

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 069 079 857

HD U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Labor.
6064 Eight hours for women employed in District
U6 of Columbia.
1913c

HD
6064
U6
1913c

THE LIBRARY
OF THE
NEW YORK STATE SCHOOL
OF
INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR
RELATIONS



AT
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

EIGHT HOURS FOR WOMEN EMPLOYED IN
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

LIBRARY COPY

HEARINGS

4.5. Cong. not under
BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON THE BILL

H. R. 27281

RELATING TO THE LIMITATION OF THE HOURS OF WOMEN
EMPLOYED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 30 AND FEBRUARY 6, 7, 8,
10, 11, AND 12, 1913



COMMITTEE ON LABOR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WILLIAM B. WILSON, Pennsylvania. *Chairman.*

WALTER L. HENSLEY, Missouri.

JAMES P. MAHER, New York.

ARTHUR B. ROUSE, Kentucky.

DAVID J. LEWIS, Maryland.

WILLIAM S. HOWARD, Georgia.

FRANK BUCHANAN, Illinois.

FINLY H. GRAY, Indiana.

JOHN J. GARDNER, New Jersey.

EDWARD B. VREELAND, New York.

J. M. C. SMITH, Michigan.

WILLIS C. HAWLEY, Oregon.

WILLIAM S. VARE, Pennsylvania.

AGNES H. WILSON, *Clerk.*

EIGHT HOURS FOR WOMEN EMPLOYED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 30, 1913.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. William B. Wilson (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has met this morning for the purpose of hearing statements in connection with House bill 27281, a bill to regulate the hours of employment and to safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia, and so forth, and the committee will first hear from Mr. Peters, the author of the bill.

STATEMENT OF HON. ANDREW J. PETERS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, we are here to urge favorable consideration by your committee of House bill 27281, a bill to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia in any mill, factory, manufacturing establishment, or workshop, laundry, bakery, printing, clothing, dress-making, or millinery establishment, mercantile establishment, store, hotel, restaurant, office, or where any goods are sold or distributed, or by any express or transportation company, or in the transmission or distribution of telegraph or telephone messages or merchandise. That is a somewhat long title, Mr. Chairman, but I think it indicates quite clearly the object of the bill and shows the real scope and effect of the legislation proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask, Mr. Peters, if the occupations enumerated include all gainful occupations outside of domestic service?

Mr. PETERS. That is the intention, Mr. Chairman, to include everything outside of domestic service. It provides that no female shall be employed or permitted to work in any of the industries or occupations outside of domestic service, as you have suggested, for more than 8 hours in any one day, or more than 6 days in a week, or more than 48 hours in any one week, and that no female under 18 years of age shall be employed or permitted to work in connection with any of the establishments named in the first section of the act before the hour of 7 o'clock in the morning or after the hour of 6 o'clock in the evening of any one day. It is not necessary for me to detain the committee by reading the whole bill. I think I have indicated in what I have said pretty clearly its general provisions.

The committee no doubt knows that there are 30 different States that have some kind of factory laws relative to the employment of women. There still remain a few States which stand forth in unenviable contrast, and I regret to say that one of those localities is the District of Columbia, which comes particularly under the care and protection of Congress itself. The only law in the District which Congress has enacted to protect women in employment is the provision that there shall be a reasonable number of seats provided for the girls and women when they are not waiting on customers.

The CHAIRMAN. That would only apply in the case of mercantile establishments?

Mr. PETERS. Yes; as I understand it, that would only apply in the mercantile establishments. So it seems to be apparent that if the Federal Government is to keep pace with the States it must take a long step ahead of its present position.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do you not think the Federal Government ought to take the lead?

Mr. PETERS. I think so, decidedly; and instead of lagging behind Congress ought to enact a statute that would be in itself a model, because it is the leading legislative body, and, in addition to establishing a worthy precedent, it should enact a law to give the people protection for their own sake.

There is a bill now, which is in conference between the two Houses, which, if enacted, will prohibit the Government and contractors doing work for this Government from employing men more than eight hours per day, and it seems that it is only fair to ask ourselves that if Congress will pass a law of that nature why should it not pass a law granting similar protection to women—women who much more need its protection.

Three States stand out as having adopted an eight-hour law for women, and those States are California, Colorado, and Washington.

In the bill which you have before you, Mr. Chairman, and which is presented at the instance of the National Consumers' League, there has been embodied the best features of the laws of these three States, and the attempt has been made to consolidate them into a measure which it is hoped will prove a model measure, and which will stimulate similar action by the various States.

I do not need to call the attention of the committee to the general policy of legislation for the protection of workmen, and the protection of women and children in particular. Many of the States have recognized the necessity for protecting their citizens from the greed of manufacturers and from the greed of employers for a number of years. From the commencement of the last century we have seen the slow, unfortunately slow, but steady growth of public opinion, putting through one law after another, from the commencement of the factory laws in England down to the laws which have been enacted in the last 10 years in this country. While the spread of the enactment of proper factory laws in the several States has not been as rapid as we should like, yet in many of the States there has been shown a commendable response to public sentiment. My own State of Massachusetts has shown this, and it is particularly interesting to me to have this matter come up here. When I was in the Massachusetts State Senate, I was on the committee on the relations of the employer and employee, and sat in

extended hearings relative to the law which was before us for the protection of women in mercantile establishments in the city of Boston, a bill very similar to this one, but one which, I am frank to say, was not as good as this bill, but which, after considerable effort, we got through, and which persons have told me has proved not only a help to the women, but the mercantile establishments themselves recognize its justice, and say they would not care to go back to the conditions which prevailed there before this law was enacted.

Of course, Washington is not a factory city, and it is recognized that it is not; still the problem of the employment of women and children is a very considerable one to the citizens of Washington. Because there are few factories here, it does not by any means follow that there are no abuses and that there is no need to protect the citizens of the District.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to a few facts which have been covered in a preliminary report which has been compiled by the Department of Commerce and Labor relative to hours, earnings, and duration of employment of wage-earning women in the District of Columbia. That department is making a series of reports on the subject of the employment of women and children. While the report concerning conditions in the District of Columbia has not yet been published, through the courtesy of the department I had an opportunity to look into the report, and want to call the committee's attention to one or two of the statements in it, and wish to say further that Miss Obenauer, who has compiled the report, is here to-day and prepared to answer the questions of the committee in regard to any of its contents.

The first division of this report deals with the employees of the retail stores. The report of the investigator shows that the average hours of employment in the retail stores of the District of Columbia were from 9 to 9½ hours, considerably in excess of the 8-hour day, which we propose to provide for in our bill, and considerably in excess of the hours which the men are allowed to work who are employed by the Government. If Congress provides a limitation for men in Government employ to eight hours a day there is certainly, Mr. Chairman, every reason why the women in the District should be protected in regard to the number of hours during which they can be employed. The report shows that the retail stores constitute the largest employers of women. The chief objections to be met in store work are due to overtime work during the holiday season and in the long hours every Saturday throughout the greater part of the year.

The Christmas season brings to the hearts of most of our citizens very definitely a feeling of rest and happiness, but there is one class of people to whom it brings feelings of tremendous strain and overwork and suffering, and those are the people who work in the stores and meet the great increase in the demand on the employees which comes during the holiday season. It is perfectly practicable to meet this demand by increasing the number of employees in the stores, and it has been done successfully by employers in my own State, which I called to the attention of the chairman a few moments ago. This is not done, and apparently it will not be done, here unless the employers are in some way forced to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. You think unless the employers are in some way forced to do it, it will not be done?

Mr. PETERS. I do. Approximately 70 per cent of all the women examined by the investigator who were employed in the stores of the District of Columbia worked overtime during the week before Christmas; approximately 69 per cent of those examined who worked overtime at Christmas were employed 70 hours or over during that week. Thirty-one per cent of this number worked from 75 to 80 hours. It is therefore evident that by far a greater proportion of the women workers in the stores are subjected to a tremendous hardship a short time before Christmas. This investigation further showed that the hours of some of these employees were from 14 to 15 hours on the day before Christmas.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Where was that?

Mr. PETERS. In the District of Columbia. The detailed information gathered by this investigation, and which will be included in this report, has not been published, but I have a good deal of it here. During this Christmas rush, Mr. Chairman, that the women were working over time 31 per cent of them were working about 75 hours a week, while the men in the employ of the Government were still protected in their 8-hour day.

The other characteristic objection in the retail stores is in regard to the long hours on Saturday, and this report shows that 58 per cent of the employees who were examined by the investigator worked from 11 to 12 hours every Saturday in the year except a short time during the summer. It may also be of interest to know that of 2,670 girls in these department stores in the District the largest single group, constituting 16.7 per cent of the whole, received from \$4 to \$5 for their work. Of 193 personally scheduled and reporting as working over time, 91.7 per cent got no extra pay for this work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You mean they received four or five dollars a week?

Mr. PETERS. Yes, sir; that was the pay of the largest single group, constituting 16 per cent of the whole.

The manufacturing and mercantile establishments, according to the last census, employed 828 women in the District of Columbia. On the whole, their condition, so far as I learn from this report, seems to be rather good. Fifty-five and one-tenth per cent of the 147 women scheduled work from 48 to 51 hours a week. On the other hand it was found that 40 per cent of those reporting overtime to the examiner worked on an average from 65 to 75 hours, and 32 per cent from 60 to 64 hours. I wish to add that in laundries 47.7 per cent of the women scheduled in this report worked 55 to 59 hours per week. Fifty-four and five-tenths per cent of these women work 10 hours per day for at least four days in the week. In the busy season, 44.7 per cent of the women reporting overtime were employed 12 hours per day. It must be kept in mind that this law will not affect employment where the hours are reasonable, and it is only aimed at those instances where there are excessive hours and where they will continue to be excessive until the employer is compelled by legislation to give his people proper conditions.

It is only fair to the employer, Mr. Chairman, to say that there are mercantile establishments which do give their employees proper consideration, and it may be assumed that they are therefore at a

disadvantage with their less scrupulous and less enlightened competitors.

The other main division of women employed in the District of Columbia includes those in hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous establishments. Here the chief abuse lies in the seven-day week, with little or no recreation. The report shows that about one-third of these women had a maximum day of 12 hours though the normal day was shorter. The particular abuse which exists is the fact that the employment continues every day in the week. I need not take up the time of the committee to any great extent; because there are numbers of people here who wish to contribute the benefit of their judgment and experience to the committee this morning, people from different parts of the country, many of them known personally and all by reputation, and whose study and work on the problems involved in the employment of women and children are far greater and their experience far more extended than mine. I wish to impress on the committee, however, the fact which I believe is the strongest one in favor of this bill—the fact that this District now stands in the unenviable position of being far behind the majority of the States of the Union in enacting legislation for the protection of women and children, and that we as Members of Congress, who have placed on us the responsibility for legislating for this District, should provide for it the best code of laws possible and the greatest protection for its citizens, not only in justice to them, but so that the laws of the District of Columbia can be pointed to with pride and will, in themselves, form a stimulus and encouragement to the enactment of laws of this kind in the various States.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you leave the discussion of this bill I would like to point out the fact that in section 1 you provide that the women and children shall not be permitted to work more than 8 hours in any one day, or more than 6 days, or more than 48 hours in any one week. In a recent investigation or hearing held by this committee it was shown that in certain occupations people were employed and kept on duty for from 14 to 16 hours per day, and yet in that 14 to 16 hours they were only required to work 7 or 8 hours per day, although they were on duty during the entire 14 or 16 hours. Now, might not that condition arise here in the hotel and restaurant service, where employees would be on duty for 14 or 16 hours and not be required to work more than 8 hours, and come within the provisions of this law. Do you not think the bill should be amended so as to make the 8 hours continuous, with, say an hour's intermission for lunch, and that the work must be performed within 9 hours from the beginning of the service?

Mr. PETERS. Well, Mr. Chairman, the provisions of the bill are that no female shall be employed or be permitted to work in any mill, factory, manufacturing or mechanical establishment or workshop, bakery, printing, clothing, dressmaking, or millinery establishment, or mercantile establishment, store, hotel, restaurant, office, or where any goods are sold or distributed, or by any express or transportation company, or in the transmission or distribution of telegraph or telephone messages, or merchandise, more than 8 hours in any one day, or more than 6 days, or more than 48 hours in any one week. I should be inclined to think that that wording would

cover that; certainly, I think, that your idea should be carried out most clearly.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose that in connection with the preparation and serving of breakfast that $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours were required, the same in connection with lunch, and the same in connection with dinner, you would then have $7\frac{1}{2}$ hours of actual work in the day.

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That, if continued for 6 days, will give you less than 48 hours of work, but those who are employed in that service would naturally have to be on duty in the interim between breakfast and lunch and between lunch and dinner although not engaged in actual work. They would practically be on duty the entire length of time. Now, this bill would not cover a condition of that kind, would it?

Mr. PETERS. Not unless the word "employ" would be construed to cover that, and that the detention of them in a hotel would amount to employment. I should think it would be doubtful; I should be inclined to think it would be better to add some provision to cover that.

The CHAIRMAN. Has it not been your experience that the courts in construing a bill of this kind construe it to give the least possible advantage to the workers which their construction can give?

Mr. PETERS. There are some very unfortunate interpretations of some of the labor legislation in regard to the hours of work.

Mr. ROUSE. I would suggest that the last appropriation bill for the Post Office Department provides for the number of hours of employees in that department, that they shall not be required to work more than 8 hours in any 24. That is right along this line.

Mr. GRAY. I just want to ask Mr. Peters if he makes any provision as to the smallest wage that is to be paid?

Mr. PETERS. There is no provision for a minimum wage.

Mr. GRAY. You leave that to be perfected by the contract between the parties?

Mr. PETERS. Yes. It was not thought desirable to put such a provision as that in the bill.

Mr. GRAY. You would not give them protection in the matter of the kind of contract that may be made; I mean, so far as wages are concerned?

Mr. PETERS. There would not be any protection as regards the amount of wages in this bill. This bill would affect purely the hours of labor.

Mr. GRAY. The wages to be determined by the contract of the parties?

Mr. PETERS. Yes. It was felt that that was a separate matter, and however desirable it might be, an attempt to add that to this bill would very seriously jeopardize its passage at this time.

Mr. GRAY. It would not be very much benefit if the compensation was reduced to meet the reduction in the hours of labor. The women would not be very much benefited in that way.

Mr. PETERS. I think that their compensation would be governed by demand and supply, on which this legislation would probably have little or no effect; for experience has shown that the reduction of hours from 9 to 8 has not been generally followed by a reduction in wages.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to state in that connection that, almost without exception, so far as organized labor is concerned, the reduction of hours has resulted in an increase of wages, and not in a reduction.

Mr. GRAY. That is where you have an organization.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That was due to the strength of the organization, to some extent.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to append to my remarks certain extracts from a recent book by Miss Josephine Goldmark, entitled "Fatigue and Efficiency," in support of the constitutionality of laws similar to the one proposed in the bill now pending.

THE "FREEDOM OF CONTRACT" THEORY.

It is a fact of common knowledge that after our Civil War, the fourteenth amendment of the Federal Constitution was adopted, and similar provisions in the State constitutions, declaring that "no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

The "freedom of contract" assumption has so vitally affected the very existence of the laws in which we are concerned that we may well glance at the six or seven most important decisions of superior courts on the subject handed down during the last 16 years, between 1895 and 1911.

