and dairy products exported in 1880 for the calendar year was $389,000,000.

The saving in railway service at half a cent a ton constituted 13.36 of the total value; at one cent a ton per mile it constituted 26.72 per cent. of the total value.

In considering these changes, it must be constantly borne in mind that they have been made chiefly by the strongest and most profitable lines of railroad in the United States—the New York Central, Lake
Shore, Michigan Southern and Central, Pennsylvania, Baltimore and Ohio, Illinois Central, Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, and others of similar kind.

It may also be remembered that a considerable part of the reduction in cost has been made possible by the substitution of steel for iron rails, notwithstanding the fact that this substitution began when steel rails cost about three times as much as they now do; was continued for a long period at twice the present cost; and the cost of steel rails in this country, or rather we should say the price of steel rails to such railroad corporations as do not make them in furnaces in which they are themselves interested, is now one hundred per cent. higher in this country than it is in Great Britain.

It may therefore be inferred that although there may be some temporary upward variations in the charge for railway service, for instance, in winters when the roads are much obstructed by snow or are injured by frosts, the general tendency will be to steady reduction. This reduction may hereafter be small and slow on the consolidated lines east of Chicago, but must be rapid and large on many of the Western lines.

On southern and southwestern traffic, a reduction of at least one-half is sure to be compassed within the next decade. These future reductions will be promoted, not only by the lower cost of operating, but also of building and extending railroads.

The double cost of steel rails in this country as compared to Great Britain may be considered in connection with the statement of the probable surplus revenue of the United States that may be applied to the reduction of the national taxes, if the Congress now elected shall turn its attention from the dead issues of the past to the great fiscal questions of the future that are now pressing for consideration.

The total weight of our grain crops in the year 1880 was 70,000,000 tons. How much have the people of the United States been saved by the service of the railroads in the cost of moving their own supply of food?

If we begin our computations in the year 1866, being the year after the war ended and the reduction of debt began, and estimate the sum saved in each year on all the merchandise moved by railroads in the United States, the saving will presently be proved to amount to a sum more than equal to the sum that has been paid upon the national debt. In other words, if we were to apply the rate paid for the movement of merchandise from 1866 to 1889, inclusive, reduced to gold, to the quantities moved in each year from 1866 to 1880, inclusive, and then deducted the amount that has been actually paid from the aggregate of that estimate, the difference amounts to more than $1,100,000,000; how much more than this sum will presently appear; the facts are so startling to be stated fully without proofs preceding them that will prevent their being doubted by the most incredulous.

The details of the traffic of other railroads are not yet available to prove this estimate, but soon will be, when Poor's Manual of 1881 is published; but that the rule of increase of traffic and decrease of charge has been constant upon the lines centering in Chicago, as well upon those connecting Chicago with the sea, will be proved by the fact that, comparing the year 1868 on the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne and Chicago, 1869 on the Illinois Central, Chicago, Milwaukee and Saint Paul, and Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, and 1870 on the Chicago and Northwestern, the tons moved increased from 7,708,106 to 17,515,891 in 1879, and the average charge per ton per mile decreased 47 per cent.

One proposition will now be absolutely sustained, to wit: That the
excess of cotton which has marked the increased inefficiency of free labor, added to whatever sum has been saved in the increased efficiency of the railroads, far more than equals the reduction of debt since the war ended.

It therefore follows that no man in all this broad land has been obliged to work harder in order that the debt might be paid, but the reduction has been compassed by free labor and free railroads.

The price of cotton has declined, but the value of each year’s crop has increased; and while the gold value of Western farm products has hardly altered, the crops have doubled.

It cannot be too often repeated that the railway and the steamship have eliminated distance. The Western farm and the Eastern workship, the Southern plantation and the Northern factory have been brought near each other, and in the process the very lines of railroad that have been most profitable to their owners are the specific lines that have performed the largest service at the least cost to those who use them. One day’s wages of a common mechanic in Massachusetts will pay the cost of moving his year’s substance of bread and meat 1,000 miles, from Chicago to Boston.

When we consider this, we may realize that Cornelius Vanderbilt and his associates, who led the way in the consolidation of the railway service, and thus rendered low costs possible, were the great communists of the day. They brought about community of subsistence and carried abundance to the door of the common laborer. For every cent they earned in the railway traffic and added to their great fortunes, the people have saved a dollar’s worth of labor in the work of earning their subsistence by the reduction of the charges that steadily accompanied the increase of the traffic upon the railroads.

It matters little whether their motive was that of pure selfishness or enlightened self-interest, the result is the same. All commerce is an exchange of services, and it may often happen that he who makes the greatest fortune works the greatest benefit to the community, whether he knows it or not; and to this rule the great railroad corporations, even if they have no souls, form no exception. The principal and most profitable among them now do the largest amount of work for the community at the lowest cost of any that are in operation, and there is no other great element in the cost of subsistence of the whole people that has been so much cheapened in the last ten or twenty years, as the cost of railway service.

May we not, therefore, dread the attempt of State legislatures, and of Congress, to alter these conditions by meddlesome statutes, and to prescribe rules for the conduct of this vast and varied service! If either body were to attempt to regulate the production of the farm by statute, who would be more quick to resent the interference than the farmers themselves! But the farmers derive their titles to their lands from the same source that the railway owner holds the title to its track. They are no more producers than the common carriers are; they move the soil with their machines; they move the seed; they move the crop on their wagons to the mill and to the market. All that the railroad does is to keep the product moving. One is as much under the supervision of law as the other, but if the work of either could be regulated by statute with success, it would be the simple work of the farmer and not the complex work of the railroad.

Again, who would be more ready to resent any attempt to control the rate of wages or earnings by statute than the great body of consumers to whom the railroad carries its beneficent service! - Yet this, again,
would need but a page where the prescriptions for the earnings or wages of the railway would need a whole code of laws.

Service for service is the rule of all exchange, and it is the competition of product with product in all the great markets that absolutely controls the traffic on every line of rail, and in the long run compels its managers to do the most work for the least charge. The price of wheat in Odessa controls the policy of the New York Central Railroad.

On the other hand, the cost of railway service is not alike between any two points in the country; it differs with the grades, with the distance from fuel, with the appliances for loading and unloading the cars, and with the length of the haul.

It may be said that with all the ability that has yet been given to the problem, no rule has yet been devised by which the special cost of any particular service can be ascertained with accuracy, and the only approach to a rule yet known is based on a crude computation of averages; and it has been well said that the railway service requires a legislature of experts in constant session to save it from ruin.

In his Railroad Manual of 1880, Mr. Henry V. Poor contrasts the average charge per ton per mile on several of the great through routes between the East and West, constituting the very lines against which the charge of monopoly is most frequently raised.

He gives the tons moved on thirteen principal lines and the receipts from freight. While the traffic increased 41\% per cent, the earnings increased only 3.84 per cent. The average rate per ton per mile in 1873, on all merchandise, was 1.77 cents; in 1879 only 1.02 cents.

He then goes on to say:

"The freight earnings given in the above table were in 1873 about one-third of those of all the railroads in the United States, and in 1879 about one-fourth. Had the rates of 1873 been maintained in 1879, the receipts for the latter year, instead of being $1,16,311,452, would have reached on the roads named the sum of $2,230,618,838, and for the United States, $922,475,352. The difference between the amount actually received and that given above shows what has been gained by the public in the operations of our railroads alone. In no other branch of commerce can anything like this saving be shown. It is the result of intelligence, skill, and ingenuity, left free to work out the best possible results, unhampered by other legislation than that of their own officers composing a legislature in constant session."

This reduction in the cost of and in the charge for the service of railroads is more than equal to the reduction of the public debt in the same period, from 1873 to 1879, yet the more it has been accomplished the louder has been the clamor for legislative interference and the greater has been the misrepresentation of the true facts. Land-owners whose possessions would have remained a wilderness, farmers who could have found no market for their produce, miners who could not have smelted their ores, unite in their endeavor to cripple and retard the progress of those who have conferred the greatest benefit upon them, and in this attempt are aided by counsel whose statements of facts and estimates in figures have as little basis in reality as the policy they sustain has in sound reason.*

It cannot be denied that this vast change in the railway traffic has been accompanied with some hardships. There have been periods when a railroad war has occurred and the charge between far distant points

* See the exposure by Albert Fink of the misstatements made by Judge J. S. Black (N. Y. World, February 29, 1881, and in later numbers of the same paper).
has been reduced to less than cost. At such times the charge between intermediate points, not being reduced in the same proportion, has seemed unduly high, and many places have suffered from what appeared to be an unjust discrimination; but the real fault may have been that the rate on the long traffic has been too low and not that the rate on the short traffic has been too high.

Again, the terminal charges constitute a much greater part of the cost than any one who has not carefully examined the subject would believe; they therefore constitute a very large element in the cost of a short haul on small quantities, and may be a very small element in a long haul of very large quantities.

Again, it is impossible that such a service should have been organized in so short a time without inequalities for which time only could disclose a cure.

When we think of this vast service in the concrete the mind almost refuses to receive the impression, and the magnitude of the transactions and of the quantities moved renders the comprehension of the simple elements of the problem exceedingly difficult. The subject must be presented in its two-fold aspect—in terms of least and greatest. The daily ration of solid food of an adult consists of about two and a half to three pounds of meat, bread, vegetables, sugar, butter, &c.—let us call it three pounds, or one pound each for breakfast, dinner, and supper.

The great crops of grain now produced in this country weigh seventy million tons; the hay crop, which is but a synonym for meat, butter and cheese, adds thirty million more; to these must be added the root crops, the weight of sugar, tea, coffee and other articles of food; in all, not less than one hundred and fifty million tons of food must be consumed by this nation or exchanged for the foreign products that we need. This huge volume is but one year's supply, to be moved not only once, but twice, thrice, and more; it must all be converted and reconverted, sorted, divided and exchanged. Three hundred thousand million food pounds to be converted, condensed, and finally sorted into as many parcels of three pounds each as there are people, in order that each may have a breakfast, a dinner and a supper.