The fallacy of this thesis has been of late so much discussed that it need not delay us long. It is coming to be recognized that since employees do not stand upon an equality in bargaining power with their employers the so-called "right" to contract for a day of any length is purely theoretical. The worker in fact obeys the compulsion of circumstance. No one can suppose that young women working in the box factories of Chicago, discussed in a previous chapter, need or desire to be protected in their "right" to labor overtime nine months in the year, or that women in laundries should be "free" to work 14 hours or more during several days of the week. They have, in fact, no choice or freedom in the matter. The alternative is to work or starve. To refuse means to be dismissed. Modern industry has reduced "freedom of contract" to a paper privilege, a mere figure of rhetoric.

The first Ritchie case.—Yet this was precisely the ground upon which the judges of the Illinois Supreme Court in 1895 declared invalid an Illinois 8-hour law for women employed in factories. In what is known as the first Ritchie case¹ they declared that the police power of the State did not sanction such an interference with the working hours of adult women. There was no "fair, just, and reasonable connection between such limitation and the public health, safety, or welfare proposed to be secured by it." Hence the law was declared unconstitutional, and for 13 years—until this decision was practically overruled by the United States Supreme Court in 1908—it retarded the movement for the protection of working women in all our States.

The case of Holden v. Hardy.—Curiously enough, three years after the decision in the Ritchie case, a law limiting men's hours of labor was carried to the Federal Supreme Court at Washington and was sustained.² This case involved the validity of the Utah law fixing an 8-hour day for men employed in mines and smelters. The court handed down a decision which has become almost a classic in its clear statement of the broad principles at issue. It is true that the employments regulated were clearly dangerous to the health, safety, and welfare. Therefore the limitation of hours was more obviously justifiable under the police power. Indeed, the court based its favorable decision on the fact that work in mines and smelters was not like ordinary employment, but that the operative was "* * * deprived of fresh air and sunlight and is subject to the foul atmosphere and a very high temperature, or to the influence of noxious gases."

But the judges dealt not only with the hazards of these employments. They struck a loftier note, which rises clear and strong above the technical argument. They were preoccupied with something larger than the single law in dispute. It was the State which figured before them—a congregate whole which was only as great as "the sum of all its parts." These parts, they said in

¹ *Ritchie v. People* (155 Ill., 98; 1895).

² *Holden v. Hardy* (165 U. S., 366; 1898).

stirring words, did not stand upon an equality with one another in the economic scale, and therein lay both the need and the justification of the State's intervention.

"But the fact that both parties are of full age, and competent to contract, does not necessarily deprive the State of the power to interfere, where the parties do not stand upon an equality, or where the public health demands that on party to the contract shall be protected against himself. The State still retains an interest in his welfare, however reckless he may be. The whole is no greater than the sum of all the parts, and when the individual health, safety, and welfare are sacrificed or neglected the State must suffer."

It is significant, as the court pointed out also in this decision, that such cases as the one at bar have not been brought by working people eager to secure their "right" to labor any number of hours, but by the employers, to whose advantage it is for them so to labor. "The argument," said the court, "would certainly come with better grace and better cogency from the other class."

These two decisions, then, set forth clearly the issue between personal liberty and the police power. In the Ritchie decision the judges set a theoretical freedom above concrete realities. In *Holden v. Hardy* the law appeared to be justified by its necessity.

In defending the cases which we have reviewed up to this point, the arguments and citations of the lawyers had been almost wholly confined to the purely legal aspects of those actions. Briefs of counsel had discussed in infinite detail the power. But the point at issue had, in fact, wholly shifted from relation between the fourteenth amendment and the police the State's abstract right to restrict individual rights to the practical necessity for every such restriction. The question was no longer abstract and legal, but rather in a deep sense social and medical. It followed that the purely legal defense of these laws was falling wide of the mark. It had long been unreasonable to expect that judges, trained in schools remote from factories and workshops, should be conversant with those underlying practices and conditions which alone could justly weight the scales. The men upon the bench needed for their guidance the empirical testimony of the working woman's physician, the factory inspector, and the economist. They needed, in a word, to know the facts.

The Oregon case and a new line of defense.—Such an opportunity offered in the very same year. A laundryman was arrested for violation of the Oregon law fixing a 10-hour day for women employed in factories and laundries. The validity of the law was affirmed by the Oregon courts, and in December, 1907, an appeal was taken to the United States Supreme Court at Washington. Here, then, was an opportunity to present the real issue to the highest court in the land, concerned for the first time in its history with a statute limiting the workday of adult women.

The document was made up from the accumulated mass of British and Continental factory inspectors' reports, commissions, and enquêtes, as well as the observations of medical men and economists. It was well received by the court, which in its decision upheld the validity of the Oregon law. Quoting from the new empirical evidence contained in the brief, the court stated that it "took judicial cognizance of all matters of general knowledge," thus in a single phrase warranting the new emphasis upon practical data.¹

The decision in the Oregon case was indeed no narrow victory. It was the most sweeping decision ever rendered by the Federal Supreme Court in relation to working hours. It was not confined to the consideration of the 10-hour day or to a working day of any particular length. It left to the States the liberty to determine what working hours were wholesome and reasonable. It went far beyond the statute at issue, which dealt with the employment of women in factories and laundries, and looked toward the protection of women in other employments. In a word, the highest court of the Nation rejected the fiction of the free contract as regards the working woman and declared that "her physical nature and the evil effects of overwork upon her and her future children justify legislation to protect her from the greed as well as the passion of men." The new method of defense had amply justified itself.

The second Ritchie case.—It was again to be put into practice and again to be justified in the following year (1909), immediately after the auspicious Oregon decision had in principle reversed the earlier Ritchie decision of the Illinois Supreme Court. The way was now open for laws protecting women from overwork, and many States enacted such legislation. Among others, the Illinois

¹ See pt. 2, p. 558.

Legislature of 1909 provided a 10-hour day for women employed in laundries and factories. Hence, 14 years after the first Ritchie decision a new law was carried up to the Illinois Supreme Court for its adjudication.¹

A wholly new bench of judges were sitting in the case. The widespread public curiosity throughout Illinois as to the outcome of this case bore witness to a new recognition of the large issues at stake, not only to women in industry, but to the State. The court in sustaining the 10-hour law was not deterred as the same court had been 14 years before by the freedom of contract theory. All that body of "general knowledge" which the Federal judges had taken into cognizance was again admitted to carry its due weight. In a single illuminating sentence the Illinois court also responded to the new emphasis upon the substantial and substantiated facts, remarking "what we know as men we can not profess to be ignorant of as judges."

THE DISTINCTIONS OF SEX.

Now, among these facts known to all men and presented to the court were the ill effects of industrial speeding, strain, and the like, upon working women, qua women. Their physical organization, the greater morbidity of working women compared with men in the same occupations, and the dependence of future generations upon the health of women—all had been dwelt upon to justify the legal restriction of their hours. This was because the earlier decisions overthrowing the validity of women's labor laws had denied any special protection to women "on the mere fact of sex." Women were citizens; hence their contractual powers could not be disturbed. Indeed, the New York Court of Appeals went so far as to say in the face of civilized precedent that "an adult woman is not to be regarded * * * in any other light than the man is regarded when the question relates to the business pursuit or calling."

This specious argument and the alleged impossibility of differentiating between men and women was, indeed, long an obstacle in the way of securing women's laws. Thus in England between 1874 and 1901 the factory acts were in the main opposed by an important wing of the women's rights party. Superficially viewed, the great movement to obtain for women in all fields rights from which they have been debarred, might appear inconsistent with the efforts to protect one sex as contrasted with the other. But this is a fundamental misconception. It ignores the fact that protection of health has never been held a bar to the efficiency of men as citizens.

It has yet to be suggested, for instance, that the miners of 13 States—Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming—are discriminated against because the State restricts their working hours to 8 in 1 day² for the explicit purpose of protecting the health of its citizens. It has yet to be suggested that the interstate railroad telegraphers are less valuable as citizens than any other men because Congress in 1907 restricted their work to 13 hours by day and 9 hours by night. This statute and similar restrictions in many States were enacted nominally to safeguard the traveling public. But its only excuse for being is the effect of excessive hours upon the operative's efficiency. These restrictions upon men's working hours have never interfered with their value or dignity as citizens. Why, then, should similar restrictions—wider and more inclusive for women—operate against their dignity or value as citizens? Their physical endowments and special functions make the protection of their health even more necessary than the protection of men's health; they need even more than men the legislative protection which, as Justice Brewer said in the Oregon case, "is designed to compensate for some of the burdens which rest upon" them.

It is true that, as we have seen, the restriction of men's hours of labor has been upheld by the courts only when the occupations sought to be regulated are manifestly dangerous to health, such as mines and smelters, or where public safety is directly concerned, as in railroading. Yet in so far as prohibition of excessive hours for men has been justified by dangers resulting to their health and efficiency, the argument for more inclusive women's laws is precisely similar.

¹ Ritchie & Co., v. Waymann (244 Ill., 509, 1910).

² Ten hours in 1 day in Maryland, applying to Allegany and Garrett Counties.

STATEMENT OF MISS MAUD YOUNGER, OF SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman. I now desire to present to the committee Miss Maud Younger, of California.

The CHAIRMAN. Please state for the record your name and address.

Miss YOUNGER: Maud Younger, 2008 Lyon Street, San Francisco.

The 8-hour law for woman took effect in California on the 21st of May, 1911. Since then 20 months have elapsed, and upon the ground of actual experience we can now say with Mark Twain that the objections to this measure are all in the nature of prophecies which have never come true when tried, for many objections were raised, and dire disaster was prophesied should the 8-hour bill become law.

First, there was the objection to giving the women 1 day's rest in 7. This objection came from those enterprises which were in operation every day in the year, as telegraph, telephone, and transportation companies, and hotels which said "Our guests eat 7 days in the week," and condensed-milk factories which cried, "Cows give milk on Sunday as well as week days." But since the law has gone into effect all these enterprises have been able to adjust themselves by the simple method of employing one extra relief girl to every six previously employed; that is, she relieves A on Monday, B on Tuesday, C on Wednesday, and so on. Consequently it is merely a question of expense due to the employment of additional women.

Then there were other employers who did not object to the 6-day week, but to the 8-hour day. First came the retail merchants. They said their stores were open from 8 in the morning until 6 at night, or 10 hours a day. However, since the passage of the bill they have been able to adjust themselves to the law by having part of their force work from 8 in the morning until 5 in the afternoon and part from 9 until 6, with 1 hour for lunch.

The laundries also objected to the 8-hour day, though not to the 48-hour week. They said that on Monday morning the drivers collect the wash, so that the girls did not come until noon, which necessitated longer hours on other days. Since the law has gone into effect, however, they have been able to adjust themselves by having the girls come on Mondays at noon and work until 9 at night, with 1 hour for supper. The San Francisco laundries incidentally already had a 48-hour week, owing to the union; but the workers said it had cost them 11 weeks' strike and \$60,000. They thought that an 8-hour day through legislation would be simpler and more economical, also far less inconvenient to the public in general.

Then it was objected to that there was no provision for overtime or rush seasons. On this subject a little cracker packer spoke at the public hearing in our State senate.

She told of her work, 9 hours a day, standing at the end of a canvas chute down which the crackers came so fast that she had to pack, pack, without turning her head—pack without moving aside unless some one were there to replace her or the crackers would go all over the floor. Then sometimes, after the day's work was over and there were rush orders, she must work overtime, 2 or 3 hours perhaps. She said that though the girls were paid for overtime they would rather give up the extra pay than to have the wear and strain that

resulted from the extra work. She said that the day after they were so tired that even shorter hours could not make up for the strain under which they filled the rush orders. A short time after the law went into effect I met this same girl on the street and asked how the law was working. She said the girls practically did as much in the 8 hours as they had previously done in 9, because they were so much fresher when they went to work in the morning. She said also that there was no difficulty in filling the rush orders.

Then, it was objected that there was no provision for special seasons. Here came the department stores again, with their Christmas season when they remain open at night. However, they have been able to adjust themselves to this law by having part of their force come at noon or at 1 and remain until 10 in the evening, with 1 or 2 hours for supper. The owner of one department store told me that though this involved an additional expense, that the eight-hour law had proved very satisfactory, owing to the greater efficiency of the girls. He said that previously, under the long hours, the girls had broken down and it had been necessary to replace them and to train new girls during the terrible holiday rush, but that, under the eight-hour law, every girl had remained at her post throughout the entire season, and the law had thus been of benefit to the merchants themselves. In a letter which Mr. Harris Weinstock, one of our best known merchants, wrote while the bill was before our legislature, he said: "In some of the mercantile enterprises in which I am interested we have been working on an eight-hour basis for women with every satisfaction to them and to ourselves. If the eight-hour day in mercantile establishments is made a common condition in California, including the Christmas holiday season, it will work no hardship upon the employer, it will be a blessing to the woman worker, and will tend to make for a higher degree of efficiency on her part."

Then came other trades with other seasons. The candy men claimed three seasons—Christmas, Easter, and the Fourth of July. Each trade seemed to have a special season, and each predicted calamity should the bill become a law.

However, notwithstanding all the opposition, and this bill was the hardest fought of the entire session, public sentiment was so strong that the bill went through with only five dissenting votes in the entire legislature. Since it has become a law the opponents have adapted themselves very readily to the change. I have talked with many of them—owners of department stores, hotel men, manufacturers—and they have all said that the law was not at all terrible, as they supposed it would be, and they would not again oppose it.

It was also objected, in behalf of the girls themselves, that wages would be reduced. I have asked very generally, but have found only two or three instances of this kind. One was a girl who had stood behind a counter nine hours a day for three days a week and the other three days she had worked from 8 in the morning until 11 at night. For this she had received \$9 a week. After the law went into effect I asked if her wages had been reduced and she said, "Oh, yes; a dollar a week; but I don't mind; I'm glad to give up the extra pay for the sake of the shorter hours."

Then it was objected that women would be replaced by men. We see, however, that the only adjustment that has been necessary since the law went into effect has not been the displacing of women,

but rather the employment of more. This has meant an additional expense, but we know that the expense in the end is not borne by the employers, but by the public; and it is an expense which we in California bear very willingly for the sake of a healthier, happier womanhood. This greater expense is, moreover, made up to a large extent by the greater efficiency of the girls.

This eight-hour law has been upheld by the Supreme Court of California. The decision was unanimous. The test case was that of a hotel waitress. Now, it has been proved by means of a pedometer that a waitress who works 10 hours a day walks 10 miles a day. In some hotels there were girls working 12 and 14 hours, yet I believe the United States Government allows its mules to walk only 13 miles a day.

I am going to close by taking you into a hotel. In this case it is in the laundry of one of the large hotels of southern California. It is the 22d of March, 1911, eight days after the bill, having passed the legislature, had reached the governor. The girls were working in the laundry 14 hours a day. As they passed the irons wearily over the clothes they discussed the bill, with its prospects of relief. They said, "No; the governor won't sign it. They'll never let him. Its too much to hope for." And they worked on hopelessly. Suddenly the door opened. A girl burst in, waving an afternoon newspaper and shouting, "Girls, he's signed it, he's signed it! The eight-hour bill is law." At once there was pandemonium. The girls laughed and sang and danced and shouted. Suddenly some one cried, "Look at Julia and Nellie! They've fainted!" Yes; they had fainted. The relief, so longed for, so hardly expected, had come, and coming, overwhelmed them. They had dropped at their posts.

Now, it had been objected that the women themselves opposed the passage of this bill, but there were scenes of this kind throughout California when the eight-hour day became law.

These laundry girls had worked 14 hours a day, but I am going to close with the words of one girl who had worked only 9. She said, "You don't know what that extra hour means to me. Why, I never knew what heaven was until we got the eight-hour law."

MR. BUCHANAN. You stated that in one case there had been a reduction in wages of \$1 a week?