How is this movement compassed? By cart and wagon; by railroad, lake or canal; again by wagon or by hand; if the movement be analyzed the most costly part is the last or final distribution. If the wheat be traced throughout its course the heaviest single charge upon it will be found to be the cost of distributing the loaves of bread that come from the baker's oven; the lightest, the charge for moving the barrel of flour a thousand miles from Chicago to the seaboard.

Ten barrels of flour constitute a ton weight—the railways earn a dividend when moving this quantity a thousand miles at $5 to $7 a ton, or half a cent to seven-tenths of a cent a ton a mile—1,000 miles at only 50 cents a barrel. What does it cost to move the barrel from the railway to the warehouse—from the warehouse to the baker's oven! How far will half a dollar or seventy cents go in paying the cost of moving and distributing the 100 to 300 loaves of bread that are usually made from that barrel?

Any attempt to control the rates that may be charged upon a railroad by statute is but an indirect attempt to regulate prices by law. Such undertakings have always failed. If legislators desire to test their ability, let them undertake to regulate the traffic in loaves of bread, and see how much they can cheapen the cost of running bakers' carts and carrying on grocers' shops. Every sumptuary law has failed;

44—C 3—(5 LAW)
scarcity has ensued from every attempt to regulate prices by law in all
lands and at all times; and even where statutes regulating the price of
railway traffic have been enacted in this country, they have either been
disregarded or repealed as soon as the attempt to enforce them has
proved their mischievous effect.

The traffic over the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad,
mostly from Buffalo to New York, amounted in 1880 to over ten mil-
ion tons, one-half or two-thirds of which was food. For this part of
the distance between New York and Chicago, the proportion of each
half dollar on each barrel of flour was not over 30 to 35 cents. If a
forced reduction of this charge could be made by law to the extent of
one-half, consumers and producers might gain 15 to 20 cents a barrel,
but the end might be bankruptcy even to that great corporation.
Fifteen to 20 cents is little if any more than the average cost of moving
that barrel from the warehouse of the dealer to the dwellings of his
customers. On such small fractions does the great railway service
now depend. There is another aspect of least and greatest. Nearly
60,000,000 tons of coal are mined and moved every year, and a large
amount of this coal is consumed in the railway locomotives that again
are worked in moving other substances. The present locomotive engine
is almost barbarous in its waste of fuel; not over 3 or 4 per cent. of the
actual units of heat in this fuel are converted into the actual motion of
the train, and the dead weight of the train and engine is three or four
to one of the load carried. Not over one pound in a hundred of coal
consumed on a railroad is actually and absolutely applied to the move-
ment of the load. Yet this power has caused a social revolution in
this country, and is rendering the payment of rent on land devoted to
agriculture in Great Britain almost if not quite impossible, because it
has enabled us to sell grain, meat, and dairy products at such low
prices that they leave little or no margin for rent on land devoted to
their production in any part of the Kingdom of Great Britain and
Ireland.

Having thus presented a part of the argument in favor of free rail-
roads, and stated the result, before we consider the final summary let
us devote a small space to the beneficent power of free labor, cotton as
well as corn constituting one of the great powers of the land.

In the last years that preceded the final struggle by which this nation
at last became truly free, the writers in De Bow's Southern Review
gravely argued that it was the high price and not the low price of cotton
that limited its production; because, for every cent a pound added to
the price of cotton a hundred dollars was added to the price of the
human chattel that raised the crop; hence, whatever the stimulus to
the traffic in slaves this might give, the States or sections that engaged
in the most abhorrent and barbarous practice of supplying this demand
could not adequately meet it. It thus happened from 1858 to 1860,
when the spindles of the North and of Europe were rapidly increasing,
that for every million dollars expended in a new factory, the cotton
States must have earned and expended a million and a half dollars in
stocking with human live stock and starting the new plantation that
was to supply the mill with cotton.

That this could not be done was plain to the far-seeing vision of the
few leaders in secession by whose acts the civil war was promoted, and
under whose malignant control white and black alike were kept in the
bondage of oppression and of ignorance; hence the ill-concealed, and
often openly avowed determination to reopen the slave trade.

It will not be long ere these base purposes will appear to have been
as infamous to the progressive men who now constitute the New South as they did to John Brown when he began the great struggle for freedom in his attack upon Harper's Ferry, and the time may not be far distant when the descendants of the soldiers in the Confederate armies will erect a monument to John Brown as the great liberator of their land from oppression.

The inefficiency of the old system will be apparent from the two following tables.

Feeble attempts have sometimes been made to disprove the evidence of these figures; it has been affirmed that the increase of cotton has been due, not so much to the greater efficiency of labor as to the application of white labor to new fields under new conditions. What better testimony could be borne to prove the utter inefficiency of the old system, which compelled the most intelligent masters to work their slaves with the rudest tools and most unprofitable methods, but forbade white men working at all except under a sense of indignity. It is grandly true that emancipation struck the shackles from the wrists of white as well as black—mind and muscle were set free together.

The most conclusive evidence of progress in the Cotton States is to be found in the immense increase in the number of small farms; but still further evidence is to be found in the fact that the consolidation of Southern railroad lines has begun, by which the cost of transportation between North and South will soon be reduced at least one-half.

When this occurs, the advantage of the manufacturer of New England over his competitor in Old England, which now varies from half to three-quarters of a cent a pound, may be increased, to our great advantage in the export of cotton fabrics.

Crops of cotton of the United States.

FIFTEEN YEARS OF SLAVE LABOR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Bales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1846-7</td>
<td>1,860,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847-8</td>
<td>2,494,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848-9</td>
<td>2,808,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849-0</td>
<td>2,171,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1</td>
<td>2,415,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-2</td>
<td>3,050,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-3</td>
<td>3,352,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-4</td>
<td>3,055,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-5</td>
<td>2,932,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-6</td>
<td>3,045,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-7</td>
<td>3,056,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-8</td>
<td>3,238,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-9</td>
<td>3,994,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859-0</td>
<td>4,829,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-1</td>
<td>3,826,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45,875,591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is doubtless true that a considerable part of the recent crops have been made by white labor; that proves yet more conclusively the redemption of the cotton States from oppression.

FIFTEEN YEARS OF FREE LABOR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Balees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1865-6</td>
<td>2,228,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-7</td>
<td>2,059,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-8</td>
<td>2,459,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868-9</td>
<td>2,459,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869-0</td>
<td>3,154,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-1</td>
<td>4,352,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-2</td>
<td>2,974,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872-3</td>
<td>3,330,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873-4</td>
<td>4,178,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874-5</td>
<td>3,832,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875-6</td>
<td>4,096,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-7</td>
<td>4,485,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877-8</td>
<td>4,611,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-9</td>
<td>5,073,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879-0</td>
<td>5,757,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56,438,335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excess of fifteen free-labor crops

The crops of cotton of 1880–81 will probably reach 6,250,000 bales.

It may now be time to show the relation which the excess of our grain and cotton crops have borne to the reduction of our national debt. It is with the excess of farm products of grain and cotton that we have paid our foreign debt and have reduced the gross debt of the nation.

The maximum debt, liquidated and unliquidated, as computed by the Hon. Hugh McOulloch in his last report as Secretary of the Treasury:

On the 1st August, 1865, amounted to $2,997,363,903
On the 1st March, 1881, it was $1,879,356,412

Decrease in fifteen years and seven months 1,117,429,791

The excess of cotton raised in this period above the quantity raised in the last fifteen years of slavery, 9,762,741 bales, all of which has been exported, has been worth in gold coin over $650,000,000. When this year’s crop is added and sixteen years are compared, the excess of free over slave labor will be nearly 14,000,000 bales, worth in gold coin at least $800,000,000.

The great progress of this nation and its relief from the burden of debt are due to two factors—free labor and free railroads. Add to the first fruits of liberty in the cotton States the sum that has been saved on our grain crop by the reduction of the charge upon our railroads, and the aggregate of the two sums is vastly more than equal to the
amount that we have paid upon our national debt in the period that has elapsed since the surrender of the rebel armies.

Without this reduction in the railway charge the export of grain and meat would have been very limited, and the grain would either have been wasted or it could not have been produced. The relief from the crowded state of the cities that took effect during the war would not have been possible, nor could the disbanded armies have found peace and prosperity on the farms of the Great West.

In the four years after our armies were disbanded, preceding January 1, 1870, to wit, 1866 to 1869, inclusive, the actual tons moved over the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad numbered 10,102,569; the tons moved one mile numbered 1,868,448,779; the freight earnings were $50,556,875 in currency, or, reducing each year's earnings to gold, at the average rate of each year, $36,560,000 in gold.

The average charge per ton per mile for this period was, therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In currency</td>
<td>2.7056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In gold</td>
<td>1.9567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the ten years ensuing, 1870 to 1879, inclusive, the actual tons moved on the same line numbered 60,221,553; the tons moved one mile numbered 14,353,521,585; the freight earnings in currency were $174,594,548; reduced to gold, $159,658,000.

The average charge per ton per mile in this period was, therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In currency</td>
<td>1.2164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In gold</td>
<td>1.1123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reduction in currency has therefore been 1.4294 cents per ton per mile, in gold .8444 cents in the latter period as compared to the former. Applying these rates of reduction to the tons moved one mile in the ten years, 1870 to 1879, inclusive, to wit, 14,353,521,585, we get the following results:

| Reduction in currency | $213,751,350 |
| Reduction in gold     | 121,201,136  |

That is to say, had this line been able to charge the same rate in gold from January 1, 1870, to January 1, 1880, that it did charge from January 1, 1866, to January 1, 1870, its earnings from freight would have been $121,201,136, or 70 per cent more than the actual charge made and collected.

Does any one suppose that this reduction was made from choice? Would not the managers of this line have charged the same rate in each period if they could? This change has been accomplished under the pressure of three separate factors:

First. The competition of railroad with railroad, working in moderate degree.

Second. The competition of all the railroads with all the water-ways of the country, working constantly, and each year more and more effectively.

Third. The competition of product with product in all the great markets of the world—the most potent factor of all the three.