MISS YOUNGER. Yes.

MR. BUCHANAN. What was the salary?

MISS YOUNGER. The salary had been nine and it was reduced to eight.

THE CHAIRMAN. In section 2 of this bill it is provided that no female under 18 years of age shall be employed or permitted to work in any of the establishments named in section 1 before the hour of 7 o'clock in the morning or after the hour of 6 o'clock in the evening. I understand from your statement that some of these establishments in California have adjusted themselves to the conditions under the new law there by having some of their employees come at noon, or in the afternoon, and remain until 8 or 9 o'clock in the evening, as the case may be. Does the law in California exclude the employment of females under 18 years of age after six o'clock in the evening?

MISS YOUNGER. No; it does not.

The CHAIRMAN. Consequently, they would not be required to employ after 6 o'clock in the evening, in adjusting themselves to the requirements of the new law, women more than 18 years of age; they might employ younger persons than under your law?

Miss YOUNGER. Yes. There was no prohibition of night work at all, but I believe that most of the girls, except the cash girls in the department stores, are over 18 years of age. Certainly those in the laundries.

Mr. PETERS. You approve of this provision in section 2?

Miss YOUNGER. Yes, sir.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. FLORENCE KELLEY, OF NEW YORK, N. Y.,
REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL CONSUMERS' LEAGUE.**

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Kelley has come from New York to talk about this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Give your name and address for the record.

Mrs. KELLEY. Florence Kelley. My address is 106 East Nineteenth Street, New York City; general secretary of the National Consumers' League.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to one objection which I think is quite sure to be made before the discussion ends and the bill is adopted and signed. It is one that we have heard in every State in regard to legislation like this, namely, that where one State or district goes rather far ahead of the adjacent territory in legislation such as this there is a danger of driving valuable industries away. For instance, it may be asserted that they might move from here into West Virginia or Maryland, or other places which have not the eight-hour day for women and girls. We always meet that objection, and I wish to forestall it. There is in the District of Columbia no considerable amount of manufacturing, and the employment of women here is chiefly in industries which, in the nature of things, can not move away, such as hotels, telephone service, laundries, and stores; nearly all the industries which are characteristic of the District of Columbia would be obliged to stay where the people are whom they serve, whether the working day is eight hours, as the Government guarantees to its employees, or whether it is unlimited. I ask attention also to an objection raised here which, I think, is covered in the bill. That is as to the detention of women for a long period of hours, even though they are actively occupied only a part of the time. I think that is covered in the text of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. We would be glad to have you point it out.

Mrs. KELLEY. On page 3, section 5. [Reading:]

SEC. 5. That every employer shall post and keep posted in a conspicuous place in every room in any establishment or occupation named in section one of this act in which any females are employed a printed notice stating the number of hours such females are required or permitted to work on each day of the week, the hours of beginning and stopping such work, and the hours of beginning and ending the recess allowed for meals. The printed form of such notice shall be furnished by the inspectors authorized by this act. The employment of any such female for a longer time in any day than that stated in the printed notice shall be deemed a violation of the provisions of this section. The presence of any such female on the premises at any other hours than those stated in the printed notice shall constitute prima facie evidence of a violation of this section. Where the nature of the business makes it impracticable to fix the recess

allowed for meals at the same time for all females employed, the inspectors authorized to enforce this act may issue a permit dispensing with the posting of the hours when the recess allowed for meals begins and ends, and requiring only the posting of the total number of hours which females are required or permitted to work on each day of the week and the hours of beginning and stopping such work. Such permit shall be kept by such employer upon such premises and exhibited to all inspectors authorized to enforce this act.

That is taken from the statute of Massachusetts and other States which regulate working hours. It has been found possible to enforce the provision that the employees shall only be there while they are actively engaged in work. It puts the burden of proof on the employer to show that.

The CHAIRMAN. Under this provision it would be simply up to the employer to furnish evidence that they were not employed during that period. It would not be conclusive; simply prima facie evidence that they were not thus employed?

Mrs. KELLEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, take the instance which I cited in my question to Mr. Peters, a hotel employee working for $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours in the preparation and serving of breakfast, $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours in the preparation and serving of lunch, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours in the preparation and serving of dinner; there you have $7\frac{1}{2}$ hours all told, but there is an interim between breakfast and lunch and dinner, that, taken in connection with the $7\frac{1}{2}$ hours, makes the number of hours very much greater than these $7\frac{1}{2}$ seemingly working hours. Now, if the women who performed that service in the hotels, in the kitchens, in the dining rooms for a longer period than $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours on each of those occasions it would be prima facie evidence that the proprietor was violating the law; but suppose he does not allow them to remain on the premises in the interim. They must hold themselves in readiness just the same to be there at a specified time, so that, while not on the premises, they would be practically on duty from the beginning of the preparation of breakfast until the closing of the serving of dinner. In the practical application of this clause, which you say is taken from the Massachusetts and New York law, do you find it actually protects the girls against a condition of that kind, so far as your observation goes?

Mrs. KELLEY. So far as our observation goes, it does.

The CHAIRMAN. Your observation is that it does?

Mrs. KELLEY. I would like to call your attention to another thing. We have tried to incorporate in this bill only those things which have been tested by experience. The primary provision, the restriction of working hours to eight, has been held constitutional by the Supreme Court of Washington and the Supreme Court of California and has just been adopted by a large majority vote in a referendum in Colorado.

If experience should show that this particular clause is defective, it can be remedied later.

In drafting a bill with relation to working hours of women we always suggest its contents under the shadow of the courts; and our great desire in this case, since we aim at model law in the District of Columbia, is to have only those things which have been tested by experience.

I hesitate to urge the committee to put in a provision which was taken direct from a Federal law with regard to postal employees.

because Congress can draft a law for those employees in any way it sees fit. In regard to private contracts it seems safer to stay within the limits of those provisions which have been upheld as the general restriction of hours has been upheld by the Federal courts and the other provisions by the State courts.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think it would make the bill very much stronger, without making any greater chance of being thrown out by the court, if the bill specifically stated that eight hours should constitute a day's work and that 8 hour's work must be performed within 9 hours in the 24, thereby allowing for the usual hour for lunch and obviating the possibility of this intervening or lapsed time between portions of the day's work?

Mrs. KELLEY. If we had any precedent in which the court had sustained that provision in regard to private contracts between private parties, I should be glad to have it put in.

Other suggestions in regard to the bill can be better made by Miss Goldmark.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to ask Miss Younger a question in regard to the amount of wages. You referred to one case where there had been a reduction of wages, due to the reduction of hours. Do you know of any other case where wages were reduced on account of the reduction of hours?

Miss YOUNGER. There were two or three other cases, but they were arbitrary. The day the eight-hour law went into effect certain manufacturers arbitrarily reduced wages. It was usually where there was just extra work and they had not given the girls an opportunity to see whether they could do as much.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There has been no general reduction of wages; it is rather the exception to the rule?

Miss YOUNGER. It is very exceptional.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I simply wanted the information as a matter of record.

STATEMENT OF MISS JOSEPHINE GOLDMARK.

Mr. PETERS. The next witness I wish to present is Miss Josephine Goldmark.

The CHAIRMAN. Miss Goldmark, give your name and address to the stenographer.

Miss GOLDMARK. Josephine Goldmark; 106 East Nineteenth Street, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. Kelley spoke, in passing, of the various decisions of the courts holding this legislation for women to be constitutional, and I think the committee might like to have brought to its attention what the decisions of the courts have been in regard to the constitutionality of measures, such as the one which has been suggested here.

I hardly need draw your attention to the fact that it is now five years since the Federal Supreme Court, the United States Supreme Court here in Washington, upheld an Oregon measure limiting the hours of labor of women. It was the first time that question had ever been brought to the United States Supreme Court. There had been a previous case in which the Supreme Court of Illinois had held this kind of legislation unconstitutional as an infringement upon women's freedom of contract. The Supreme Court here at

Washington considered the question carefully and handed down a decision which has become classic, holding that the special physical burdens of women and the need of preserving the health of women for the sake of the Nation gave States the right, under their police powers, to enact legislation protecting women from excessive hours or labor. The court said that this question affects not only the women themselves, but affects the welfare of the whole Nation—to preserve working women from being exhausted by too long hours. That was in the year 1908, in the case of *Muller v. The State of Oregon*.

Since then the supreme courts of other States have upheld the constitutionality of similar laws. Illinois was the next State to consider the question, and it is of great interest to find the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois in the year 1911 entirely reversing the decision of the same court which had passed upon a similar measure 14 years before. Following this decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Oregon case, the Illinois Supreme Court also held a similar measure constitutional, saying, "What we know as men we can not profess to be ignorant of as judges." They said that the excessive hours of labor in factories and stores and laundries undoubtedly injured the health of women, and they declared the law constitutional, as a valid exercise of the police powers of the State. Since that there has been similar cases in Michigan and Ohio, and the Supreme Courts of those States are on record also as upholding legislation of this kind.

These laws provide for somewhat longer hours than the bill now before you provides, but within the last year both the Supreme Courts of California and Washington have upheld the constitutionality of eight-hour laws, as Mr. Peters has pointed out, similar to the bill under consideration at present. In both cases the decision of the United States Supreme Court was again followed, and the decisions both specifically said that it was within the police power to safeguard the health of its women in this way.

In regard to the need for this protection, as far as some of the department stores are concerned, there is no doubt that the physical hardship which women and girls suffer who work in department stores has not been recognized. The physical strain is much greater than is popularly supposed. The long hours which the women and girls are required to stand are particularly injurious to health, and the standing is practically continuous during the rush season. During these seasons the girls have not an opportunity to sit down except for a very short break, which is not at all sufficient to compensate for the strain of the long day. The Government report on laundries, which was published as a part of the Federal investigation of women wage earners in 1910 and 1911, showed the excessive strain on health in that employment. The women not only have long hours of work, but they suffer from the heavy physical strain that is inevitable in using laundry machinery, which involves great physical effort. The "body ironing" machines, where a heavy tread is necessary for each operation of the machine, is particularly harmful. This hard physical labor and the long hours which prevail in laundries are undoubtedly dangerous to health.

If the committee should wish, I should be glad to furnish them with a copy of my book called "Fatigue and Efficiency," which

brings out these points in regard to the strain on health, and brings out also various points in regard to the increase in efficiency under shorter hours. It is not a matter of theory; it has been proved in establishments where careful records have been kept giving the output under long hours and under the eight-hour day. Unfortunately, only a few such careful records have been kept in this country. They have been more carefully kept abroad, and where they have been kept they show that after a short period of adjustment efficiency has been increased with shorter working hours and the amount of the output has gone up. It is a matter of getting a better result from the workers in the shorter period. The book also goes into these questions of the constitutionality of the labor laws which I have just briefly reviewed.

The CHAIRMAN. We would be pleased to have you leave the book with us, Miss Goldmark.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Could we not have those parts containing the matters spoken of by Miss Goldmark made a part of the hearings?

The CHAIRMAN. That would necessitate some one going through the book and making a selection of the parts that should be used.

Mr. PETERS. I will be responsible for that, and Miss Goldmark and I can go over it together, and I can incorporate such parts of it in my remarks.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think it will be of great value.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do that, Mr. Peters. If there is no objection, then, that course will be pursued.

Mr. PETERS. It has just been brought to my attention that the House meets at 11 o'clock, and it is now considerably past that hour, and I will ask the next witnesses to be as brief as possible.

The next witness will be Dr. George M. Kober, a professor in the medical department of Georgetown University, of this city.

STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE M. KOBER, PROFESSOR OF HYGIENE, MEDICAL DEPARTMENT, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I will now present to the committee Dr. George M. Kober, of this city.

The CHAIRMAN. Please give your full name and position and address to the stenographer.

Dr. KOBER. George M. Kober; professor of hygiene, medical department, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

As a teacher of hygiene, I am very much interested, especially from the standpoint of health, in the bill which is now before you. I feel that we have been somewhat negligent in safeguarding the health of our working classes practically all over the world. This especially applies to the safeguarding of the health of our working women, many of whom are destined to be the mothers of the future citizenship of this country. Upon their physical vigor the vigor of the Nation must necessarily depend.

Efforts are being made, in recent years, to safeguard the health of the workmen, and very properly. I have advocated in a textbook on industrial hygiene the eight-hour working day, from the standpoint of hygiene and for reasons that have already been given to you by Miss Goldmark.

I believe that the enactment of such a law will result not only in benefit to the laboring classes, but also increase his efficiency and output and thus benefit the employers. After all, we are only human machines, capable of doing so much work, and work performed beyond the point of endurance will greatly impair our efficiency. There can be no question about that. Most of the accidents that occur occur as the results of overstrain and fatigue.

I was so much impressed with the absolute brutality and excessive hours of labor for women that I requested, as chairman of the section of industrial hygiene, of the Fifteenth International Congress of Hygiene, held here last fall, Dr. Rosalie Slaughter Morton, of New York, to present a paper on the "Effects of industrial strain upon the health of working women," and as it is a comparatively brief paper I commend it to your favorable consideration, as it points out very clearly the injurious effects of overwork.

It does not require much expert medical testimony to convince you of these evil effects. You can see the effects of overstrain even in the department stores where the labor is presumed to be light, and certainly it is light as compared with many other occupations, but when you observe the physical conditions of the women engaged there, you will be impressed with the fact that their health is by no means robust. They do not compare with the average farm girls, who, as you know, work probably considerably over eight hours a day, but there is a great difference in the physical environment. They are engaged in an outdoor occupation with pure air and sunshine, whereas the industrial workers are confined in an atmosphere often vitiated by products of combustion and respiration, insufficient ventilation, and defective lighting, and of course such an environment is calculated to seriously affect the physical welfare of the operatives.

The CHAIRMAN. Doctor, in that connection, the tendency of our industrial system is to specialize, is to have the same individual performing the same operations continuously from one year's end to the other. Have you given any attention to the physical effect, both as to the special development or abnormal development of certain muscles brought about by the specialization and the effect upon the nervous system, of continuously doing the same thing in an occupation? What is the effect upon the nervous system?

Dr. KOBER. I should say that the excessive use of certain groups of muscles or nerves is bound to lead to a breakdown sooner or later. That is illustrated by the frequent occurrence of telegraphers' and typewriters' cramp; and many other so-called fatigue nervoses, which are entirely the result of the excessive use of certain groups of muscles in the arms and hands and also of special senses, as in the numerous affections developed in telephone operators. Then again the monotony of certain work results in a great deal of wear and tear to the nervous system; although the machine performers most often work symptoms of fatigue appear earlier than when individuals are engaged in work where they have to go through more or less of a mental operation and where the work is not so mechanical.

I am simply here to make a strong plea for the enactment of the bill, and I want to say that if the Congress of the United States enacts such a bill as is presented here they will do more for true

womanhood and motherhood in the United States than by the enactment of any measure that has ever been presented before you.

EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIAL STRAIN ON THE WORKING WOMAN.

[By Rosalie Slaughter Morton, M. D., New York City. Read before Section IV, International Congress of Hygiene.]

In reviewing the literature on the hygiene of occupations, I have been interested to observe that much of the most able and comprehensive work has been done by women, and also that physician have given much gratuitous time to an analytical study of this subject.¹

What has been done shows the great desirability of the appointment, under a national department of health, of a commission to make a systematic study of industries and their various forms of strain on normal women of different ages and types. Such a study would involve the detailed consideration of modifying factors which are necessary in order that accurate deductions may be made from statistics. For instance, present records show a high percentage of tuberculosis among both men and women working in tobacco. Unquestionably they are affected by the irritation of dust and fumes which render them susceptible to various derangements, especially bronchial catarrh, which lessens their resistance to tuberculosis; but, on the other hand, stripping, sorting leaves, rolling stogies, and so on, is not as strenuous as some other form of work; so many who already have tuberculosis seek employment in tobacco factories.