Had not this reduction in the charge for moving our crops been made upon this line, coupled with an equivalent reduction on all the lines between Chicago and the seaboard; had there not been a reduction in substantially the same degree on all the great Western lines centering in Chicago, the crops could not have been moved at all; they could not
even have been made, because the export of the surplus not required for home consumption would have been forbidden.

Had the production of these great crops been promoted and made possible by their further production or leading forth upon the railroad to the use of men, our disbanded armies could not have found homes and work without long delay, but they would have been crowded back upon the cities and towns already occupied by the excess of population that the abnormal demands of war had centered in them.

There is but one more example that needs to be given.

In the single year 1879 the tons moved one mile on the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad numbered 2,956,827,387
Freight earnings numbered $18,270,950
In the four years 1866 to 1869, inclusive, the tons moved one mile numbered 1,868,448,779
Freight earnings in currency numbered $50,566,875
Freight earnings in gold numbered $36,560,000
Cents.
Gold charge per ton per mile in 1866 to 1869, inclusive 1.9667
Gold charge per ton per mile in 1879 .7954
Reduction 1.1613

Had the charge of the first period been made upon the traffic of 1879 the difference would have been $26,650,000 more than the actual amount collected.

The following table gives in a graphical form the facts that mark the changes that have occurred on the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, comparing the average of each year, 1866 to 1869, inclusive, with the single year 1879:

Each year's average from 1866 to 1869, inclusive, compared to 1879.

**NEW YORK CENTRAL AND HUDSON RIVER RAILROAD.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual tons moved</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons moved one mile</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings in gold</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECREASE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charge per ton per mile in gold</td>
<td>59.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual charge on 9,441,213 tons moved in 1879 $18,270,950
Charge as it would have been had the average gold rate of 1866 to 1869, inclusive, been made in 1879 $44,630,250
Difference saved on the traffic of 1879 $26,650,000

In the consideration of this table two facts should be observed:

First. That the increase in the tons per mile moved exceeds the increase of the actual tons moved 117 per cent., from which fact it would appear that the local or State traffic has gained in more than a full proportion from the reduction in the charge per ton per mile.

Second. The prices of the leading products of agriculture named in a
preceding table, at the port of New York, were substantially the same in 1879 as they were if computed in gold in 1869, from which it may be assumed that Western producers have received the full benefit of the reduction upon the through traffic.

All the data for the above computations have been taken from Poor's Railroad Manuals without any knowledge on the part of any person connected with any railroad line of the writer's intention to prepare this statement; some of the tables have been submitted to railroad officials for examination, but the writer has no connection with, and hardly any interest in, any railroad; his sole purpose in the preparation of this paper has been to clear away the rubbish that obscures a most important public question.

The traffic upon the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad in 1880 amounted to over 10,000,000 tons. Mr. H. V. Poor estimates the traffic on all the railroads of the United States in the same year, including coal, at 250,000,000 tons.

The traffic on this line has not increased in any greater degree than it has upon many other main lines to Chicago, or from Chicago to the sea, although it may have increased more than that of other lines in other directions. The reduction on the freight charge has been equaled, or even exceeded, on some other important lines, but is probably greater than the average on all the lines of the country taken together.

The saving on this line only, in the ten years from 1870 to 1879, inclusive, was over one hundred and twenty million dollars in gold coin ($120,000,000).

If the traffic on this line represents a twentieth part of the traffic of all the railroads of the United States, and the charge has been decreased in the same ratio, it proves a saving of $2,400,000,000 in ten years' time.

But there is another more certain method of establishing the ratio of the traffic of this line to all the rest. In the Railroad Manual for 1880 the freight earnings of all the roads of the United States are given for nine years, 1871 to 1879, inclusive, amounting to $3,228,508,877.

The freight receipts of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad during the same nine years were $160,105,322, or substantially one-twentieth of the whole amount.

But this ratio may be contested, and neither time nor space suffice for the necessary proof. It may be alleged that the reduction of charge on this line has exceeded the average.

Let it suffice to prove what cannot be gainsaid, and what will presently be more than proved when the compilation of the traffic of all the great through lines is completed, on which Mr. H. V. Poor is now engaged for his Manual of 1881.

If the reduction on all lines has only been one-half that upon this line—if one-half remains yet to be gained—still the aggregate saved has been $1,200,000,000, or a larger amount in ten years than the aggregate reduction of the national debt in more than fifteen years.

If this be admitted, then the point is well taken that no man has worked harder or longer in order to make this payment; but it has been the result of only a partial solution of one of the problems of distribution.

The function of statute laws in this matter has been that, so far as general laws have rendered the co-operation of labor and capital possible, by means of the organization of corporations competent to do the work, they have been necessary; and it is for that work, in part, that governments exist and that statutes are needed.

So far as attempts have been made to impose special conditions, and by statutes to regulate rates of traffic and to control the executive
work of the railway service, they have either obstructed progress or failed to meet the intention of those who framed them; or else they have become inoperative within a very short time after their enactment.

The forces that rule this country, North and South alike, are the great industrial powers born of agriculture, and promoted by commerce among men and nations. These forces are reconstructing Southern society, and forcing even the most unrepentant Bourbon to obey their behest; while the ship-loads of corn with which we have attacked the privileges of those classes in England, who would have destroyed this nation, have been more potent than any weapons of war that were ever forged.

The writer has treated this subject in another place, but is permitted to present it again, in order to show yet more conclusively the power of the farmer and the railroad when united in the bonds of a common interest. In so doing he must indulge in some repetition. He has no apology to offer for this or any other repetition in presenting this case. It must be considered in every aspect in order to be comprehended.

American competition in grain, meat, and dairy products is making it almost impossible that rent shall continue to be paid on land devoted to agriculture in Great Britain.

From recent investigation it appears that out of 72,117,766 acres comprising the total acreage of Great Britain, exclusive of the metropolis, 15,303,165 acres, or a little more than one-fifth, are divided into 1,593 separate landed estates, and are held by 526 dukes, marquises, earls, viscounts, and barons, constituting the House of Peers. These estates have yielded an annual rate of £12,529,068, over $60,000,000. Even this statement, startling as it appears, is believed by Mr. Arthur Arnold to be an underestimate both of the acreage and of the rental, as the estates of peeresses were not included in this compilation, neither were many estates held in special trusts.

In the further treatment of the question of land-tenure, Mr. Arnold reaches the conclusion that more than four-fifths of the land of Great Britain is in the possession of about 7,000 persons; but in regard to their title he makes a distinction between possession and ownership, in view of the fact that at least 52,000,000 acres of this land are held by those who are only life-tenants under entails or other settlements. Mr. Arnold's words are, "I say, in possession, because the landed gentry in this country are not owners, in the strict and proper sense of the word, of the lands with which their names and titles are connected."

He contests the view commonly held in this country, that the price of land is very high in England, and that the high price is induced by the social distinction that its possession implies; but holds, on the contrary, that the price of land is far below its true value, and that it pays but a low rate of interest, for the reason that its use and product are restricted by the necessary conditions that must be imposed upon the tenant, in order that the system of landlord and tenant may be sustained at all; that, if it could be freely used in the cultivation of a variety of products, the income would be much greater and the price would then advance.

It is difficult for any one in this country to imagine such a condition as is pictured by these figures; four-fifths of the area of a country inhabited by about 33,000,000 people, owned by 7,000 persons, and four-fifths of that portion held only under a life-estate!

Such is the system now approaching its end under the effect of our competition. The longer legislative abuses or obstructions are maintained, the more severe must be the struggle for their removal; yet
when the time comes they must yield, because the further attempt to maintain them means war or anarchy. Witness the condition of Ireland at this very time.

Let the bitter struggle through which England passed in the great contest over the corn-laws be remembered; let it be considered that the power of the House of Lords and of the Established Church is founded mainly on the possession of and the rent of land; further, that the very existence of the present system depends absolutely upon a body of trained tenant farmers, estimated at about 560,000 in number, in Great Britain (there are over 600,000 tenants in Ireland), whose capital has been invested in improvement of these lands; which capital has been, or is now being, destroyed by a series of bad seasons and by our competition; that without these tenant-farmers the possessors of the soil are as powerless to use land as they now are to dispose of it; and then the true meaning of wheat at forty shillings a quarter, and beef at sixpence a pound, will be apparent, if it be true that these prices will continue to be profitable to us, and yet forbid any rent being paid upon land devoted to their production in England.*

It may be as true of the economic as of the spiritual gospel, that it brings not peace, but a sword. It cuts away abuses that in their fall will promote much misery before the righteous conclusion is attained. No return to the protection of agriculture in Great Britain can be considered for a moment; the rent of land is but a tithe of the income of the people, and cheap food is vital to the very existence of the vast majority who are engaged in manufactures, in commerce, and in the mechanic arts. It may well befit us who are well spared the distress which must ensue before this revolution on which Great Britain is now entering is ended, to remember that we are members one of another, bound by the inter-dependence of nations, and that upon the welfare of England our prosperity greatly depends, because she is our principal customer. As the fall of slavery brought misery on both North and South here, so must the fall of privilege work sadness over the sea.

It is this system, with all its good and evil, that is now tottering to its fall. The pleasant country life, of which Washington Irving gave us such charming pictures, and of which we have read so much in English literature, may have to give place, in order that panperism may be abated. The abounding charity of those who enjoyed its benefits could only alleviate this evil; almost a revolution is needed to remove its cause. Rented land must of necessity be cultivated under conditions that will maintain its fertility, whether held under lease or only at will. These conditions can only be applied in any large measure to staple crops or to grazing and dairy farming; they are inconsistent with small farming, unless the landlord himself owns but a small area of land, and gives close personal supervision to the manner of its cultivation by his tenants. Great estates can only be rented on the conditions that are applicable to the great staple crops of grain, or to the products of the dairy and of meat.

The competition in the sale of wheat in Great Britain, on the part of this country, has already caused a reduction in the area of land devoted to wheat, from a little under 4,000,000 acres to a little over 3,000,000, during the last seven years—a reduction of one-fourth. A portion of the whole of this discarded area has been devoted to grazing, but dur-

* Seventy per cent. of the tenant-farmers of England occupy less than 50 acres each; 12 per cent. between 50 and 100; 18 per cent. over 100. Five thousand occupy between 500 and 1,000 acres each; 600 occupy over 1,000 acres each.—Jas. Caird, The Landed Interest.
ing the latter part of this period our competition in meat, butter, and cheese has affected the rent of land used even for these purposes. The English commissioners, Messrs. Pell and Reed, who lately visited this country, concluded that there was more permanent danger of our competition in the production of meat than of the permanent continuance of our export of wheat.

They seem to have come to the conclusion that our railway service had reached its lowest cost, and could not be much more reduced; and that as the virgin soil of the far West became exhausted, we should be unable to export wheat at less than forty-eight shillings a quarter, although they admit that the day is still far distant when this upward limit will be reached.

In the meantime rents are not only being greatly reduced in England, but many of the heavy lands as yet undrained are thrown entirely out of cultivation—the encumbered owners being unable to drain or improve them, and no tenant being able or willing to work them. The Irish land question is but the beginning; the English land question must come next, and cannot long be deferred. It may happen that no delay in the change of the system of land tenure in Great Britain need be made in the expectation that there will not be a continuance of our supply of wheat, and that as our product increases in ratio to our home demand we may not supply wheat in Liverpool even at thirty shillings a quarter, if we can get no more.

For instance, the blue limestone, commonly known as the “blue grass” section of Kentucky, covers 10,000 square miles or 6,400 acres—more than double the present wheat acreage of Great Britain. It appears to have been overlooked by the commissioners, but with a tolerable system of farming it is capable of producing as large a crop of wheat per acre, without manure, as the average of the high farming of England—the rotten limestone containing a very large proportion of phosphates sending up new elements of fertility every year, so that the cost of production is only the cost of cultivation and of harvesting the crop. This section has had only an indirect connection with the seaboard, but will presently have one or more direct lines of communication averaging about 650 miles.

The only reason that a full supply of wheat may not then be profitably sent to England at thirty shillings a quarter will be that hemp, tobacco, horses, mules, and cattle will pay better. There are several other sections of the New South from which nearly or quite as good results may be expected, of which even we at the North as yet know but little.

Lest it seem rash to make positive assertions, let us consider some questions in regard to a small section of the New South, that may even make it necessary for some of our own countrymen to study geography again.

Cannot a square of land, about three-fourths as large as France, be marked off in the center of that portion of the United States, lying east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio, comprising a portion only of the states of Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, North and South Carolina, and Virginia, covering the “blue grass,” the “Piedmont district,” the ranges of the Southern Alleghenies and the Blue Ridge, with the rich upland valleys lying between; all of which section will range from 650 to 6,700 feet above the sea, and be quite free from malaria, unless it be in some of the river bottoms? Is not this section, which is nearly twice the area of Great Britain, equal to Great Britain and France combined, in the variety and quantity of its possible mineral products, and more than equal to either in its possible agricult-
ural products! It contains the purest iron and coal in close proximity; salt, sulphur, copper, lead, zinc, corundum in greatest abundance, and also gold, which could well be spared if tin might take its place. In fact it may well be asked whether this single section of the New South sustains the present agricultural and mining population of the United States in health and comfort, and under much better average climatic conditions than they now enjoy?

Is not this terra [almost] incognita of this country yet inhabited as to about one-half its area, only by a very sparse population, so isolated by the surrounding pall of slavery until recent years as to have depended wholly upon themselves? Are there not even yet numbers of inhabitants in these fertile mountains and valleys clad in homespun, some of whom have never even seen a wheeled vehicle, and greater numbers who have never seen a locomotive engine.

Is not a national survey of this territory called for, in order that the facts as yet observed only by a few may be spread upon the national record so as to turn the tide of emigration, especially of the English, toward a land which may be vastly more congenial to them than the distant prairies of the far West?

Well may the laborers of Europe, born down by the burthen of debts that can never be paid, and that have been mainly incurred in sustaining the vested wrongs that oppress them, have watched the struggle for personal liberty in this land as one in which they also had the greatest stake. The great crops that have been treated in this paper are but the first fruits of that personal liberty—the shadow only of the substance yet to come.

The population of Europe, aside from Russia and Turkey, numbers about 225,000,000. They occupy an area equal to the arable land only of this country, or a little over 1,500,000 square miles. Upon the continent of Europe more than one in every hundred and ten of the population is a soldier in active service. This means that the work of one adult man in every twenty-two is withdrawn from productive service, and he must be sustained at a heavy cost by those who remain at work; of whom again one, and most countries two or more are forced to waste a large part of their time in the reserve, and are subject to be called into active war at a moment’s notice.

What may be the changes that the adverse conditions of Europe and the prosperity of this country may bring into action, few can yet conceive. Of this we may be sure—that the coming century of liberty and commerce will only serve to make the past century of slavery and war more dark than it ever seemed before, as the North and the New South united emerge from the shadow not yet quite dispelled, into the glorious sunlight now flashing in the dawn.

In this again the figures fail to convey the impression, and the graphical method must be adopted. In order to convey the impression, let us omit from the consideration the half civilized nations of Russia and Turkey in Europe, and omit Alaska in the United States.

Austria, Germany, Roumania, Servia, Montenegro, Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, Netherlands, Belgium, Greece, Switzerland, Great Britain, Denmark, Sweden and Norway comprise 1,546,802 square miles. The United States, aside from Alaska, comprise 3,034,399 square miles.

The national debts of the empires and kingdoms of Europe in the above list, according to the latest data as given in "Mulhall’s Progress of the World" amounted to $16,794,500,000.

* Such is the testimony of recent scientific explorers.
The debt of the United States on the 1st of March, 1880, was $1,880,000,000.
The national expenditures of the above named States of Europe in 1879 amounted to $2,282,900,000.
The national expenditures of the United States in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, amounted to $267,642,957.
The population of the States of Europe named, according to the latest census taken at different dates since 1875, approximates 225,000,000.
The population of the United States, June 1, 1880, was a trifle over $50,000,000.
The standing armies of the States of Europe named, in actual service in camp or barracks, together with smaller but more expensive force in the navies of the maritime States, number over 2,100,000 men, to whom must be added a much greater number in the reserves who have wasted years of their lives in preparing for war, and who may be called into active service at a moment's notice.
The standing Army of the United States numbers 25,000 men.
The following table will convey a much more vivid impression of the relative burdens than these figures can give:

*The burdens upon Europe and America compared (omitting Russia, Turkey, and Alaska).*

### RELATIVE AREAS.

| Europe, 1,546,602 square miles | United States, 3,034,309 square miles |

### RELATIVE POPULATION TO ONE SQUARE MILE.

| Europe, 146 per square mile | United States, 164 per square mile |

### RELATIVE BURDEN OF DEBTS TO EACH INHABITANT.

Since 1848 the debt of Europe has nearly tripled and is still increasing. In 1860 it was $16,704,600,000, or an average to each inhabitant of $74.54.

In 1848 the United States owed no debt of any moment. On the 1st of August, 1860, our war debt was at its maximum, and was estimated (liquidated and unliquidated) by Secretary McCall, at $2,937,380,265, an average to each inhabitant at that date of $69.35.

March 1, 1881, the debt had been more than one-third paid, and was reduced to $1,679,656,412, an average to each person of $46.85.

### RELATIVE BURDEN OF NATIONAL EXPENDITURES TO EACH INHABITANT.

Europe, in 1880, $2,282,900,000, or an average to every person of $10.15.

In the United States, in 1866, after our armies were disbanded, our expenditures were $569,763,130, or an average of $9.63 to each inhabitant.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, they were $267,642,957, or an average of $8.35.
RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

RELATIVE BURDEN OF STANDING ARMIES.

In Europe each 110 inhabitants, or at
the ratio of one able-bodied man to
each five, each 22 men sustain one
soldier in active service. The re-
erves, liable to be called into active
war at any moment, are estimated at
twice the regular army.

In the United States each 2,000 inhab-
licants, or each 400 men, sustain 1 soldier.

If these lines do not convey an impression of duties as well as priv-
eliges to the citizens of this country they will fail of their purpose.

While our Senators are debating questions of appointment to petty
offices connected with that body, the great industrial forces of the
nation are seeking true statesmen who shall give them opportunity to
work with freedom.

It was well said by Carl Schurz on a recent occasion, "That it proved
the strength of this nation, that the most important question on which
the last Congress divided was the question whether the rate of interest
that the Secretary of the Treasury might be permitted to offer on re-
funding the national debt should be 3 or 3½ per cent."

It is a sign both of the strength and of the weakness of the nation
that, in the present session of the Senate of the United States, the
most important question at issue appears to be, what person shall
occupy the position of Sergeant-at-Arms of that body and dispense
the patronage of that petty office.

The war is ended and slavery is dead; the new forces born of liberty
are reconstructing the late slave States with a power that no act of Con-
gress can much affect. The wise policy of the late administration has
given these forces almost free play, and their results have been made
evident in the welfare of white and black alike, such as has never been
witnessed in the past, however short it may be of that which will surely
be attained in the future.

The interest of the people demands general laws that shall give equal
opportunity to all; Congresses and legislatures spend year after year
in special legislation, hence the greatest confidence exists, and there-
fore the greatest progress is made when neither are in session. If they
would spend their time in removing the obstructive statutes that their
predecessors have enacted their sessions would be welcome.

In the last century the inventions that have been applied to textile
manufacturing have reduced the work of furnishing all the cotton cloth
that 1,000 inhabitants of this country, 1,600 Chinese, or 3,200 East
Indians need in a year—to the measure of the labor of two hands in the
cotton-field, one man's work or its equivalent in money to move the
cotton to the factory, and two operatives tending the spindles and
looms—only five in all. A less proportion of each thousand can fur-
nish all the woolen fabrics needed.

In twenty years the improvements in the handling of timber have
reduced the labor of conversion into boards and other building mate-
rial so much that one man is sure to take the place of eight then em-
ployed.