The available data on a number of trades show the value to the business and social welfare of the world, as well as to the individual, of wisely conducted industry, for, to become truly constructive to the state, it must be profitable both to employer and employee.

The regulation of work to an eight-hour day has proved necessary for men, in order that they may retain their efficiency, and such regulation of hours for women is equally necessary. Shorter hours and fairer pay would lessen the effects of industrial strain upon the working women, both individually and eugenically, to an extent which would raise the health and efficiency of our race at least 70 per cent. Factory and other nondomestic industry is not in itself a menace to women; in fact, in many instances a woman's physical and mental health is better when she is engaged in a regular and impersonal form of work.

Statistics from insane asylums and life insurance companies show that a higher percentage of insane come from the class of domestics and housewives than from women in trades and professions, and that longevity among women has increased during the last 25 years. Most of the women who break down from work do so from causes which are in no way related to sex. In gathering information for this paper, I found that the average of temporary illnesses in three New York department stores shows that the number of employees who seek relief in the hospitals located in the stores is divided between men and women in about equal ratio to those employed. Of the women patients, approximately one-third suffer from headache, one-third from indigestion and miscellaneous ailments, and only one-third have menstrual disorders, making a very small proportion out of the total number of employees. For instance, in a store which employs 3,000 women, there will average not more than 10 a day who come to the rest room or hospital for a few hours on account of dysmennorrhœa. In one of the stores, which employs approximately 3,500 women, the nurse who had been in attendance for 8 years said that she knew of only 15 cases of permanent pelvic trouble brought on by work in the store. In one store, which is situated at the junction of several surface and elevated street car lines, the daily attendance in the store hospital is double that of a store in a more quiet location. The ventilation of the former store is also poorer than in the latter. The proportion of those who suffer from dysmennorrhœa is larger in the store which is not so well ventilated and which is noisier, showing that general hygiene has its effect upon a woman's health during her period. A point which is often overlooked when statements are made regarding the endurance of women as a class is that their lower wages do not enable them to purchase such sustaining food as men customarily have. For instance, the average amount paid for their lunch by women in shops, factories, and clerical positions is 15 cents; the average paid by men in the same lines of work is 30 cents. The con-

¹ See appended list of references.

sequent lack of nutrition in a very short time lessens the endurance of women workers. Among the 3,800 employees in the head office of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. absences on account of illness have been conspicuously reduced since the company has provided a substantial lunch for them, and a similar result has followed this wise economic step taken by other employers.

On the general subject of hygiene in relation to industry, many significant deductions may be made which apply to women workers in their homes, in colleges, in professions, in shops, and in factories, showing that their endurance, capacity, and output are influenced by mental and physical hygiene rather than by sex. The papers which have been or will be read before this congress direct intensive thought toward many details of industrial strain which are applicable as much to the working woman as to the working man; in fact, according to the schedules of the Twelfth Census (1900), we find women in 295 out of the 303 separate employments there tabulated. The general headings given are: Agricultural, professional service, domestic and personal service, trade and transportation, manufacturing and mechanical pursuits. The eight employments in which no women are recorded are: Soldiers of the United States, (2) sailors of the United States, and (3) marines of the United States, (4) street car drivers (though two women are reported as motormen), (5) firemen (in the fire department), (6) apprentices and helpers to roofers and slaters, (7) helpers to steam boiler makers, and (8) helpers to brass workers.

It may be of passing interest and, perhaps, a surprise to note that a limited number of women were registered in unusual occupations; 5 women were employed as pilots on steam railroads, 5 as baggagemen, 31 as brakemen, 7 as conductors, 35 as engineers and firemen, and 26 as switchmen, yardmen, and flagmen; 6 women were reported as ship's carpenters, and as many as 181 were reported as blacksmiths, and 508 as machinists; 8 as boiler makers, 31 as charcoal, coke, and lime burners, and 11 as well borers.

The laws, or lack of them, for the protection of women's health and the occupation in which women suffer from lack of fresh air or proper light, too great heat or cold, speeding up, inhalation of irritating dust and gases, etc., and the effects of these various forms of industry, have been so comprehensively presented to you that anything I might say would be in large part a repetition; therefore, I will confine my paper to the especial effect upon women of trades which involve prolonged and unnecessary standing, the pushing of heavy trucks from room to room, as in the larger canneries; the constant carrying of heavy weights, as core makers in foundries, who carry trays of sand cases weighing from 10 to 50 pounds from work benches to ovens; or operating machinery by treadle pressure, with incessant kicking, as in a case cited by Dr. Caroline Hedger, where, in assembling screw drivers, a girl kicked 7,000 times a day with one foot. Violent treadle pressure, as in button-stamping machines, perforating presses in binderies, and the laundry cuff press, is especially harmful to women.

In order to push or carry a heavy weight it is necessary to forcibly inflate the lungs and rigidly fix the diaphragm. This increases interabdominal tension, and will eventually lead to prolapsus, antiversion, antiflexion, retroversion, or retroflexion of the uterus. The fatigue consequent upon continuous heavy muscular effort causes a relaxation of the ligaments which support the uterus, and, as the organ is situated in the pelvis with the heavy end up, when the ligaments lack tone the force of gravity tends toward misplacement. Normally the uterus is well balanced by the round and the broad ligaments on each side, the sacro-uterine behind, and the vesico-uterine ligaments in front, and is to some extent supported by the vagina.

According to the investigation of Elizabeth Beardsley Butler, in Pittsburgh, in 1907-8, prolonged standing as customary in most departments of cracker factories, laundries, dyeing and cleaning establishments, metal works, lamp and glass factories, mirror, broom, cork, paper-box, soap, and trunk factories, in some pressrooms, and in most mercantile houses. This standing for long hours may tend toward uterine misplacements, as indicated above. Then, too, the fatigue of the nerves of the back bears directly upon the uterine nerve supply, which is derived from the second, third, and fourth sacro-spinal nerves, and from branches of the hypogastric (sympathetic) plexus; this not only causes local but reflex symptoms which impair the functions of other parts of the body. The numerous occupations which, on the other hand, require the employee to be seated for hours in one position have an especially deleterious effect upon a woman's health by tending to overfull bladder, constipation, and pelvic congestion. The uterus is placed between the bladder and the lower end of the large

intestine which passes above and back of the uterus, and the straining caused by difficult defecation produces at least 50 per cent of downward misplacement of the uterus, with all its attendant discomfort, and the frequent necessity of spending several weeks in a hospital. Constant overloading of the rectum causes pressure on many of the 28 blood vessels in the pelvis and interferes with the return of venous blood, thereby causing congestion and possible inflammation of the ovaries, Fallopian tubes, uterus, and vagina, which means oftentimes invalidism, sterility, habitual miscarriages, or lifelong misery.

Dr. Ely Van der Warker has called attention to the fact that the shape of the knee, the shallowness of the pelvis, and the delicate construction of the foot of a woman render her inadequate for continuous standing for 8 or 10 hours. He calls attention to the "smallness of the patella and the narrowness of the articular surfaces of the tibia and femur. The lateral prominences of both bones are more developed in man, and therefore his knee joint helps to form a more perfect sustaining column. In a woman the muscles which keep the body fixed upon the thighs in the erect position labor under the disadvantage of shortness of purchase owing to the short distance, compared to that of a man, between the crest of the ilium and the greater trochanter of the femur, thus giving to men a much larger purchase in the leverage existing between the trunk and the extremities; and, comparatively, the woman's foot is less able to sustain weight than the man's, owing to its shortness and the more delicate formation of the tarsal and metatarsal bones." It must, however, be borne in mind that this is somewhat offset by the fact that the average weight of a woman's body is less than the average weight of a man's, and that the feet of European and American women have increased in size with their greater use.

One of the primary drawbacks for women in the industrial life of to-day is that most factories are equipped for the convenience of men workers. Mrs. Florence Kelly called my attention to the use in one instance of tables designed for men to sit at them, and used by girls 14 years old, who are thus quite needlessly obliged to stand.

Prolonged standing and excessive use of the legs, as in the manipulation of the treadle machines, has an effect upon the bones of the pelvis, particularly in poorly nourished women between the ages of 14 and 25, as the bones are then not sufficiently hard to resist the mechanical effects of the extreme pressure. The pelvis forms a bony girdle which supports the weight of the rest of the body and is itself supported by the legs, the heads of the femurs fitting into the acetabuli, the concave sockets on each side of the pelvis. Constant standing causes this pressure to symmetrically narrow the pelvis. The incessant use of one limb may cause a lateral deformity which will render difficult or impossible an erect position of the body, upon which depends to a large extent the health of every organ, because unless the lungs have sufficient room to expand they can not aerate the blood, and therefore a large portion of the waste products of the body is not eliminated, and oxygen is not supplied to the tissues of the body. All occupations which cause the workers to become round-shouldered are fundamentally injurious, because the space for each organ in the body is so apportioned that the encroachment of one organ, or set of organs, upon others (as from faulty position of the bony structure) interferes with the function of the organ pressed upon. The especial menace of any pelvic deformity is in its relation to pregnancy. Any narrowing of the pelvis interferes with development of the child in utero and may necessitate an instrumental delivery, with the attendant risk of serious injury to both mother and child.

The health and vitality of the child from the time of conception depend very much upon the mother's physical condition; an unhealthy condition of her tissues may prevent a proper development and implantation of the placenta. A large number of miscarriages are due to this cause, and later, if she is overworked and poorly nourished, the nourishment of the child will be very much interfered with during gestation and lactation.

In a symposium on sex problems in relation to the health of working women it would not be right to omit mention of two very important factors which greatly reduce their health ratio, although these diseases are not due to industrial strain, and indeed the women themselves are often ignorant of having acquired them. Their working efficiency is frequently reduced as a result of their suffering from syphilis and gonorrhoea, and the economic effect of this is far-reaching. The placenta, under ordinary circumstances, acts as a filter and prevents the transmission of disease; for instance, a child of a tubercular mother is not born with tuberculosis, but a child may inherit syphilis from its mother or father. Unfortunately, a large number of working women suffer

from syphilis and gonorrhoea, of the presence of which they are ignorant, and for which they therefore do not seek diagnosis and treatment.

In connection with the physical efficiency of women a study of women athletes was made in 1884 by Dr. Sarah E. Post, and one recently made by Dr. Anganette Parry is interesting. She found that a bareback rider, 35 years old, who while performing jumps through a hoop at the rate of six times a minute, in one pregnancy rode until the eighth month, and a normal child weighing 9 pounds was born at term. In another pregnancy she also rode until the eighth month, and began riding again four weeks after the birth of this her fourth child. The woman is in perfect physical condition.

Another rider continued to ride until the eighth month and later nursed her child. These women, when asked whether they were exceptional cases, said no one ever heard of anyone breaking down in the business. Another, who was also the mother of a rider, had six children living. A trapeze performer, 25 years old, has regular menstruation and no pain. The flow stops while she is performing.

A hippodrome acrobat; tumbler; hand balancer; 27 years old; began training at 5 years; trapeze and rings; first menstruation at 12; always regular; 5 days; moderate flow; no nausea or vomiting; no cramps; occasional headache; flow does not stop while performing. Married at 20; first pregnancy; performed until fifth month; very easy labor—12 hours; second pregnancy, very easy labor—half an hour; after three months went back to the stage; plenty of milk.

Mrs. Hosfall; father an American, mother an Indian; educated by missionaries in summer; the rest of the year followed the band of Indians; married at 20; trapped with husband; poles, tracks boat, handles ax, builds cabin, shoots, hunts, cooks; skillful in Indian woman's practical work, dressing animals, tanning, and so forth. Four healthy daughters in five years; two youngest each born on the bank of the river, with the temperature many degrees below zero, where she was entirely alone and must keep fire and cook; passed successfully through it all.

Dr. Parry pointed out that these women wore no heavy skirts; that their training began in childhood; and that they undoubtedly have unusually strong uterine ligaments; they are very careful of personal hygiene and have plenty of air, wholesome food, and work which they enjoy. A young woman recently swam across San Francisco Harbor, a distance of 8 miles, and on arrival was not fatigued. The feat had been accomplished but twice before. These are exceptional cases and not especially to be recommended, for in both men and women an overtaxed dilated heart often results in fatty degeneration of the heart and muscles and generally follows a discontinuance of vigorous athletics. Moderate regular exercise is necessary for continued good health, and the normal woman can attend to her ordinary duties during her menstrual period without injury, although on account of the uterus being physiologically heavy at that time, overexercise and vigorous exercise should be avoided the first three days of the period.

Much has been said and written about nervous strain in women's work, and there are some occupations, especially that of telephone operators (as pointed out in the investigation of telephone companies, in Senate Document No. 380), which call the special senses into play in a manner in which they are required to act not only continually but concertedly. This feature calls for special consideration in estimating the strain to which telephone operators are subjected by the nature of their work. As has been pointed out, connections on a switchboard are made by inserting a small plug in a small hole above which the number of the telephone requested appears. The eye is attracted in the first instance by the glowing of a light which announces the call. It has then to immediately find on the switchboard the hole in which it is necessary to insert the plug to make the desired connection. Similarly in disconnecting, the eye detects the extinction of the light, and then seeks on the switchboard the number with which the connection has been made. This means constant employment of the muscles of the eye in different directions and constant use of the optic nerve. The ear, in receiving calls, is required to distinguish between a multitude of different voices to ascertain at once, in order to avoid repetition, the number asked for, no matter how indistinctly or ill pronounced the number may be. This necessitates constant alertness of the auditory nerve, while the vocal organs are scarcely less constantly in use in the answer of calls, the repetition of numbers, and the conduct of such conversations as may be necessary. The sensations created by the operation of the several senses in this

manner transmit their several messages to the brain, which, in turn, directs and governs the actions they suggest.

These special senses are simultaneously called into play also in stenography, typewriting, and telegraphy, but to a less extent than in telephone operating. These forms of work are psychologically and physically well adapted to women, but hours of employment should be shorter than in other forms of work which are less expert and taxing to the nervous system. The report of the Royal Commission of Canada on telephone companies presents a study of special value.

The increase of nervous prostration among both men and women is perhaps the most important effect of strain which we have to consider, for all muscular and intellectual effort requires the expenditure of nervous energy, and over-long working hours wholly exhaust the sources of nerve endurance. Nerve cells are the producers of energy, and nerve fibers conduct this to the muscles. Stimulation is wholesome; overstimulation produces accumulations of waste products, which act as a definite poison, and demonstrable changes take place in the cells of the brain and spinal cord. Miss Josephine Goldmark has compiled much valuable data in her book on "Fatigue and Efficiency," which forms an unanswerable argument for shorter hours of work for both women and men.

The measure of pleasure one finds in work markedly affects the amount of strain, as is well illustrated by the fact that work which well accomplishes its object is less fatiguing than the same amount of energy spent on work in which one is not interested or which results in failure. The training of women in salesmanship by Mrs. Lucinda W. Prince, in the Woman's Educational and Industrial Union, in Boston, shows the value of so educating woman that her brain and physical force may work together, giving her a sense of responsibility in regarding her work as a vocation, with intelligent interest in system, attention to details, increased knowledge of the goods to be sold, color, design, textiles, etc. Pupils sent from five well-known Boston department stores receive full wages while taking the three months' course, which occupies them each morning. The value of this as a business proposition, as well as an illustration of the increase in efficiency with the lessening of strain, is shown by the fact that their afternoon sales give them a weekly total as high as the employees who do not attend the school and who work all day.