Who can measure the potentiality of machinery applied to agricul-
ture! The week's ration of a Southern negro, which he chooses in
preference to any other food, is a peck of meal and 3½ pounds of bacon,
worth at wholesale prices 35 to 50 cents. One man working a pair of
horses in Iowa can work 60 acres of land, each acre producing 60 bush-
els of corn at 60 pounds to the bushel, or 216,000 pounds—108 tons.

In every art the labor and drudgery have been reduced and the pro-
duct increased, while science has, at the same time, abated most of this
noxious and dangerous condition of work.

The problems of the future are not how to produce but how to dis-
tribute the abundance of the field, the mine, and the factory. Abund-
ance and intelligence go hand in hand, and the measure in which this
assured abundance may be enjoyed is but the measure of the service
that each section, each State, or each person of our common country
can render to his neighbor.

With each improvement in machinery, wages or earnings become
larger, and the hours of labor necessary to subsistence are diminished;
the absolute share of the capitalist is increased, while his relative share
of each year's product is diminished; on the other hand, the share of
the laborer is increased both absolutely and relatively. The common
allegation that the use of machinery decreases employment and re-
duces wages, is without foundation. The "progressive desires" that
distinguish men from beasts bring new wants into existence, and as
the possibility for better conditions of life ensues the standard rises in
respect to what is necessary to a comfortable subsistence.

Imports continually increase as the export of our excess enables us
to pay for them, and "the ships that pass between this land and that
are like the shuttle of the loom, weaving the web of concord among
the nations."

Since the end of the rebellion of Slavery against Liberty, the great
forces of industry and commerce have assured prosperity in spite of the
malignant effects of inconvertible paper money, of the constant attempts
of Congress to tamper with the standard of value, and of State legisla-
tures to hamper and restrict the movements of trade by means of ob-
structive and meddlesome statutes applied to railroads. But the com-
mon sense of the people always finds its exponent, and by the veto mes-
sages of President Grant and President Hayes some of the most ob-
noxious measures have been stopped, while the Granger acts applied
to railway service defeated themselves as soon as any attempt was made
to enforce them.

It only now remains for legislators to learn that their chief duty is to
remove obstructions rather than to attempt to impose conditions upon
commerce.

It is useless to palter over names that have ceased to represent ideas
or facts. This nation has a function in the world that is yet almost a
vision. There are three economic principles that it needs first to learn
before the vision can be realized.

First. In this country earnings or wages are limited only by want of
intelligence, skill, or industry.

Second. The man or woman that earns the highest wages in the fac-
tory, on the farm, or in any department of industry in which machinery
is largely employed, compasses the largest production at the lowest
cost.

Third. The State that exchanges the product of its machinery and
skill with another in which manual labor is still the rule, gains most in
wealth.

Liberty under laws that forbid injustice and oppression, but leave
the whole movement of society perfectly free, is the condition under
which the greatest material results can be attained. When South and
West shall strive alike, with and equal skill and equal intelligence to
do the work best adapted to their climate and soil, all sectional an-
tagoneism must cease, and all alike shall prosper. In order that this
prosperity may be most fully enjoyed, it will be necessary that the two
instrumentalities by means of which all exchanges are made possi-
bles—the railroads and the banks—shall be relieved from the obstruc-
tions that ignorance and prejudice combined seem determined to place
in their way.

But one thing more remains to be considered, and that is, the revisi-
on of the tariff. On the one side are the advocates of the system of pro-
tection, who have themselves petitioned Congress to appoint a commis-
sion of experts to do the necessary work. On the other side are those
who, like the writer, believe that true protection to American industry
would consist in the gradual removal of all legal obstructions to com-
merce, but who yet well know that for many years to come a tariff must
be maintained for the purpose of collecting a large revenue from cus-
toms. If once this question could be fairly reached and the necessary
legislation secured for the appointment of such a commission, a moder-
ate tariff might be enacted that the reasonable men in both these schools
would sustain; the country might have a long period of rest from the
danger of meddlesome legislation upon this vexed question.

It would be an interesting task, did time and space permit, to add to
the computation made in this paper of the sum saved and annually
added to the quick capital of this country by the service of the railroads—
another computation of the yet larger amount of added capital that
now represents the increased efficiency of the annual work of the peo-
ple of the United States. It would be safe to assume that, where the
mechanical work of distribution has been reduced one-half in the last
ten years by the service of the railroads, the primary work of the pro-
duction of our fields and of our mines, and the secondary work of manu-
ufacturing their crude products into other forms ready for consumption,
have been reduced at least one-fourth by the improvements in ma-
achinery and metallurgy during the same period.

As a productive unit, every man in the United States possesses fully
one-third more power than he did in the year 1866, when personal lib-
erty had been finally established and forever assured in this land.

It is this abundance of quick or active capital, the product of these
new forces—of corn and pork, of beef and bread, of iron, of cotton, of
copper, wool, and the like, and all their secondary products—that is
borrowed and lent by the instrumentality of money. It is the title to
these commodities, measured in money, that is deposited in banks and
that is lent by their officers.

It is this vast increase of actual substance that has reduced the safe
rate of interest to only three per cent. now where it used to be six or
more.

Whether the rate that shall be paid for the borrowing of this capital
shall remain at three per cent. or even less, or be advanced by its
quicker and more productive use, is no longer a material question, but
one of intelligence and integrity.

The field for its use is as broad as the land itself, of which as yet less
than one-sixth part of the arable portion fit for cultivation is under the
plow, and even that produces only half the crop that more skillful
cultivation would give.

One-half at least of the territory of the United States, aside from
Alaska, is believed to be good arable land, exceeding 1,500,000 square
miles, while the area cultivated in grain, cotton, and root crops in 1879 was less than 225,000 square miles.

Who, then, shall not fully enjoy the use of this new capital?

First. The States, either South or North, that repudiate their debts.

Second. The citizens of these States. Where public integrity is not maintained, private confidence and credit cannot be established.

Third. The States in which the laws relating to the title of land are not simple and well devised to give security to him who buys.

Fourth. The States in which the laborer is not honored, and where justice is not accorded to rich and poor alike, without distinction of race, color, or condition.

Fifth. The cities in which municipal integrity is not assured. They may be centers of material wealth by the mere power of their position, but they will be in constant danger until public duties are as well performed as the work that is done for private gain.

Sixth. All persons whose intelligence, education, or opportunity has not sufficed to train them in the use of borrowed capital in a way that shall be profitable to them and at the same time safe for the lenders.

This last exception of those who cannot yet fully benefit by the greater power of producing and accumulating capital is the most material one in the list. It seems very certain that the power of accumulating has for the time being outrun the power of using, hence capital must increase rapidly in ratio to the demand, until the general standard of intelligence and education is advanced in an equal degree. This will take a long period, especially as new forces are being constantly applied to even greater production and distribution. This country never needed the world for a market so much as it does now.

From this reasoning it may follow that for a very long period the rate of interest on Government bonds, mortgages and other safe investments must be very low indeed.

Finally, it may be asked: Does not the future material prosperity of this nation depend solely upon the character of its people?

If the mental and moral characteristics of the people are equal to the opportunity which they enjoy, what will be the influence of this nation upon other countries?

Finally, there are certain conclusions that must follow from the propositions submitted in the foregoing paper, of which the following is a summary.

It has been held that the cost of railway service has been reduced not less than an average of one hundred and twenty million dollars in each year of the last decade. This is equivalent to a general relief from taxation to that extent, because the things moved by rail are mainly those of universal and common consumption.

Next it has been held that if with this saving be coupled the increased power of production ensuing from the application of more effective machinery, each human unit, i.e., each man, woman, or child engaged in farming, mining, metallurgy, or manufacturing, possesses a potentiality for production at least one-third greater than each unit engaged in the same pursuits possessed in the decade previous to 1870.

Under the application of these great industrial and commercial forces, capital has rapidly accumulated, and the power of accumulation may now be even greater than the power to use in a safe, well-established, and customary manner.

It has been the general conviction that it would be useless to offer a United States bond, payable at a fixed date, not to be sold at less than par, at any lower rate of interest than 3½ per cent.; but may not the
computations given in this paper lead to the conclusion that if a bond is offered at three per cent., not redeemable or payable at a date fixed, but purchasable by the Government at the market price when needed for the reduction of debt, such a bond may be placed at par; may there not then be greater assurance of its being maintained at par than English consols in just such degree as our position is now safer and stronger than that of Great Britain?

This again leads to another important consideration, to wit: the expediency of ceasing for a time the rapid reduction of the debt of the United States. There may be many reasons for adopting such a course.

First. if, in the case of the Supreme Court should righteously declare the reissue of legal tender United States notes unlawful, a large and immediate addition to the circulation of national bank notes would be desirable, and such an issue ought to be secured, like the present issue, by the deposit of United States bonds.

Second. Nothing would more conduce to the prosperity of many of the States, especially many of the Southern States, than the establishment of savings banks organized under State laws. The taint of repudiation, unfortunately, forbids recourse to State or municipal bonds as security for the investment of trust funds in many States, and until State credit is re-established it is very desirable that United States bonds should be available.

It may therefore be held that the present reduction of the debt of the United States should now be checked, and should cease for a time, when the total debt has been reduced to $1,500,000,000. This debt would then consist of the 3 per cent. consols now proposed, and the remainder might consist of the outstanding 4 per cent. bonds. The total interest would therefore be, in round figures, $54,000,000, or about $22,000,000 per annum less than it was March 1, 1881.

The reduction of debt for the year ending March 1, 1881, was $115,000,000. It is not likely to be less in any future year under our present system of taxation, as the increase of population, and the elasticity of the revenue that ensues therefrom, will fully offset the additional sums that may be added to the pension list under the unwise acts lately passed.

The debt on the 1st of March was $1,281,000,000
Before any action can be had to reduce the taxes, the debt may be,
January 1, 1882, below 1,800,000,000
Assuming a continuous surplus revenue at the rate of the year ending March 1, 1881, in which year our interest was $77,000,000, that is to say, at the rate of 115,000,000
Add thereto the interest to be saved by the payment or conversion of the 5 and 5 per cent. bonds into 5 per cent. consols in 1881 and 1882, say on $100,000,000 paid $6,000,000
Reduction of interest upon the balance 11,000,000
17,000,000

Available surplus 132,000,000

The excess of revenue for the year ensuing after January 1, 1882, may therefore be one hundred and thirty-two million dollars.

If it be then assumed that a reduction of debt of $32,000,000 per annum will thereafter be sufficient, a sum that, annually applied, would bring the principal of the debt to $1,500,000,000 before 1892, there would remain a further surplus of revenue of one hundred million dollars per year, to be applied by the Congress now elected, at its next session, beginning December 1, 1881, to the reduction of the national taxes after January 1, 1882.
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Peace, order, and industry, free labor, and free railroads have therefore brought this nation, in sixteen years from the date when nearly two million men returned to the pursuits of peace from the camps in which they had been gradually gathered during four years of civil war, to this point.

That it is entitled to the highest credit of any nation in the world, and that its legislators at the next session of Congress, only eight months distant, may apply a surplus revenue of one hundred million dollars to the reduction of national taxation.

May it not therefore be hoped that the Senate of the United States will then have determined the question on which it is now engaged, as to who shall fill one or more of its petty offices, in order that when it meets in December it may be prepared to give some attention to the fiscal questions of the future; in dealing with which the reputation and political standing of each and all of its members will be made or marred. By that time it may be impossible to conceal incapacity to deal with the great questions of the future by wrangling over the dead issues of the past.

This article has been prepared simply as a study of one of the pending questions in political science; in presenting it to those who, like myself, are especially interested in the study of political economy, I beg to call attention to another phase of the main questions treated in this article.

It has often been held that the application of machinery to agriculture worked in the direction of large estates operated by great capitalists. This is undoubtedly the first effect of machinery applied to almost unlimited areas of virgin soil, as in Dakota, and it may also be true in respect to lands that need irrigation; but this tendency is only perceived in respect to grain crops. In regard to all other crops, the very reverse is true.

The great crops, like the great factories, appeal to the imagination and impose upon the observer. Wheat, as an aggregate, assumes an immense importance; but man does not live by bread alone, and a barrel of flour a year more than suffices for the use of each inhabitant of this country. One barrel can now be moved from any part of the northern or central sections of the United States devoted to wheat culture to any point on the coast, east, west, or south, for less than a dollar.

The very conditions of the cultivation of cotton and tobacco are converting the Southern States into great communities of small farmers, and the beneficent political effects of this social revolution are yet to appear.

In the North, again, but not confined to it, a new force has lately been developed. If "ensilage" means, in fact, one-half what is claimed for it, it may work social and political changes in almost as great a degree as the railroad itself. It begins to appear that 60 pounds of ensiled maize, or other green crop, will serve as the daily ration of one milch cow or one steer, if combined with a small quantity of bran or of cottonseed meal. It also appears that from 25 to 75 tons of maize can be produced on a single acre in almost any part of the United States, that is not without the climatic area of Indian corn cultivation; that is to say, 833 to 2,500 daily rations to a single acre, of food suitable to keep cattle, hogs, and poultry fed almost wholly, and horses fed in part, in good and healthy condition the year through.

If this be so, this force works intensely in the direction of small farms under high cultivation, without implying very hard or long hours of labor. From such conditions the following changes must ensue: Aggregations of small farms around very numerous central towns; a restoration of a numerous, independent, and intelligent class of prosperous
farmers in New England and elsewhere in the eastern parts of the United States, in sections where agriculture has been somewhat depressed by distant competition; and a return to forms of society like unto those on which our very liberties were founded, but under much less arduous conditions.

The railroad at first tended to segregation, or to a very wide diffusion of population in the farming districts, but to concentration in the manufacturing States.

The various new forces tend now to aggregation, not concentration, under the best conditions of life, around common centers in respect to agriculture; while the telegraph, the telephone, and, in yet greater measure, rapid transit and the transmission of power by steam or by electricity over long distances, must surely tend to diffuse the population of cities, now dwelling and working under very bad conditions, over a much wider area than has heretofore been consistent with the nature of the occupations now conducted in cities; that is, to aggregation rather than concentration.

It would hardly be consistent with the main purpose of this paper to attempt to picture the city of the future, when it shall have been reconstructed under the beneficent influence of these new forces.

It may well be alleged by the managers of the railway service of the country that an injustice is done to them in limiting the comparison of the rates charged to a gold standard, inasmuch as the transactions of the country have been conducted upon a currency basis, and the so-called “lawful money” has consisted of United States notes during the whole period under consideration, from January 1, 1866, to January 1, 1879, when the difference between these notes and gold coin was removed. In fact, it is true that all transactions except the payment of interest on the public debt and the collection of duties have been in currency, and the true measure of the saving brought about by the railway service should be stated in dollars of lawful money.

The average rate charged upon the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad from 1866 to 1869, inclusive, was 2.7058 cents per ton per mile; from 1870 to 1879, inclusive, 1.2164 cents per ton per mile; difference 1.4894 cents. At this rate of difference the saving on 14,353,521,585 tons carried one mile was $213,781,350.

As has been stated, this line has performed one-twentieth part of the railway service of the United States during this period. If we multiply the saving on this line by 20 the quotient is $4,275,627,000, a sum more than equal to the money cost of the civil war to the people of the United States.

But it is not probable that the rate of reduction on all lines has been equal to that on the New York Central. The reduction that can be proved, however, and will be provable, when “Poor’s Manual” of 1881 is issued, is fully three-fourths of this sum—that is to say, $3,206,720,250, or an average of $320,000,000 a year for ten years, from 1870 to 1879, inclusive.

The revenue of the United States from all sources during the same period has averaged $317,000,000 a year.

The claim that the railway managers may therefore present and substantially prove is, that they have made such a reduction in their charge for moving merchandise during the past ten years as to have equaled the sum levied upon the people of the United States during the same period, for the payment of national expenses as well as for the reduction of the national debt.

There is one other aspect in which the saving that has been compassed in the cost of moving merchandise by railroad can be presented.
It is perhaps superfluous, but yet meets a comment that has often been made, especially in England, namely, that we were converting our quick capital into fixed investments in this country with too great rapidity, especially in the construction of railroads.

The panic of 1873 has been, without sufficient reason, attributed to this cause; and some predictions of other difficulties of like kind have been made affecting the present time.

We may, therefore, present the case in the following manner: There will probably be constructed within the limits of the United States, in the year 1881, 8,000, perhaps 10,000 miles of new railroad. Their average cost may be computed at $25,000 per mile. The total expenditure may therefore reach $250,000,000.

It has been said previously that railroad begets railroad; and we may now make the following almost incredible statement: Computing the rates again in gold coin for both periods, we find that the reduction in the charge for moving merchandise in the year 1879, as compared to the years 1866 to 1869 inclusive, on the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, amounted to $26,650,000 for the work done by this single line in that single year, 1879.

As has been stated, this road performed one-twentieth part of the railroad service of the United States in the year, 1879.

If we therefore multiply the sum saved by 20, we reach an aggregate of $533,000,000.

Let us admit, in order to cover contingencies, that the reduction on other lines has been only one-half that on the line named, which is yielding altogether too much for the sake of a safe computation, and we reach a saving in the year 1879 of $266,500,000; in other words, a sum sufficient to cover the entire cost of the construction of 1880, with a large surplus over.

Assuming that the saving in 1880 was substantially the same in ratio to the price of commodities as in 1879, and it appears that the sum saved on last year's work, namely, 1880, will suffice to build the 10,000 miles now under construction in 1881.

It would therefore follow that the conversion of quick capital into fixed railroad investments will not be likely to create a commercial crisis at present, except so far as its expenditure in unprofitable lines, or on a merely speculative basis, may create distrust even in respect to other lines that are needed. The saving compassed by existing lines as compared to the period 1866 and 1869 is sufficient to cover the cost of the apparently excessive construction of the present time. In this connection it should be remembered that the construction of new lines works a yet greater saving, because it substitutes the service of the road for the service of the wagon.

The most conspicuous example of the saving compassed by this latter change may be found in the case of the Central and Union Pacific Railroad. The saving in the cost of moving supplies for the Government of the United States as compared to the rates that were paid to wagon-trains before their completion, long since exceeded the entire amount of the bonds of the United States that were lent to these two corporations to aid in their construction.

In fact, from whatever point and in whatever aspect the service of the railway is considered, it becomes evident that it has been the prime factor in enabling the people of this country to overcome the losses of the civil war, in enabling the Government to resume specie payment, and in establishing prosperity on a solid basis.

EDWARD ATKINSON.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Miles per</th>
<th>1 mile per</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Rank in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>7,354</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>14572</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>58,529</td>
<td>10,547</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8,226</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>4,754</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>51,951</td>
<td>9,912</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>50,935</td>
<td>8,960</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>49,909</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>53,909</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>9,198</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>31,337</td>
<td>5,580</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>57,947</td>
<td>9,375</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>53,445</td>
<td>9,315</td>
<td>16.53</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>German Empire</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>19,469</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>30,865</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>7,948</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>9,123</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>10,874</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>54,015</td>
<td>9,990</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>26,755</td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>32,927</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>49,279</td>
<td>9,550</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>72,292</td>
<td>14,010</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>49,490</td>
<td>9,990</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>72,292</td>
<td>14,010</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>54,720</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>29,990</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>61,942</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>26,284</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>51,951</td>
<td>9,912</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>89,950</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>75,056</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>49,138</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>72,292</td>
<td>14,010</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>140,964</td>
<td>26,620</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>26,284</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>89,950</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>148,950</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>177,060</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>132,920</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>26,284</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>84,876</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>29,990</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>150,002</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>148,950</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>104,954</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>150,002</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>132,924</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>99,954</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Idaho Territory</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>26,284</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>148,950</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>132,924</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>99,954</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>150,002</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>95,954</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>55,954</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>52,954</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>54,720</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>177,060</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>26,284</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>150,002</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>132,924</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>99,954</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>150,002</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>95,954</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The United States have approximately one mile of railway to each 1,000 inhabitants. Europe has one mile to each 1,000 inhabitants, if Russia be included. About one mile to each 2,000, exclusive of Russia.
APPENDIX B.