In summarizing the direct effects of industrial strain on the working woman, it is my opinion, after consulting statistics compiled by many investigators, boards, institutions, companies, colleges, and others, and also after conferring with a number of thoughtful people who have opportunities to observe women who work under varied conditions, that, with properly regulated hours of work and recreation, outside of the excessive physical labor to which I have referred in this paper, women may work in practically any field of modern industry, and not only retain but increase their standard of health. But they must be given hygienic and properly arranged buildings in which to work and they and their employers taught the common sense of the laws of health. This education is the great need. For when legislatures and their constituents really comprehend that the health of its citizens is the greatest asset of any nation, they must pass laws protecting the health of laborers, and this will occur when a greater number of their constituents are interested in the health of women of all classes.

Without education, good laws may be inactive. For instance, in six States—Massachusetts, Maryland, California, Wisconsin, Illinois, and New York—we have laws providing seats behind the counter for saleswomen, which, however, they are prevented from using by the disapproving watchfulness of a floor-walker who is ignorant of the relation of fatigue to inefficiency.

When individuals are educated to understand that their happiness and continued usefulness depend upon personal as well as industrial hygiene, there will be a fullness of joy in living which is a perfectly practical standard for the attainment of which the world's best citizens are working.

REFERENCES.

- Butler, Elizabeth B.—Women and the Trades. Pages 358-367: Health conditions among women workers.
 Jacobi, A. (M. D.).—The Physical Cost of Women's Work. (Charities and the Commons, 1907, v. 17, pp. 839-844. Overwork of women and its effect on their health.)

- Klink, Jane S.—The Health of Women Workers. (Academy of Political Science, N. Y., vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 35-40.)
- Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor.—Female Health, Special Effects of Certain Forms of Employment Upon. Sixth annual report, 1875, II, pp. 67-112. Published also by physician who made investigation, Ames, Azel, Jr. Sex in Industry; a plea for the working girl. Boston, Osgood, 1875, 158 pp.
- United States Labor Bureau.—Report on Condition of Women and Child Wage Earners in the United States, 1910-1912.
- Fourth Annual Report of United States Commissioner of Labor, 1888.—Working Women in Large Cities; conditions of health.
- Wright, Carroll D.—Effect of Work on Health. The working girls of Boston, Mass., pp. 68-75. Fifteenth annual report of Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, 1884.
- Special report of the Census Office.—Statistics of women at work. American Labor Legislation Review.—Industrial diseases.
- Smart, Isabelle T. (M. D.).—The Question of Heavy Apparatus Work for Women.
- Senate investigations of telephone companies, 1910.—Health of Women Employees; pp. 20, 76, 82, 105, 108, 109.
- Publication 12 of the American Association for Labor Legislation.—Occupational Diseases.
- Dana, Charles L. (M. D.).—Occupational Neuroses, in Medical Record, March 9, 1912.
- Abbott, Edith.—Women in Industry.
- Kober, George M. (M. D.).—Industrial and Personal Hygiene.
- Appeal from the Circuit Court of Cook County.—Legislation limiting hours of labor.
- Bulkely, L. Duncan (M. D.).—The Place of Women in the Modern Business World, as Affecting Health. Bulletin of American Academy of Medicine, page 342.
- Kellor, Frances A.—Experimental Sociology, page 86: Occupations.
- Goldmark, Josephine.—Fatigue and Efficiency. Charities Publishing Company, N. Y., 1912, page 890. Physical effects of overstrain on women workers.
- Hedger, Caroline (M. D.).—Relation of Infant Mortality to the Occupation and Long Hours of Work of Women. Bulletin of the American Academy of Medicine, Easton, Pa., 1910, v. 11, pp. 80-89.
- Van Kleeck.—Working Hours of Women in Factories (Charities, New York, 1906-7, v. 17, pp. 13-21). Result of long hours and overwork on physical condition of working women.
- Fourth Annual Report of United States Commissioner of Labor, 1888.—Working Women in Large Cities.
- Macy, Mary Sutton (M. D.).—The Industrial Occupations of Women in Relation to Infant Morbidity and Mortality.
- Smart, Isabelle T. (M. D.).—Relation of Women in Industry to Child Welfare. Woman's Medical Journal, March, 1911.
- Saleeby, C. W.—Woman and Womanhood.
- Kelley, Florence.—The Sex Problem in Industrial Hygiene. American Journal of Public Hygiene, Boston, June, 1910, v. 20, pp. 252-257. Plea for legal regulations for hours of labor for women.
- Birmingham, England, health department.—Industrial Employment of Married Women and Infant Mortality.
- Spencer, Anna Garlin.—Social Use of the Postgraduate Mother. The Forum. Launching of the Child. Outlook, 101; 75-80.
- Physiological Basis for Education. Nineteenth Century. 71; 945-65.
- Infant Welfare. Am. Journal Soc.
- Report of the United States Department of Labor on the condition of woman and child wage earners, Vol. XIII.
- Origin and Control of Mental Defectives. Pop. Sci. Mon., 80; 87.
- Woman and the Wage Question Rev. of Rev., 45; 439-42. Same, 45; 226-28.
- Efficiency in Child Saving. Am. Acad. of Med., 41; 69-70.
- Conservation of Womanhood and Childhood. Outlook, 99; 1013-9.
- Woman in Industry. Atlan. Monthly, 110; 116-24.
- Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States. Am. Econ. Rev.
- Scrub Woman of the Financial District. Survey, 28; 414-6.
- Revelations of Industrial Life. Liv. Age., 274; 138-47.
- Legislative Gains for Woman. Survey, 28; 95-7.
- Forsythe.—Children in Health and Disease.

Sir John Gorst.—The Children of the Nation.

Saleeby.—Parenthood and Race Culture.

Thomas Oliver.—Dangerous Trades.

Statistics of Women at Work. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

A. Mosso, professor of physiology, University of Turin.—Fatigue.

Dr. A. Forel.—Hygiene of the Nerves in Health and Disease.

Dr. Sarah E. Post.—Exercise for Women as Illustrated in Circus Riders and Gymnasts. Medical Record, May 17, 1884.

Parry, Angenette (M. D.).—Relation of Athletics to the Reproductive Life of Women. Am. Jour. Obstet., Sept., 1912.

STATEMENT OF MRS. GRACE COULON, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I now desire to present to the committee Mrs. Grace Coulon, who was formerly and for a long time a laundry worker in this city and who will speak to the committee of her experience as a laundry worker in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you please give your full name and address to the stenographer.

Mrs. COULON. Mrs. Grace Coulon, 618 Twenty-third Street.

The CHAIRMAN. State for the information of the committee your experience in connection with laundry work, telling it in your own way the number of hours you were required to work, what kind of work you were required to do and the wages you received and the wages your associates received for that work, and any information of that kind that may occur to you; state in your own way.

Mrs. COULON. I went to work in the laundry here when I was 13 years of age, and I am 26 years old now, and I have worked continuously during that time in laundries up until about six weeks ago, when I went to the Y. W. C. A. I worked as hard as anybody in the laundry. The girls have to work from half past 7 until 6 o'clock at night. They have awful hard work to do. They don't stand in one place all the time. They move around from one machine to another, except when they are working on towels or on the mangle. Of course the salary of the girls is not very large, because some of them work for \$2 or \$3 and some of them for \$4 and \$5.

Mr. BUCHANAN. A week?

Mrs. COULON. Yes. Of course they are not going to get this eight-hour law to pass for laundries because they can not get it through, and the laundries can not do the amount of work they have to do in eight hours with the force that they have, and they won't get other girls, because it costs them too much.

Mr. PETERS. Are those the hours of labor for every day in the week?

Mrs. COULON. Every day in the week; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. About how high a temperature is there in the room in which you work; how warm is it?

Mrs. COULON. I have worked on the machines that we used to iron on, and sometimes it was very hot—more or less up to 100; it was very hot.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do I understand you to say that the wages of laundry workers, the girls, do not average over \$4 a week.

Mrs. COULON. Some of them do not.

Mr. BUCHANAN. About what do you think would be the average?

Mrs. COULON. Well, a girl might get—I could get \$10 a week if they would pay it to me.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I mean what is the average pay; what would be about an average for the girls working there?

Mrs. COULON. In the different departments in the laundry?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mrs. COULON. Well, some of them get seven, some of them six, some four and a half, and some five. Of course, they do not pay them all that much, because they could get other girls for less wages.

Mr. BUCHANAN. When you left the employment of the laundry, what wages were you getting?

Mrs. COULON. When I was working there I was getting seven and a half.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In working there in the laundry, were you working alongside of men doing practically the same work?

Mrs. COULON. Yes; I was doing the same identical work that the men were doing, and they were getting from fifteen to twenty dollars a week.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And you were getting seven and a half?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir; I was doing exactly the same work they were doing.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You think you earned at least \$10?

Mrs. COULON. I certainly could get it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You could not get your employer to pay you that?

Mrs. COULON. No; I could not.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Did I understand you to say that there were other girls that were willing to work and who did work for less money than you were getting?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir; that is so.

Mr. BUCHANAN. They could get other girls at a less rate than seven and a half dollars a week?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Because of that fact you told them that you were earning \$10 a week but only receiving seven and a half dollars a week?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And you had been there for 13 years?

Mrs. COULON. Not in one laundry.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You had been engaged in laundry work for 13 years?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You knew the details of the work from the beginning, from the taking in of the laundry to the taking out of the laundry?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You were only receiving seven dollars and a half a week?

Mrs. COULON. When I first started I only got one dollar and a half a week.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do you work the same number of hours on Monday as on other days?

Mrs. COULON. No, sir; I went to work at 9 o'clock on Mondays.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You continued until 6 o'clock in the evening?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How long did you have for lunch?

Mrs. COULON. Well, just according to how much work we had. We sometimes had three-quarters of an hour and sometimes it was half an hour and sometimes an hour.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You had no definite time allowed for your noon-day lunch; it was according to the rush or work, the amount of time that was allowed you for lunch?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is that a common custom in the laundries in the District of Columbia?

Mrs. COULON. That was in this one; I do not know about the others, but I believe so.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In all the places you have worked?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What is the percentage of girls employed in laundries who are less than 18 years of age; young girls, 14 to 18 years of age?

Mrs. COULON. I do not think we had very many that were not of age; only these young girls, young colored girls, who worked on the mangle and shaking, and such as that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There were not many, you say, who were under 18 years of age?

Mrs. COULON. No, sir; there were not.

Mr. BUCHANAN. They were mostly girls who had nearly reached or who had reached maturity?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Were you required at any time to work overtime?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir; we were in the case of a breakdown or a holiday; we had to work overtime to make up for lost time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You were required to work overtime because of the rush of business?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir; we were.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Were you paid extra wages when you were required to work overtime?

Mrs. COULON. No, sir; we were not.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How much overtime is the greatest amount of overtime you have ever worked?

Mrs. COULON. I have worked from 7.30 in the morning until 10 at night.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Has that been very frequent?

Mrs. COULON. No; only when we have a holiday and were not open; the next day we would have to work late to get the work out.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I believe you stated that when you started, at 13 years of age, you worked for \$1.50 a week?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What work did you do?

Mrs. COULON. I first learned to mop; I knew nothing about the laundry at all when I went in.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How long did you work for \$1.50 a week?

Mrs. COULON. I could not tell you.

Mr. BUCHANAN. About how long?

Mrs. COULON. About a month or so; then I got the 50-cent raise, and I was raised 50 cents every time I got a raise.

The CHAIRMAN. How long were you paid \$7.50; how long before you quit?

Mrs. COULON. I was paid that two months before I left; and he only paid it to me because I was going to leave, and he wanted me to stay.

The CHAIRMAN. How much had you been paid before that?

Mrs. COULON. \$6.50.

The CHAIRMAN. How long had you been paid \$6.50 before that?

Mrs. COULON. Oh, I guess about a year.

The CHAIRMAN. About a year?

Mrs. COULON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you worked before that time for how much?

Mrs. COULON. Five and one-half to six dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any people whom you have to assist in supporting out of the wages you earn?

Mrs. COULON. I have a little boy; I am a widow with a little boy.

The CHAIRMAN. Your little boy; any parents?

Mrs. COULON. I help to take care of my mother.

The CHAIRMAN. You help to take care of your mother?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir. The only reason why I left the laundry was because my nerves got all unstrung from the machines and the wear of the work; the work was too much for one woman to do.

The CHAIRMAN. You felt the strain was entirely too much on your nerves?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir; I felt that the strain was entirely too much on my nerves.

The CHAIRMAN. About how long do people generally work in laundries—the idea I have is whether there are people of your acquaintance in laundries who have worked in laundries longer than you have?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, indeed; some of them; there are.

The CHAIRMAN. Many of them?

Mrs. COULON. Yes; quite a few of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Getting a higher rate of wages than you got?

Mrs. COULON. Not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are the highest wages you know of which a woman gets in laundry work?

Mrs. COULON. Yes. The only reason I got those low wages was because they can bring the darkies in and and get them for two and three dollars. They let them work one day and come when they please and go when they please, and they will put up with it because they pay them such small wages and they do not care.

The CHAIRMAN. You have that kind of competition to meet?

Mrs. COULON. Yes. The white girls have to work all the time, and the colored women work when they please; they take small wages and you could not expect any more out of them.

STATEMENT OF MR. SAMUEL GOMPERS, PRESIDENT AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I now wish to present Mr. Samuel Gompers.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gompers, will you state your full name and address?

Mr. GOMPERS. Samuel Gompers, Ouray Building, Washington, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. It might be well to state whom you represent; some of us might not know.

Mr. GOMPERS. I am president of the American Federation of Labor.

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor, at its recent meeting in Washington, had before it, among other matters, the consideration of the bill H. R. 27281, and unanimously gave to the bill and the principle involved in the bill its indorsement. The executive council, in the interim of the conventions of the American Federation of Labor, is intrusted with the authority and responsibility of initiating legislation in the interests of working people and of assisting or cooperating in having legislation of that kind and character enacted.

In addition to my own personal interests in legislation of this character, so that it may be known to you that I speak in this matter by the authority and in behalf of the American Federation of Labor, I desire to state that the bill under consideration has hearty support of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor. It was a great pleasure for me to hear the splendid testimony given before this committee this morning upon the subject of the physical and mental and social and economic and political welfare of the people of our country, and of the necessity for having legislation of this character enacted by the Congress of the United States. It has been a great struggle for the workers and the sympathizers with labor to break through the crust of bigotry and prejudice and greed, to let the world know of all that is implied and involved in the legislation and the movement for the reduction of the hours of labor. You may know—many of you do not know—that I have appeared before the committees of Congress not only for the purpose of advocating a limitation of the hours of labor of men engaged in the overground pursuits, men engaged in the factories, in the workshops, in the mills, but I have pleaded for a limitation of the hours of labor of the men who work underground, a limitation of the hours of labor of Government employees—for those who work for the Government because the Government is the employer, and the only reasonable way we can reach the Government is through legislation. But in all other fields of industrial activity I have believed and advocated the belief that the men who labor can best secure for themselves the regulations of their hours of labor, and that they should insist upon it that the hours should be limited to a normal and a healthful workday.