[From the Journal of the American Agricultural Association, Nos. 3 and 4, 1881.]

THE STANDARD OF ADEQUATE RAILWAY SERVICE.

BY EDWARD ATKINSON.

When the Massachusetts Central Railroad is completed, of which a portion is now open, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will possess more miles of railway in ratio to its area than any other State or country in the world.

The completion of this line in the year 1881 will make our railway mileage more than 1,950 miles in a territory of 7,800 square miles, or ONE LINEAR MILE TO EACH FOUR SQUARE MILES OF TERRITORY.

If we may assume that this is a fairly adequate service to meet our present need, we may establish it as a standard, or 100 per cent. For the purpose of comparison by the graphical method previously adopted in the article on "The Railroad and the Farmer" (to which this is an appendix), we will define the standard of 100 per cent. by this formula:

MASSACHUSETTS RAILROADS IN 1881—COMPLETE.

1 MILE OF RAILWAY TO 4 MILES OF AREA, 100 PER CENT.

The following table shows the ratio of the railway service of the United States and Europe to this standard of adequate service, the miles of railway in operation being taken from "Poor's Railroad Manual of 1881," with some slight variations as to European States, derived from "Martin's Year Book of 1881."

It would be interesting to compare the miles of railroad with the population of these several States, but the table would need to be changed every month, as in our Western States and Territories the railroad leads and makes the way for the incoming population, while in Europe the practice is the reverse.

In "Poor's Manual" the miles of railway stated to be in operation in Texas at the end of 1880 numbered 3,293. The Galveston News computes 4,389 in operation September 1, 1881. The number of miles chartered since September 1, 1880, many of which are in progress, comprise more than 5,000 additional miles. It thus appears that the railway mileage of Texas is extending more rapidly than the population increases, and may continue to do so for some time to come. The same rule holds with respect to all our principal Territories. The railway precedes population, gives value to land, and creates its own traffic. It may be observed, also, that the pioneer crops upon the land thus opened are bulky, and require railroads in order to be moved. They consist of grain and meat, of ores and timber, or of wool and hides. The occupations of the new settlers are therefore of a kind that give a large quantity of traffic for a small number of persons. Hence the measure of miles of railroad to population might be a more fallacious standard than the comparison to relative areas. But neither standard can be taken as an absolute one, and the only purpose of the present computation is to present some rather interesting facts, and to make a rough-and-ready estimate of what increase in railway service we may need in the immediate future, and also to prove how easily we may meet this need as it comes, be it greater or less.
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Subject as such statistics are to the qualifications stated, we may yet affirm that there is perhaps no single standard by which the progress of a State or nation may be more accurately measured than by a full consideration of its means of communication. In former times the standard was the highway; next came the canal, and now it is the railroad.

Of course this rule is subject to many exceptions; for instance, it is not fair to compare Maine to Massachusetts, because of the vast area of territory in the former State, which is at present unoccupied, if not uninhabitable. Neither would it be just to apply this rule to Norway and Sweden, or to like countries where mountain ranges are a barrier to railway service. In such a state as the Netherlands, also, the vast network of canals needs to be considered in addition to the railroads.

But after all suitable qualifications have been made it will be perfectly apparent that the extension of the railway service is a tolerably fair and just measure of the intelligence of the people, and of their freedom from the burden of standing armies or from the curse of slavery.

It will be an interesting study to reconstruct this table in 1891, and then to mark the progress of the Southern States; then can be measured the first decade of genuine progress on which these States are just now entering, and it will be seen in what degree liberty may have enabled the old slave States of the South to overtake their younger sisters in the West.

Is there not a lesson in these facts that among European states, England and Wales, Belgium, Switzerland, and Scotland, the four states which enjoy the greatest freedom or the most adequate system of education also possess the most adequate railway service? Even Ireland, under English rule, exceeds France. Germany is far in advance of Austria, Italy, Spain, and Russia. All the great states of Europe which have wasted their substance in sustaining standing armies, and which have built up barriers to trade in the shape of hostile tariffs, stand far below our own States of the free North.

Mark once more that among our own States, in just the measure in which they have wasted their substance in slaves, have they been deprived of railroads. The border States suffered the least, but in just equal proportion to the darkness of the pall of slavery has been the privation of railroads in the cotton States.

The free young State of Iowa is far in advance of her neighbor, Missouri. The Germans, who constitute so large an element of the population of Iowa, have already provided themselves with better means of communication than the fatherland enjoys. The Scandinavians of Wisconsin and Minnesota have more than double the railway service of the countries whence they came; but Virginia, crippled by slavery, notwithstanding its vast resources, lags far behind, and only finds poor company with Austria and Italy. Kansas, hardly yet of age, stands even with Georgia, the most progressive of the cotton States. Nebraska, younger yet, already leads Mississippi, while Texas, also held back by slavery until recent times, will yet soon pass up the column, and has already escaped the comparison with Turkey, below which country she stood last year.

There is another aspect of this question which possesses great interest. Massachusetts has now, including the Massachusetts Central Line, a part of which has just been opened, one linear mile of railway to each four square miles of territory; yet a large portion of the State is mountainous or sterile, and does not need railway communication to one-half the extent in which such service will be called for in the near future in many other States. When we consider the wealth of minerals in the
mountain sections of the Middle States and of many of the Southern States, and the agricultural potentialities of the West, it must surely happen that very many, if not all, the present States of the Union will ultimately demand railroads equal to Massachusetts, and that their construction will be profitable. The following table will therefore give some idea of the immediate future of railway construction if the States named may be assumed to have the need of railways in the proportions indicated, the present service of the State of Massachusetts being the standard.

In establishing these ratios in this rough-and-ready way, consideration has been given to the general configuration of the several States and Territories, to the probability of diversity of occupation, to climate, and in some measure to relative fertility. Of course the divisions are very general, and can only give an approximate idea of the future construction.

It will be seen that about 117,500 miles of new railroads may be required, which, at the rate of construction of the year 1881, will occupy the next fifteen years. It would, however, be safer to consider twenty years as the period which will be needed for this construction, as we may assume at least one commercial crisis and a railway panic in the next seven years, by which our progress may for a time be a little checked.

The States and Territories are divided into five classes. Class I is assumed to need very soon a railway service equal to that of Massachusetts at the present time, to wit, 1 mile to 4 square miles; Class II, one-half as much, or 1 to 8; Class III, one-quarter as much, or 1 to 16; Class IV, one-eighth as much, or 1 to 32; Class V, the present Territories, one-sixteenth, or 1 mile of railway to each 64 miles of territory.

[Massachusetts, in 1881, 1,050 miles=100 per cent.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class I.—One mile to four square miles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class II.—One mile to eight square miles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RELATIONS BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

#### CLASS III.—1 MILE TO 16 SQUARE MILES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Miles in operation January 1, 1881</th>
<th>Needed</th>
<th>Total, say, A.D. 1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>5,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>4,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>3,439</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>5,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>3,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>3,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>2,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>3,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>2,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>13,824</td>
<td>17,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Territory</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>4,067</td>
<td>4,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,601</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,472</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,473</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CLASS IV.—1 MILE TO 22 SQUARE MILES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Miles in operation January 1, 1881</th>
<th>Needed</th>
<th>Total, say, A.D. 1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>3,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>3,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>2,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2,229</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>4,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,415</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,653</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,767</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CLASS V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Miles in operation January 1, 1881</th>
<th>Needed</th>
<th>Total, say, A.D. 1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>2,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>1,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>2,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>1,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,606</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,888</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,494</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming these railways to be completed, either in the States to which the new mileage has been assigned or in some others, the proportion of the total mileage (209,000) to the area of the United States (omitting Alaska) will then be only one mile to about fifteen square miles. In other words, the United States (omitting Alaska) would then be about one-quarter as well served as Massachusetts now is.

Assuming that these roads will cost, upon the average, at the beginning, $35,000 per mile, the expenditure will amount to $4,112,500,000, or about $275,000,000 a year for fifteen years—a sum which can be readily spared, as will appear if we compare it with the annual saving that has been made by the existing railway service in the last ten years. It may also be remarked that the cost of our civil war, measured in money, was just this sum of $4,100,000,000.

One point may well be considered in this connection. It would be a very false economy if these new lines were not laid with steel rails, on which the present duty is $28 per ton, over 100 per cent. It may be safely assumed that if iron rails are made free, and the duty on steel rails reduced one-half, the protection then afforded would be excessive, but the saving on the cost of these projected lines would be, at 100 tons per mile, $1,400, or on 117,500 miles $164,500,000.
This estimate of 117,500 miles of railroad to be constructed in fifteen
to twenty years may be somewhat startling, and it may be alleged that
the capital cannot be found for it; it will therefore be well to analyze
it and to reduce it to terms of labor or day’s work.

A fair estimate of the prime cost of an average mile of single-track
railroad, equipped in such manner as to begin to develop the country
through which it runs, so that it will further develop itself out of its
own earnings, may be set at $35,000 per mile. This is sometimes con-
terred too low, but it is intended to include only a fair cost, without
admitting contractors’ profits or other charges. It may be assumed
that this amount is the measure of good work actually performed.

At this rate the amount of capital expended will be $275,000,000 a
year for fifteen years, at an average of 7,800 miles a year. In the origi-
nal article on the Railroad and the Farmer, the proof of the saving
in the service of existing railways of a greater sum than this, as com-
pared to the charges of only fourteen years since, has already been sub-
mitted, and there is yet a large measure of saving now being compassed,
especially in the construction and consolidation of Southern lines.

But a better proof of our ability to meet this expenditure may con-
sist in a yet closer analysis. Assuming $350,000 as the cost of 100
miles of railroad, let us see what labor this sum measures. The force
required consists of the officers of the corporation, the engineers, sur-
veyors, and their assistants, the managers of mines of coal and iron,
of rolling-mills, and of machine-shops for engine and car construction,
all of whom earn from $2 to $20 per day.

The next class consists of the skilled miners, iron-workers, rolling-
mill men, machinists, car-builders and other first-class mechanics, all
of whom earn from $2.50 to $6 per day.