It is not necessary before the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives to go far in argument to convince its members of the necessity of the limitation of the hours of labor, particularly of the women workers. The International Congress of Hygiene, which was held in the city of Washington a few months ago, was probably without any equivocation or without any qualifications the most intensely interesting exhibition that has ever been held in this or, perhaps, in any other country, and a visit there would have demonstrated even to the dullest the tremendous effect of industry and the evils attending modern industry upon human life. If ever any unquestionable and unquestioned testimony was given in regard to the organized labor movement and the efficiency of its work, the necessity for the success of its demands and efforts, that exposition demon-

strated it. It justified every claim made by organized labor. It justified every demand made by organized labor. When I use the term "organized labor" I use it advisedly, because the working people who are not members of organized labor have no opportunity of speaking for themselves or their fellows. The only source or power or factor that speaks in the interests of the workers is the organized labor movement and those who are trying to aid the workers, yet who may themselves not be wageworkers in the generally accepted sense of that term.

However, the fact is that the District of Columbia is not an industrial center, and I think it is not misrepresenting the people generally, or those who speak in the name of the people, to say that there is no desire to make of Washington an industrial center. Hence many of the evils attending modern industry do not prevail in the District of Columbia; but those who know, those who do go about, those who try to learn the existing conditions, know that the hours of labor are abnormally long right here in Washington. Girls who are in any way organized have some degree of protection, but yet have not an 8-hour day. In many of the occupations and trades and vocations the hours of labor are entirely subject to the control and the whim or the fancy or the immediate interests of the employer. Just as you have heard the testimony of the lady who preceded me, when the employer, for his temporary advantage saw fit, he required his employees in the laundry to work from 7 o'clock in the morning until 10 o'clock at night. He simply informed them that they had to work. There was nothing between him and his interests and the protection of the women in his employ. There was no check. It is not a good thing where there is nothing standing between man's cupidity and humanity.

We have met opposition to all our legislation that we have asked at the hands of Congress and at the hands of legislatures when the interests of the working people were affected. I do hope that there will be no opposition to this bill. It is founded upon the highest questions of right and justice, and our duty to ourselves and to our women and to those who are to come after them and us.

I desire to bring to your attention a letter which a large employer of labor has written to the president of a great international union, because it splendidly demonstrates the results of the movement to shorten the working day. It is by William J. Crawford, president of William J. Crawford & Co. (Inc.), one of the leading firms in the granite industry. It is addressed to Mr. James Duncan, international president of the Granite Cutters' International Association, Quincy, Mass. It says [reading]:

[William J. Crawford & Co. (Inc.). Monuments, mausoleums, statuary, in granite, etc.]

BUFFALO, N. Y., December 19, 1912.

MR. JAMES DUNCAN,
International President the Granite Cutters'
International Association, Quincy, Mass.

DEAR SIR: For several months the writer has wished to write to you to explain some facts which we are sure will interest you and your fellow members.

There are few firms in the country who have kept a comprehensive cost system extending over a period of more than 30 years. Just 32 years ago, in January, 1880, we commenced to keep this record of the value of each man and the exact cost of each piece of work, and we have kept this ever since. In the part of this work which will interest you we have a page for each

granite cutter, and following each entry of the piece of work he takes up is the day and hour commenced, the day and hour finished, the entire time consumed, the wages we have paid, the quarry bill, and a column for loss and a column for gain. In this way we are able to raise a man's wages from time to time as he proves his worth. We do this without request from the men, and in this way we obtain the highest efficiency, and we can not remember when a man has asked us to raise his wages.

Now, about the fact that I think will be of particular interest to you. This cost system extends back to the time when the day was 10 hours, and it shows that the same man, under identically the same conditions, accomplished more of exactly the same kind of work when he was working 9 hours than he did when he was working 10 hours, and, again, when the hours were reduced to 8 hours this same man accomplished still more in an 8-hour day than he did in a 9-hour day, or a considerable amount more than he did when the day was 10 hours long.

My observation of the conditions, and I am with our men from 8 a. m. until 5 p. m., is this, that as men work to-day at the granite-cutting trade an 8-hour day is too long, and I believe that any good granite cutter (and I mean by this a man who uses his brains as well as his muscles every minute) could do just as much work in 7 or even 6 hours as he does in 8. This may sound radical, but from close study I find that 16 hours for "rest and refreshment" to a granite cutter is not sufficient to make him approach his work in the morning in a perfectly rested condition.

We are glad to watch the efforts of a Matthewson, Johnson, Joe Wood, or any of the other star pitchers, and we would think McGraw, Griffiths, or Stahl beside themselves to put any one of these men in the box for two consecutive days of about 2 hours each day. Now, what granite cutter does not put as much of his brains and muscles into his work every day as these stars exercise? The shrewd managers knows he can get the best results from a man whose brain and body are not fatigued. We employers of granite cutters can learn a lesson from them. Once in a while there is an Edison who can work long hours profitably, but they are conspicuous by their rarity. The short life of the granite cutters is due not to dust alone, but to the hard work incident to the trade.

Again, what are the hours of the men whose salaries soar into the five-figure mark? Few, if any, are at their offices more than 4 hours each day.

Let the union and the employers get together on this question. I am going to try this experiment on one man in the near future. I am going to tell him that I have his record for the past year, we will say, at 8 hours, and I am going to pay him the same wages for a month or six weeks, and wish him to commence at 8.30 instead of 8 and quit at 4.30 instead of 5, and I do not wish him to exert himself one whit more than before, and I will give you the record of the result.

A granite cutter should receive the highest wage of any of the industrial trades. His work is hard and exacting, the danger from dust is great, and your \$4 minimum is none too high. I am with you in every effort to better the condition of your members, whom I am glad to say represent a very high degree of intelligence and are conservatively advised.

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM J. CRAWFORD,

President William J. Crawford & Co. (Inc.).

Mr. Chairman, I read this letter in its entirety not because all of it deals with the question under consideration but because I wanted to maintain the letter in its entirety, that the letter should be perpetuated and its contents should be understood.

The letter demonstrates the fact that when the hours of labor are reduced from an abnormally long work day to a normal work day the efficiency of the worker is increased and his productivity is increased. This applies not alone to the granite cutter, but it applies to every field of human activity. It applies to the women and girls as much as it applies to the strongest men.

We are much interested in the conservation of wealth, the conservation of our natural resources, but we have looked upon the entire question for too many years from a commercial viewpoint. But we

are only in recent times coming to understand that the conservation of the real resources—man and woman—is of a higher and a first consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, I presume, if we had no men and no women, no human beings, we would not care what became of our other natural resources?

Mr. GOMPERS. Long before America was discovered and given to the world the resources were here.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not want to interrupt you, but do you not believe there is coming to be a greater realization of the importance of preserving and developing our physical, moral, and mental resources than there has been in the past? I mean the physical, moral, and mental resources of human kind.

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes. It has taken years of sacrifice and hard work to bring that realization to people, but it is coming, and much of it is here now.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Largely due to the efforts of the organized labor movement?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes; I think that is true. It is because I have been so closely identified with the movement from my early boyhood up to this present day that I sometimes hesitate to take credit for the organized labor movement.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You are modest, and your modesty prevents you from taking the credit.

Mr. GOMPERS. I prefer to have you rather than me say that, Mr. Buchanan.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gompers, the witnesses who preceded you expressed a fear if the hours of labor were reduced for women, that it would result in a corresponding reduction in the compensation. In the years of experience that you have had in labor matters, have you found that a reduction in the hours of labor in any kind of industry resulted in a corresponding, or in any, reduction in the rate of compensation?

Mr. GOMPERS. Speaking generally, no; and yet definitely and accurately, 35 years ago, a definite effort was started for the establishment of an 8-hour day in some industries in which we advocated the acceptance of a slight reduction in wages to accompany the reduction in hours of labor because we were not sufficiently strong to enforce the shorter workday, and in order to overcome the shortsightedness and the opposition of the employers we offered the acceptance of the reduction of wages, corresponding with the reduction of the hours of labor, confident that the very near and almost immediate result would be an increase in these wages.

Mr. WILSON. Have you found that to be the case?

Mr. GOMPERS. It is a law as invariable as the law of gravitation, that wherever the hours of labor are reduced wages are increased. You can compare any one country with another country and you will find it to be an absolute fact, that where the hours of labor are least there the wages are highest. I do not want anyone in following out this view to fling at me the old worn-out jest, that following that to its logical conclusion, that if you do not work at all then you ought to have still higher wages. Even if that be hurled at us as an objection, or to place us in a ridiculous light, I think we can truly

say in answer that even if that is true, that you will find that those who do the least work are those who receive the highest incomes.

I am speaking of a normal workday. You compare any two States in our own country and you will find that where the hours of labor are long that wages are—I was going to say shortest—are lowest. Let us carry the illustration still further. In two industries in any one State you will find the same thing will obtain. Compare any two factories in any one industry or any two occupations in any one locality and you will find that where the hours of labor are longest, there the wages are lowest.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Gompers, is that not likely to be due to the circumstance that the weakness of the employee makes the long day and the low wages—where he is strong he gets a fair day, where he is strong in every case he gets a fair wage, where he is organized he can get his rights in most respects, where he is unorganized he has not force enough for either.

Mr. GOMPERS. That is very true. It is also true that where unorganized workers have had their hours of labor reduced, it has been invariably followed by an increase of wages. For instance, in a common industry, the needle (garment) industry, for years and years they were trying to enter upon some great revolt. They were unorganized. They had occasionally made tremendous sacrifices revolting, and after a while the employers would concede the conditions. Then when the revolt died the employers would go along and as the opportunity was presented filch away these concessions from the workers. Again the workers would toil long hours and under low-wage conditions—the sweatshop and the subcontractor and all the evils of the system.

I say that was repeated every two or three years until about three years ago. They were unorganized before these struggles, organized only for the struggle, and then when improvements came they would disintegrate. Three years ago, with the inauguration of that great strike, involving about 120,000 women and men, probably one-fifth of whom were men, every effort was made to prevent the usual stampede, to prevent the disintegration of the organization that had secured the changed conditions. They were not well organized, but they did secure a shorter workday and an increase in wages. The great strike that has been going on for the past four weeks in the garment industry in some of the branches the hours of labor have been reduced and wages have been increased. Before the strike they were unorganized, during the strike they were organized; and if I read accurately the incidents of our contemporaneous struggles they are going to remain organized, and the old folly of disintegrating and then returning to an increase of the hours of labor and the resultant reduction of wages—that era has passed, I think, in the needle trade of New York, and it is going to pass in the other trades.

If I may be permitted to speak of another matter, although it may be extraneous to this subject, the thought comes to me and presses upon me for expression. In the old time, when there appeared upon the distant industrial horizon any depressing influence, the employers of labor resorted to a reduction in wages as their first means to find a way out of the industrial depression. The organized movement gave warning to the employers that that policy had to be stopped, that the working people would resist a reduction in wages at

any and all hazards, and even though we were defeated, we would rather—to paraphrase an old line—we would rather fight and lose than not fight at all, rather resist and lose than not resist at all; and we have not had since then any extended or concentrated effort on the part of employers to attempt reductions in wages.

So, in this instance, the only application these facts have here is that with this organized-labor movement encouraging and helping the women and the men in the needle trade to learn the lesson of associated effort, all the remaining evils, the sweat-shop conditions, contractor and subcontractor, this home work that makes a sweatshop of the bedroom, that almost defies humanity in trying to save the children from disease, will be abolished. These have got to stop, and I think they are going to stop.

Gentlemen of the committee, I urge that you report this bill to the House with your favorable recommendations that it do pass. I am not quite so sure that the parliamentary situation of the present Congress, particularly in the House of Representatives, gives us much hope for the enactment of this bill at the present session of Congress; but let us have, if we can not get more, let us at least have the recommendation of this Committee on Labor to the House and to the country that a bill of this character should be enacted into law. With that prestige I think we shall have made considerable progress.

I am not given to the flattery of men, but since perhaps this will be the last time that I shall have the opportunity of appearing before the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives of this Congress, I ought not to close without expressing another thing in connection with that fact. The Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives has become one of the greatest committees in the constructive work of our Government, and if in the future Congresses the committee is made up of brainy men, of men with hearts and consciences which beat in unison and are attuned to each other, the Committee on Labor of the House will be the dominating factor in the legislation of our country, for it is coming to be realized that the day of merely or purely political statesmanship is at an end and that the era has opened for industrial and human statesmanship. To the Committee on Labor I want to say on my own behalf—and I think I am justified in saying for the men and women of labor whom I have the honor to represent—that they are grateful and appreciative of the work and intelligence and faithfulness of the members of the Committee on Labor of this House whom I have now the honor to address.

Mr. LEWIS. Before you leave, I notice this bill is restricted to women workers. Are you informed as to whether there are any restrictions in regard to hours now for male workers in the District; if so—

Mr. GOMPERS. Government employees and those who are working for contractors who are doing work for the Government.

Mr. LEWIS. I, of course, refer to private employment, as this bill does.

Mr. GOMPERS. There is no such law applying to the workers of the District of Columbia who are employed by private employers.

The CHAIRMAN. But there are mutual contracts entered into between employers and their employees regulating the hours of labor, are there not?

Mr. GOMPERS. Yes; and the 8-hour day generally prevails.

Mr. LEWIS. Coming directly to the point, is there a serious reason why the bill should not be made to apply to male as well as to female workers?

Mr. GOMPERS. I would not advocate it. I regard the women workers and minors as particularly the concern of the Government. I want the men to secure the 8-hour day by their own effort, by their own individual and their associated effort. I do not think it is a good thing to coddle our men too much.

Mr. LEWIS. I think, in view of this possible condition, that if there is no restriction upon the number of hours a male can work and there is a restriction of 8 hours upon the female, the natural thing, where both male and female workers can do the work, would be to discharge the females and perhaps employ the men, who would be worked 16 hours.

Mr. GOMPERS. Nothing like that is likely to arise, because the men in the year 1913 will not work 16 hours. Consequently if the hours of labor are reduced for the girls and the women, you will find that they can and they will do better and more work. It is not increasing expense of the business of an employer by reducing the hours of labor, but, to the contrary, as I gave some illustration, or tried to illustrate, by a few instances, of the result of a reduction in the hours of labor and the comparative conditions between any establishment whose hours of labor are long and those where they are short, I omitted to mention or to use this as an illustration to state that where, as a matter of fact, the hours of labor are generally short industry has more largely developed. It seems there is a process of elimination that industry can only be successfully conducted by large enterprises. Whether that is good or bad is not the question; but I do know that, while I have not one thing to say commending the course pursued by the large captains of industry, it is true that in most instances with the employers of labor who employ very few people conditions generally are poor—

Mr. LEWIS. You think, then, there would be no possible danger of eliminating the opportunity of employment for women because there was no restriction on the hours as to the men?

Mr. GOMPERS. I say that, for instance, in this species of legislation in old England and in New England, to restrict the hours of labor, there never has been any attempt made to secure a limitation of the hours of the male laborers of the textile industries.

It was always to limit the hours of labor of the women and children. I do not employ the terms "women and children" in recent years, and I will try to avoid that, because I think that children ought not to be permitted to work, and hence the question of the regulation of the hours of labor of children ought to be discountenanced; their labor should be entirely prohibited, but they come under the classification of women and minors and who under law are permitted to work. At a hearing before a committee of the Massachusetts Legislature some years ago, when we advocated the 54-hour week bill, a representative of the Arkwright Club, an attorney for the New Eng-

land textile manufacturers, made this statement: "If you take the women and children out of our mills you take the heart out of the industry." The words seethed in my brain and in my heart, and I have never forgotten them. That is, the thing he intended to say was, "If you limit the hours of labor of women and children in the mills we have got to close down the mills." In other words, he meant that the mills would not be able to work when the women's and children's time is up. When they are jointly employed in any establishment and you take the women and the minors out of the plant the plant has got to close up, except the branches which are engaged in the preparation of the work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is it not your experience that where the shortest hours and the most favorable conditions prevail for industry in this country—or, we will say, in the different parts of the country—you will find the greatest efficiency of the workers and the labor cost of the product in that industry is the cheapest, as a rule?