Last we have the track-layers, navvies, lumbermen, and all the com-
mon laborers who work in the mines, shops, or in the construction of
the line, all of whom earn from $1 to $3 per day. The last is of course
the most numerous class.

It is impossible for the writer to determine the proportion of these
several classes, but if we assume an average of $2 per day for the whole
force, we have probably set the rate too low. At this rate, however,
computed for 312 working days, each 100 miles of railroad will repre-
sent the labor of 5,600 men. The labor of constructing 7,800 miles a
year will require a force of 436,800 men.

WILEuroPE PREPARES FOR WAR WE PREPARE FOR WORK.

If the United States sustained a standing army equal, in proportion
to our present population, to those of Europe, omitting Russia, our
army in active service, taking no consideration of reserves, would num-
ber over 500,000 men.

If our army were equal to those of France and Germany, now actu-
ally in camp and barrack, it would consist of 600,000 men on the peace
footing, while our reserves would consist of twice that number.

Germany and Italy are struggling with widespread poverty, and noth-
ing but the sordid economy of the French, coupled with long and ardu-
ous hours of unremitting labor, especially for women, saves France.
We may well ponder upon the trials which Europe must endure, and
wonder what may be the influence of this country when the next census
is taken, and when our stalwart army of peace shall have increased
our railway mileage from 100,000 to nearly 260,000 miles. Well may
we watch with the utmost jealousy every measure which can in any
degree obstruct the progress of this prime factor in our beneficent power as a nation.

Even after the 117,000 miles of new railways have been constructed to meet the requirements presented in this paper, there will remain innumerable cross-roads and branches and tramways to be built, especially in the prairie States, where material for good highways is wanting. If any additional reasons were needed to prevent the adoption of meddlesome and obstructive statutes, the writer hopes they may be found in these considerations.

This computation of the future need of other States for railway service may be considered extravagant. It may be held that very few, if any, other States will be so densely populated within the present century as Massachusetts is now, and it may also be held that a State requires railway service in ratio to its manufacturing and mechanical employments, in which pursuits it may be said that other States may not for a very long period emulate Massachusetts. Each person who scans the table will take some exception to it, alleging that in this or that State or Territory the computation is fallacious; or it may be said that States upon the seaboard, where through lines concentrate, need more miles in ratio to their area. All this may be admitted, but as the cost of constructing railroads may yet be very much diminished, and the cost of operating in greater measure, will not the demand increase? What considerable town or section will be content to remain without a railroad connection even if its branch will only pay the cost of operating it? When all the qualifications have been taken into consideration, will not the construction of the next sixteen far exceed the work of the past sixteen years, in which we passed through the long period of depression caused by our paper currency?

The case may also be presented in another aspect: The excess of the revenue of the United States, over and above ordinary expenses and interest, is now about $150,000,000 a year. The next Congress may, therefore, remove the burden of $100,000,000 of national taxation a year, and yet leave surplus enough to pay the whole debt of the nation before the century ends.

The sum which we may therefore remove from our taxes by one act is about equal to the cost of sustaining the standing army of France or Germany, and is more than one-third the computed annual cost of doubling our railway service in fifteen years. It may well be asked whether the nations of Europe, burdened with standing armies, wasting the best years of their lives in idleness at the cost to each 50,000,000 of their population in taxes of more than the sum which we might remove by one simple act of legislation, can expect to retain the control of the great commerce of the world against our competition.

If the Congress which meets in December should dare to enact a law to this effect: "On and after June 30, 1882, all taxes imposed upon the people of the United States, either under the internal-revenue law or under the laws for the collection of duties upon imports, shall be subject to a discount of 10 per cent.; after June 30, 1883, to an additional discount of 10 per cent., and after June 30, 1884, to an additional discount of 10 per cent.," the revenue could well be spared.

These successive discounts on the present schedules of taxation would work a relief to the amount of over $100,000,000 a year after the third discount of 10 per cent. had taken effect. In the mean time, the proposed commission for the revision of the whole system of national taxation would be doing its work. This mode, however unscientific, would yet avoid all contention, and would be impartial and equitable.
The proportion of the present taxes removed would, at the expiration
of the three years—when the discount would be 30 per cent,—amount
to a sum more than equal to the money cost of the largest single standing
army of Europe, and would also be nearly equal to the amount required
to construct over 3,000 miles of railway in each year, or one-half the
number of miles required to double our railway service in sixteen years.

We may, perhaps, judge a little of the future by the past. Since the
end of the year 1865, the year in which we were relieved from the burden
of civil war, we added, up to the end of 1880, 53,600 miles; in 1881 we
shall merely add 7,400 miles more, making 66,000 miles in sixteen years,
or 4,125 miles per year. Is it too much to assume that in the next six-
teen years we shall need 50 per cent. more each year—say 6,250 per
year? This would practically amount to doubling our service, as it is
substantially at this date, October 1, 1881, to wit, 100,000 miles by add-
ing thereto 100,000 miles in sixteen years. The previous computation
is based on 117,500 miles.

At $35,000 per mile, the capital needed would be $3,500,000,000. At
$2 per day, the force employed would be 350,000 in number.

It would therefore appear by this very safe computation that two-
thirds the proportionate standing army which we should need, if we
prepared for war after the manner of European nations, will suffice for
this work.

This is not the place to discuss the influence of this nation upon the
condition of Europe. This subject has been treated in a most able
manner by Professor Von Holst; but let it be remembered that long
before the sixteen years have elapsed in which this work may be done,
our national debt will have been fully paid, even if a large measure of
reduction should at once be made on our present heavy taxes, and it
may then be possible to have some faint conception of the influence of
this country at the beginning of the next century.

While we have thus set up the State of Massachusetts as the standard
of a State fairly served, it is by no means intended to cite her course in
railway legislation as an example to be followed.

It is true that she has enjoyed the benefit of a general railway act for
several years, and that through her board of railroad commissioners
she has secured publicity of accounts on a uniform system, and also
such other methods of making public all alleged abuses as to have sub-
stantially suppressed the public agitation for meddlesome statutes for
the regulation of the service by law. But in other ways her course has,
perhaps, been an example of all that might be well avoided.

Enticed by the success in granting State aid to the Western Railroad,
now a part of the Boston and Albany Railroad, by stock subscriptions,
and to the Norwich and Worcester Railroad by bond subscriptions, she
has been betrayed into State undertakings fruitful in corruption and of
little use. The two measures of aid above named were granted before
investments in railroads had become general, and it is not to be doubted
that they hastened the connection of Massachusetts with the West
by a few years; and had the State then given its full power and influ-
ence to the development and adequate use of its one great line to the
West, the Boston and Albany Railroad, it might have secured the full
share of the great commerce which it has since sought, with compara-
tively little success, at the cost of a State debt of about $20,000,000.

Having first removed all inducement for the development of the traffic
of the Boston and Albany Railroad by a provision that if its managers
should dare to work it effectively, and should thereby earn more than
10 per cent., the property of the corporation should be taken from it at
a valuation, the State next proceeded to try to establish two competing lines—one by the construction of the Hoosac Tunnel, through which a small traffic is now in operation, the avails of which are insufficient to keep the tunnel in repair; the other by loans to what was known as the Hartford and Erie Railroad, whose history was one of continuous fraud and corruption, until, by foreclosure, it came into the possession of the New York and New England Railroad corporation, by whom it is being completed.

The result of the restrictions upon the traffic of the Boston and Albany Railroad has been to make that road the single example among all those which form a part of the through lines to the West, whose traffic has remained almost stationary for several years, while its net receipts from freight absolutely diminished.

The tons moved on this line were—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tons Moved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1,633,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>2,884,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>2,736,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The charge per ton per mile was reduced, between 1869 and 1879, more than 50 per cent., but the earnings also decreased 7 per cent., being in that respect singular as compared to other sections of the great through lines.

The State has suffered, both in its traffic and in its taxes, from the lack of development and efficiency in this line, which might, perhaps, have made a gain in its traffic equal to that of the New York Central, with which it connects, if it had been consolidated with it.

The result of the State attempt to force the construction of competing lines by State interference and aid has therefore been that the amount of the annual tax which the people of the State now pay upon the debt incurred would more than pay the cost of moving all the flour and a considerable part of the wheat consumed by the whole population of the State in each year from Chicago to Boston, a distance of 1,000 miles, while at the same time it has crippled its principal line, in which it had a large stock interest, and which might have been made adequate to do five times its present traffic by an expenditure of half the cost of the Hoosac Tunnel.

In view of the fact that the principal argument used by those who enticed the State to aid in the construction of the Hoosac Tunnel and the Hartford and Erie Railroad was in order that the people of Massachusetts might have cheap bread, it is a singular commentary that the result has thus far been to remove the wheat fields of the West 1,000 miles further away, inasmuch as the tax now required to pay the interest only on the Hoosac Tunnel debt amounts to the cost of moving one barrel of flour for every man, woman, and child in the State more than 1,000 miles.

While we in Massachusetts have thus blundered on our way for forty years, until we have seerred, in spite of our blunders, a fairly adequate railway service, there are yet many cross-roads needed; and even if our sister States do their utmost to reach our standard, it may yet happen that even at the end of the next sixteen years our old Commonwealth will still maintain her place at the head of the class.

Had the constant occupation of a busy life permitted, the writer would have been glad to have condensed the original article on the Railroad and the Farmer, which was prepared for the first number of this journal, prior to its republication in the second number.

He had also hoped that the large circulation which the first number
attained, and the wide attention with which this article has been honored, might have called forth a reply from the advocates of State or national regulation of the railway service, which would have served to call attention to any errors into which he may have fallen; but the replies, so far as he has seen them (including the article in this number by the president of what is called the Anti-Monopoly League), have been of so indefinite a character that, while at the first reading they seemed to be of some importance, on a careful consideration no substance could be found in them to which a rejoinder can be made.

EDWARD ATKINSON.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman, Gilbert E.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnesses.</td>
<td>549-551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony of—</td>
<td>549-551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, James O</td>
<td>256-266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Mrs. E. M.</td>
<td>655-659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson, Edward</td>
<td>342-374</td>
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<td>354-398</td>
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