Mr. GOMPERS. Not cheapest—lowest. The fact of the matter is, the cost is less wherever the hours of labor are reduced and more modern methods of production are introduced.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that it is now 15 minutes after 12 o'clock, and I would like to ask Mr. Peters, who has been in charge of the witnesses here, whether it is his intention to present any more witnesses before the committee and if he desires any further hearing?

Mr. PETERS. No; Mr. Chairman. I think the committee has had presented to it a very clear view of the situation, and we sincerely appreciate the length of time the committee has given to the discussion of the matter and urgently ask for the committee's consideration of the bill as speedily as possible, on account of the situation on the calendar in the House.

Mr. LEWIS. Is this restriction to women and minors a reaction from your constitutional view of the subject?

Mr. PETERS. No; not at all.

Mr. LEWIS. Is there any objection to inserting a restriction with regard to men, so far as you are concerned?

Mr. PETERS. I would not want that in there, because I think it would very seriously jeopardize the passage of the bill.

Mr. LEWIS. You mean weaken its political possibilities?

Mr. PETERS. I think it would weaken its possibilities of getting through the House and Senate, with the result of not getting any legislation on the subject through at all.

Mr. LEWIS. You are like the German professor who said that politics is the science of possibilities.

Thereupon, at 12.20 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, February 6, 1913.

The committee was called to order at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. William B. Wilson (chairman) presiding.

**STATEMENT OF MR. R. P. ANDREWS, ACTING PRESIDENT OF THE
RETAIL MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON.**

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appear before you as the acting president of the Retail Merchants' Association of the city of Washington who have placed themselves on record as opposed to the passage of this eight-hour law in its present shape.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state, for the information of the committee. Mr. Andrews, just what the Retail Merchants' Association is composed of?

Mr. ANDREWS. Just what the words imply—the retail merchants of the city of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it comprise all the retail merchants?

Mr. ANDREWS. Not all of them, but I presume a majority of the larger retail merchants.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not take in the smaller retail merchants?

Mr. ANDREWS. Oh, yes. It is of very mixed character. One or two of the largest are not in the association and some of the largest are. Some of the smaller ones are not in the association and some are.

The CHAIRMAN. I just wanted to get an idea of the composition of the association.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would like to introduce some of our members here and some of their employees if I may, so they can give their testimony, and I would like to ask Mr. King to speak a moment first.

Mr. HARRY KING. Mr. Chairman and gentleman, I would like to make this statement before proceeding further, that the Chamber of Commerce of the District of Columbia, through its board of directors, representing over 700 men in mercantile and professional life, last evening placed itself on record as opposing the passage of the Peters bill. I would like to introduce Mr. Thomas Grant, the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, who will read you the resolution.

**STATEMENT OF MR. THOMAS GRANT, SECRETARY OF THE
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE CITY OF WASHINGTON.**

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as Mr. King stated, the board of directors last night, after a very lengthy discussion on the Peters bill, which, it was understood, was identical with Senate bill 7723, passed the following resolution:

WASHINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
February 5, 1913.

During the regular monthly meeting of the board of directors this date the following, after a lengthy discussion, was adopted unanimously:

Resolved by the board of directors of the Washington Chamber of Commerce (composed of over 700 business and professional men of the District of Columbia), That having carefully considered the provisions of S. 7723 and H. R.

27281, being bills to regulate the hours of employment of women, etc., we are unanimously opposed to their passage and recommend to the Senate and House of Representatives that they be not enacted into law."

True copy.

THOMAS GRANT, *Secretary*.

The secretary was directed to appear before the House committee having the above measure under consideration and present the foregoing resolution.

THOMAS GRANT, *Secretary*.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask, Mr. Grant, how many of your members were present when this matter was considered?

Mr. GRANT. Simply the board of directors, sir. We had 90 per cent of the board present last night.

The CHAIRMAN. An attendance of about 90 per cent?

Mr. GRANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROUSE. How many members of the board?

Mr. GRANT. Thirty.

Mr. ROUSE. And that was a unanimous resolution?

Mr. GRANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to inquire what the total membership of the association is?

Mr. GRANT. Between 700 and 800.

Mr. HOWARD. And this matter was not considered except by the board of directors?

Mr. GRANT. Simply the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. HOWARD. And they were not all there?

Mr. GRANT. About a 90 per cent attendance—the regular monthly meeting of the board.

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to inquire further: Was there any action taken by all the members to instruct the executive committee in regard to this resolution, or was this resolution taken on the initiative of the board of directors only?

Mr. GRANT. On the initiative of the board of directors only, because we have had no meeting of our organization in time to handle this matter. The entire body of the organization does not meet until the 11th of this month. They undoubtedly will take the same action.

STATEMENT OF MR. GEORGE A. HEBBARD, 606 NINTH STREET, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. HEBBARD. Mr. Chairman, I represent the merchant tailors and am also secretary of the local exchange of merchant tailors. As I stated before the Senate committee, most of the work in the tailoring business is piecework and the help get paid accordingly. The working hours are generally arranged to suit conditions and the salary. If they do not want to work overtime they do not have to. It seems in the tailoring business the time is so short and experienced help extremely hard to secure. I will not say anything further on this line, but I will introduce a couple of the ladies who will speak on the conditions of the labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Before introducing the witnesses, might I ask whether it would not be physically just as hard upon a woman in the

tailoring business to work more than eight hours voluntarily as it would be if it was not voluntary?

Mr. HEBBARD. Under this bill, as I read it, ladies are compelled to work only eight hours and are not allowed any overtime. There is no other trade, or anything in the men's line, in which they can work overtime. I am simply speaking of the conditions of the business—the seasons and the conditions during the seasons.

The CHAIRMAN. This bill, if I understand it correctly, is based upon the principle that there is a physical necessity for limiting the hours of women and female children. Now, my question is based upon that presumption of the intent of the bill. Would it not be just as hard physically, just as injurious physically, for a woman to work more than eight hours, because of the inducement of being paid for overtime, as it would be if she was required to work the eight hours by virtue of your direction?

Mr. HEBBARD. I do not know. They can answer that question themselves in regard to overtime. I have a lady here who has been working for me for over 15 years, and I think she is better prepared to answer that question than I am.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You know nothing about the physical endurance of your employes?

Mr. HEBBARD. We have never asked a lady to work overtime if she did not feel disposed to. The work in the tailoring business is mostly sitting anyhow and it is not laborious work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Have you considered that part of it—the physical endurance of employes in regard to the hours of labor?

Mr. HEBBARD. Yes, sir; I have. I have had lots of experience.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But you never came to any conclusion about it—whether it was hard on them or not?

Mr. HEBBARD. I never noticed it was hard on them. I never had any complaints because they would simply starve to death if they did not make extra time during the season when they had work to do. The season in Washington is extremely short.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand from that statement that the wages in this industry are so low that if women do not have an opportunity to work overtime they would starve to death?

Mr. HEBBARD. The ladies can answer that wage question themselves. The wages here are positively good, better than in any city I know of in the East, and I say now there is a lot of work goes out of Washington to nearby cities because we can not get sufficient help, and we are willing to pay all kinds of prices to get good help.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What are some of the prices you pay?

Mr. HEBBARD. About the lowest you can get a good girl to work on piecework is \$10 a week. It is very hard to get tailors to take apprentice girls and teach them.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How long do they have to work on piecework to earn \$10?

Mr. HEBBARD. Nine hours a day.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In the form of work, how many pieces?

Mr. HEBBARD. We pay so much for a vest and so much for trousers. Girls work on different parts. A girl can make two or three or four pairs of trousers a day. We pay a foreman and he pays the help.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Your foreman is the contractor who contracts to do the work?

Mr. HEBBARD. We simply give them the work and they agree to pay them so much according to the price they get for the garment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You pay the foreman so much and he pays the help so much?

Mr. HEBBARD. Yes, sir; and the girls very often get the work up and take work home and put buttonholes in at nights.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Some people imagine this is the basis of the sweatshop operation.

Mr. HEBBARD. I would like to know if there are any sweatshops in Washington. I have been here 24 years and I have not seen any, and I have been around to the different shops with a representative from the Bureau of Labor to get statistics and go over the question of wages with him, and the shops have been pretty thoroughly investigated in Washington, and I do not know of any sweatshops here.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do they have to work at night in order to make that \$10 a week?

Mr. HEBBARD. No, sir. They get \$10 a week for the nine hours, and if they work overtime they get paid for it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I understood you to say they worked piecework.

Mr. HEBBARD. During the season.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do they earn \$10 a week whether they do a certain amount of work or not, but simply if they do a certain amount of work they earn \$10?

Mr. HEBBARD. It varies. Some work on piecework and some work nine hours a day and then overtime.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do you have a minimum basis of wages for them no matter how many pieces they make?

Mr. HEBBARD. No; we have not a minimum wage in regard to the amount of work they do. I have a girl working in the store there and some days we will not do anything, but I pay her just the same.

Mr. BUCHANAN. She is on the day-wage basis?

Mr. HEBBARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How about these tailoresses?

Mr. HEBBARD. I have not had time to go into that in detail, but from the talk of the girls, I know that girls who can do any kind of sewing at all make about \$10 a week. Some girls who simply do apprentice work make less, but good girls get very good wages, and they are hard to get.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And it would require a good girl—an expert worker to make \$10 a week.

Mr. HEBBARD. No, sir; not an expert. The girl now who gets \$10 used to get \$5 a few years ago.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How much can an expert make?

Mr. HEBBARD. We have girls who make \$35 and \$40 a week.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What part of the work do they follow?

Mr. HEBBARD. Vest making.

Mr. BUCHANAN. A special kind of vest?

Mr. HEBBARD. We pay more for a full vest than we do for a plain vest.

Mr. BUCHANAN. About what proportion of the girls earn \$30 or \$35 a week?

Mr. HEBBARD. Not very many; but they have earned as high as that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is the work all done by the piece?

Mr. HEBBARD. Every time we have coats, vests, and trousers; they are by the piece.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does it make any difference to the merchants whether they have long hours or short hours?

Mr. HEBBARD. It does not make any difference to me about the hours, but it is the conditions. If we can not get the work made up they pack it up and send it out to outside cities, as far as Rochester, in order to get it done.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that not true of every city in the country—that there is some work that is always sent out to some other place to have done?

Mr. HEBBARD. Possibly so; but I am not versed in regard to other cities; I am talking about Washington. I was born and raised here.

Mr. SMITH. Is there any agreement between the merchants as to the price they pay their help for making garments?

Mr. HEBBARD. No agreement at all; no, sir. You can get a suit of clothes for \$10 or for \$60—any price at all.

STATEMENT OF MISS ALICE C. WOODRUFF, 812 R STREET, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your occupation?

Miss WOODRUFF. Tailoress.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are you employed, Miss Woodruff.

Miss WOODRUFF. Eighth and F Streets.

The CHAIRMAN. What firm?

Miss WOODRUFF. Harrison & Bank.

The CHAIRMAN. For what number of hours are you now employed?

Miss WOODRUFF. Nine hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Nine hours?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you ever required to work more than 9 hours?

Miss WOODRUFF. Well, no sir; not required, unless it is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it ever become necessary for you to work more than 9 hours?

Miss WOODRUFF. In seasons; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long are those seasons?

Miss WOODRUFF. Well, generally from Easter, I can say, until after Decoration day.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one season. Are there any other seasons?

Miss WOODRUFF. The winter season; yes, sir; well, from about the middle of October until Christmas.

The CHAIRMAN. So there are two busy seasons of the year?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In these busy seasons what are the number of hours that you are expected to work, or required to work, or do work?

Miss WOODRUFF. Well, we are not required to work any special number of hours, and we really do not have to do it unless we want to; we are not compelled to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. How many hours do you work?

Miss WOODRUFF. I generally average about, in the real busy season, 10 or 12 hours a week.

The CHAIRMAN. Ten or 12 hours a week overtime?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in addition to 9 hours per day?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir. Of course, some work more than that.

The CHAIRMAN. There are some who work more than that?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir; and some less.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the greatest amount of overtime that you know of being worked during that season?

Miss WOODRUFF. Well, I could not very well answer that. In our room that is about as much as we do with the ladies.

The CHAIRMAN. Ten or 12 hours per week is the amount of overtime that you are in the habit of working?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir; that I am in the habit of working.

The CHAIRMAN. That would make your day's work anywhere from 11 to 12 hours per day?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes; if I work overtime.

The CHAIRMAN. When you are working, that is extra time?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been working at the tailoring business?

Miss WOODRUFF. Fifteen years.

The CHAIRMAN. What wages are you able to earn during the busy season?

Miss WOODRUFF. Do you mean the week's wages, or overtime?

The CHAIRMAN. Week's wages.

Miss WOODRUFF. Twelve to fourteen dollars, not including overtime. That is regular wages all the time, the year round, if we work. Of course, we only get paid for the time we work, not for the week.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you paid by the hour?

Miss WOODRUFF. Paid by the day.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you are not paid by the piece?

Miss WOODRUFF. No, sir; I do not work by the piece.

The CHAIRMAN. Are your associates paid by the piece, or are they paid by the day?

Miss WOODRUFF. We work by the day only.

The CHAIRMAN. How are you paid for overtime? Are you paid at the same rate per hour for overtime?

Miss WOODRUFF. No; more.

The CHAIRMAN. You are paid more per hour?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much more?

Miss WOODRUFF. We average 25 and 30 cents an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you find a general objection to the 8-hour bill—the Peters 8-hour bill—among those you are associated with in the tailoring business?

Miss WOODRUFF. Not among the employees; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not generally opposed to it?

Miss WOODRUFF. Not that I know of; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They would rather have an 8-hour work day than a longer work day?

Miss WOODRUFF. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any men engaged in the establishment in which you are employed?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Doing the same kind of work you are engaged in?

Miss WOODRUFF. Well, the same kind of work; but the men do not do the same kind of work the ladies do.

The CHAIRMAN. Different parts?

Miss WOODRUFF. There are different parts we have to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they paid a greater or less wage than you are paid for the same number of hours?

Miss WOODRUFF. The men are paid more.

The CHAIRMAN. And do they do any more skillful work than the women do?

Miss WOODRUFF. Well, I guess so. A lady can not do what a man does generally in the tailoring business.

The CHAIRMAN. And do they turn out more work per day than the women turn out per day?

Miss WOODRUFF. Well, I do not know, sir. There seems to be a part of the tailoring that the ladies do not do. There are parts of the coat or garment that the man does that a lady does not generally do.

The CHAIRMAN. But there is not any rule in the trade that would prevent a woman from doing that other kind of work?

Miss WOODRUFF. No, sir; I guess not.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a custom?

Miss WOODRUFF. But it is harder work.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with the work is there a heavier goose used by the men than the women use?

Miss WOODRUFF. No, sir; we do not use anything like that at all. The ladies in our work do not use any irons or any geoses or any boards; we simply do the finishing and the buttonholes. That is generally a lady's work in our workrooms. Of course, I suppose in the sweatshops the ladies have that to do.

Mr. HEBBARD. I would like to answer that question. In the tailoring business the ladies do not have any heavy work to do at all. The men do the pressing entirely, attending to the irons, and the running of the machines.

The CHAIRMAN. In this establishment?

Mr. HEBBARD. In a majority of the establishments in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that general throughout the country, or just specially in Washington?

Mr. HEBBARD. I am not acquainted with the conditions in other places, but I know that is positively the rule in Washington. I would like to ask Miss Woodruff this question: In regard to this overtime, if this overtime was cut out, would it reduce the earnings a great deal?

Miss WOODRUFF. Certainly it would; yes, sir.

Mr. HEBBARD. And in the summer time you would not make enough to pay your board?

Miss WOODRUFF. We would have to go off somewhere. Yes, the overtime we make in this short season helps us through the dull season, because we do not make enough in the dull season to get along on.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not expect the people to go without clothes simply because of the fact that you were limited to the 8-hour work day?

Miss WOODRUFF. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it not naturally result, then, in that work being done some other day rather than in the evening?

MISS WOODRUFF. Why, no. The season would be so short we could not get that work done.

THE CHAIRMAN. That gets back to the whole proposition: If you would not get the work done on the clothes, the people could not wear them?

MISS WOODRUFF. They would go somewhere else. Then I suppose somebody else would make them, and we would just simply lose the work; we would not have anything to do.

MR. BUCHANAN. You stated that your salary was from \$12 to \$14 a week.

MISS WOODRUFF. Yes, sir; if we work all week.

MR. BUCHANAN. It is not by the week, then?

MISS WOODRUFF. No, sir; it is by the week or by the day; but if we lose one day we only get paid for five. If we work four, we get paid for four. So that reduces our week's wages. We only get paid for the time we work.

MR. BUCHANAN. Do you find that sufficient to live comfortably?

MISS WOODRUFF. Well, we have it to do. Then this overtime helps us on very much.

MR. BUCHANAN. Do your employers inquire about your living—whether you are able to live in comfort?

MISS WOODRUFF. Well; no, sir.

MR. BUCHANAN. Whether your wages are sufficient?

MISS WOODRUFF. No, sir.

MR. BUCHANAN. Do they offer to increase them? [No answer.] It is not steady, then?

MISS WOODRUFF. No; it is not steady. It is on season's work. In dull seasons we have something to do, but not very much.

MR. BUCHANAN. What, in your opinion, would be the average weekly wages the year round?

MISS WOODRUFF. On an average? Well, I do not know, sir.

MR. BUCHANAN. You do not have any idea of what proportion of lost time you have?

MISS WOODRUFF. We lose a great deal of time during July and August; there is scarcely anything to do at all.

MR. BUCHANAN. Two months lost almost altogether?

MISS WOODRUFF. Yes, sir; and there is January and February. February is generally lost, too.

MR. BUCHANAN. That would be four months out of the year.

MISS WOODRUFF. It is practically lost; we do not count it at all.

THE CHAIRMAN. But you get about an average of \$12 a week for eight months?

MISS WOODRUFF. No, sir; we do not average that, because a good many of these days we lose half a day and a day a week.

MR. HOWARD. How do you mean lose half a day?

MISS WOODRUFF. There is not work.

MR. HOWARD. Do you mean to say if you report for work at your tailor shop you lose half a day?

MISS WOODRUFF. If there is no work we go home.

MR. HOWARD. And you work 3 or 4 hours?

MISS WOODRUFF. We get paid for that.

MR. HOWARD. And you only get paid for 3 or 4 hours?

MISS WOODRUFF. Yes, sir.

MR. HOWARD. Although you are there ready to work on that day?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir; if we work half a day and there is no more we go home.

Mr. LEWIS. Where is your product sold? Chiefly in the city, or in other cities?

Miss WOODRUFF. Chiefly in the city.

Mr. HOWARD. What is the average weekly wages of the employees in your shop?

Miss WOODRUFF. Of ladies?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Miss WOODRUFF. From \$10 to \$12 a week.

Mr. HOWARD. That is the average during the year?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. That includes the overtime?

Miss WOODRUFF. No, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. That includes the average daily work hours?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir; 9 hours a day.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean that \$12 per week would be the full amount of wages that you would earn if you were working six 9-hour days?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir; 9 hours a day.

The CHAIRMAN. And you would have deducted from your wages any time that you worked less than that 9 hours per day? That would be deducted from your \$12?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If you worked any more than 6 days at 9 hours per day, you would have the additional amount added to your wages?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir; so much an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. And you lose during the year, approximately, 4 months of time?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what proportion of that is made up as the result of working overtime?

Miss WOODRUFF. Well, really I could not say; it just depends on how much we do. Of course, sometimes I work, may be, 5 hours a week, or 6 or 7; it depends on the work in the room we have to do.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you said during the busy season you generally worked about 12 hours a week overtime?

Miss WOODRUFF. No sir; I do not work more; but there are other places where, perhaps, the girls do.

Mr. HOWARD. If you work overtime, how much per hour do you get?

Miss WOODRUFF. Twenty-five cents.

Mr. HOWARD. Twenty-five cents an hour?

Miss WOODRUFF. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is that more than by your regular wages?

Miss WOODRUFF. At \$12 a week, probably 2 cents and a half more.

Mr. SMITH. What time are you expected to go to work in the morning?

Miss WOODRUFF. Eight o'clock.

Mr. SMITH. And how long do you work then before you stop?

Miss WOODRUFF. We work until 12, 1 hour for lunch, and then work until 6.

The CHAIRMAN. During the busy season, when you are working more than 9 hours per day, do you feel the strain of the work upon you?

Miss WOODRUFF. Well, sometimes we do when we work more than 9 hours. Of course, we feel tired in the evenings when we go home, but I never broke down; I have been prostrated, though.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever felt in the mornings that you were tired and not really refreshed and ready to go to work?

Miss WOODRUFF. Not specially. I have been working, now, for 15 years, and I have had, I think, one-half day that I left the workroom sick and went home in those 15 years, as well as I can remember.

The CHAIRMAN. You are very healthy.

Mr. HOWARD. Are you a fair sample of all the ladies employed in your shop?

Miss WOODRUFF. Well—yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What age were you when you started to work?

Miss WOODRUFF. Well—I do not know. I have been working 15 years; I think that is sufficient.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. LOVITZ, 108 FIFTEENTH STREET SE.,
WASHINGTON.**

The CHAIRMAN. Where are you employed?

Mrs. LOVITZ. I make vests for Mr. Hebbard. I myself have a shop. I employ girls and men to work for me, and work for different stores. I work for Mr. Hebbard also.

The CHAIRMAN. You supply vests for Mr. Hebbard?

Mrs. LOVITZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you employ people to work for you?

Mrs. LOVITZ. Three girls to work, besides myself and four men.

The CHAIRMAN. About what length of time?

Mrs. LOVITZ. I would like to say that if my girls would not be able to work overtime I would not be able to make a living. As you know, vests are not worn in the summer; men do not wear them, and we have very little to do in the summer. Our season begins just a little before Easter. Everybody wants a suit, and we are so busy that if my girls could not work overtime I could not get the work out; and I do not compel them to work. They are perfectly satisfied to work. They said they loved to make overtime, because in the summer they had plenty of rest. Mondays, if we do not have work—if the cutter does not send anything to do we do not have work. Then we will start Tuesday morning and work until Saturday. In the season we work all week. In the summer time there is hardly anything to do at all. There are very few men who wear vests, and so if the girls will not be allowed to make overtime we could not make a living and neither could they. As I say, there are not enough vests worn to give us work the year round at the eight hours a day. I do not object to the eight hours, and I am not compelling anyone to work overtime.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a matter of fact that you are not particularly anxious to work more than eight hours? It is simply a question of getting the proper wages to live upon?

Mrs. LOVITZ. It is not possible for us to do that in the merchant tailoring. I do not know how many vests I am going to get a week.

I may have so many in the summer, and in the seasons 10 times more. If there are not vests to make I try to get them. Everybody who has been working for me has been working for me for years, and I have never been sick myself. I do not drive anyone. They simply work and make as much as they can.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you say the spring season closes?

Mrs. LOVITZ. The 30th of May. It is warm then, and very few men are wearing vests.

The CHAIRMAN. When does the fall season begin?

Mrs. LOVITZ. About the 15th of September.

The CHAIRMAN. What do the girls do between the 30th of May and the 15th of September?

Mrs. LOVITZ. Why, they work during the week; they work three or four days during the week; maybe only three.

The CHAIRMAN. And the balance of the time?

Mrs. LOVITZ. I do not know what they do.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not engaged at other occupations?

Mrs. LOVITZ. No; because if they would be engaged in occupations they could not attend to my place and the other ones also. There is nothing else for them to get here to do, and it is very hard to get experienced help in the tailoring business here. No one is driven. You simply sit there and make as much as you can. That is all.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you confine your work entirely to making vests?

Mrs. LOVITZ. I do.

Mr. HOWARD. Could you not get coat work to do?

Mrs. LOVITZ. Men make that work. The men make the coats and the trousers, and then they employ women to do the handwork.

Mr. HOWARD. Could you not shift your force from vests to trousers?

Mrs. LOVITZ. No, sir; I never learned the trade. It is an impossible thing to do. If a storekeeper wired for an order consisting of the pants and vest and coat, I could not fill the order. We each learn our trade.

Mrs. LOVITZ. Half of the vests are sent out of Washington in the season. If they can not get the work done here they send it over to Baltimore to have it done. If we would not be allowed to make a little overtime what would we do—what would my girls do?

Mr. SMITH. Could you not provide in an emergency like that by employing more help?

Mrs. LOVITZ. I have three girls working for me now. They have not enough to do all week. If I would take 6 girls how would I come out? I get paid for piecework. Each one of them gets something out of that vest. But in the summer time my expense goes on just the same, but I have no work. I could not hire 6 girls instead of 3 when I do not need them. It would cost me \$30 a week more. I get the work from the stores. My girls work from 8 to 6, and I never hurry them.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Are you paid by the week?

Mrs. LOVITZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do girls of tender age work at that trade?

Mrs. LOVITZ. No; most of them are widows; very few single girls.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No young girls?

Mrs. LOVITZ. I have one young girl; she is 19; she is the youngest. The other one is married, and the other one is a widow.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is that the reason they have to work at that work—because they get married?

Mrs. LOVITZ. It looks that way.

STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM J. EYNON, SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF TRADE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. EYNON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am manager of the Adams Printing Office. I work 8 hours a day. Our regular hours are 8 hours. We are called upon frequently to take care of emergency orders. It is not unusual for a Congressman to come in our office at 4 o'clock to have something printed and mailed that night. If this bill is passed we will, of necessity, have to displace all of our women with men. We have about 18.

The CHAIRMAN. 18 women?

Mr. EYNON. Yes, sir; from \$8.50 to \$22 a week.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the total number of your employees?

Mr. EYNON. About 60. We pay 50 per cent extra for overtime. That is to say, if a girl works 2 hours a night she is paid for 3. We can not anticipate rush orders; they are brought to us without notice, and the nature of the business requires that the work be produced in a rush. We would have to practically displace throughout the shop the women with men if this bill is passed.

The CHAIRMAN. How long do you generally keep your establishment open now?

Mr. EYNON. Our establishment closes at 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the general custom in printing establishments?

Mr. EYNON. It is. Eight hours a day prevails in 95 per cent of the shops in the town.

The CHAIRMAN. What happens if a man wants a rush order after 5 o'clock?

Mr. EYNON. To-day, do you mean?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. EYNON. Unless I was fortunate enough to be at the office and willing to send out for help, he would have to go without.

The CHAIRMAN. He would have to wait until the next morning?

Mr. EYNON. Yes; but we have sent out for help at night—had the work produced after hours. It depends upon the nature of the work.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not, so far as you are concerned, really a question of whether or not your competitors would have any advantage over you or not?

Mr. EYNON. No, sir; absolutely. We have absolutely no regard for the other shops in the town.

The CHAIRMAN. If your competitors are upon the same basis as you are, at what disadvantage would you be placed?

Mr. EYNON. None. I am not protesting against the bill, from the standpoint of disadvantage; it is the question of service.

The CHAIRMAN. If you do not get the service you want you naturally feel you are at a disadvantage.

Mr. EYNON. I would get the service I want by displacing the women by men, most assuredly.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the difference in the wages paid to your women compared to men?

Mr. EYNON. None. We have one proof reader, who is a woman, who is paid more than a man doing similar work. In our office we pay according to the value of the service rendered, and women are treated the same as men.

Mr. SMITH. Are they paid by the hour or piece?

Mr. EYNON. They are paid by the day. We have no piecework.

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to ask a question. I believe you stated you had 60 employees in your shop?

Mr. EYNON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. Eighteen of those are females?

Mr. EYNON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. Now, I believe I understood you to say in the event a Congressman or anybody else came down to your place at 4.30 o'clock with an order; that if this bill passed you would have to discard those 18 women because of the fact that you could not fill that order. Could you not call on your 42 men that night to do this work? Do these women do all the rush-order work?

Mr. EYNON. Are you familiar with the printing business?

Mr. HOWARD. Somewhat. I put an advertisement in a country paper once.

Mr. EYNON. Then your knowledge is limited.

Mr. HOWARD. Somewhat.

Mr. EYNON. We have several departments. In one department the type is set by hand; in another department the type is set by machinery.

Mr. HOWARD. Linotype?

Mr. EYNON. Yes, sir; and we have a pressroom where we print the sheets, and we have the bindery where the sheets are put together in book form. Then, we have a proof room, where the proof is read; and we have women in the proof room and in the bindery, and, upon rare occasions, women feeding a press. The rush orders that Congressmen may bring to us, 90 per cent of the time, may be used in the bindery.

Mr. HOWARD. Right in the bindery in your establishment, are they all ladies?

Mr. EYNON. All ladies.

Mr. HOWARD. How many?

Mr. EYNON. We have eight.

Mr. HOWARD. Now, to go to the next department. You have no ladies operating linotypes?

Mr. EYNON. Let me explain to you. Your order may require 90 per cent of the time being done in the bindery.

Mr. HOWARD. Will you explain to me how it would be possible that 90 per cent of the time of my order, or any order I could give in the business, could be confined to the bindery?

Mr. EYNON. I have an order of maps right now. The maps were printed in 8 hours, about 10,000 copies, and it will take about 150 to 175 hours to fold them.

Mr. HOWARD. You do not confine it to an actual binding like a book?

MR. EYNON. Not at all. We will take another order from you. You are going to deliver a speech, and you are going to send out some additional copies to the Associated Press possibly, or the United Press. You want 50 copies, and it will contain, say, 50,000 words. The bindery time on the job may amount to 1 hour; the proof-room time may amount to 30 hours. So it is not possible to use the ratio of 18 to 60 to let the 42 men do the work of the 18, because there is no way of anticipating that your orders are going to have 10 hours or 100 hours, or only 1 hour, in the bindery. and the men who work in the other departments are not experienced bindery hands. Consequently we could not use them there. We would have people cutting off their fingers, and all that. Nor could we take a bindery hand to work on a typesetting machine, because he does not know anything about it. It simply resolves itself down to the proposition that women will have to be displaced by men if your law goes through.

MR. HOWARD. If all the printing establishments are in exactly the same position with regard to the employment of women, would that not materially affect what would constitute rush orders, in regard to the time delivery would be made?

MR. EYNON. No, sir; my competitor does not set the standard in my office.

MR. HOWARD. I think you would have difficulty in demonstrating that your competitor in the printing business does not have something to say about it.

MR. EYNON. I would like to say in the conduct of our shop we do not think of our competitors. That may sound egotistical, but it is true.

MR. HOWARD. You do not have to meet competition?

MR. EYNON. We do 90 per cent of our work without estimates.

MR. HOWARD. Would that not be simply on the same principle as a grocer, who is living alongside of another grocer, and who would say, "I do not have to meet competition, because I do not ask for bids"?

MR. EYNON. No, sir. You can not find in the city of Washington two printers who will take the same job and figure it and arrive at the same conclusion.

MR. HOWARD. I think that is true everywhere so far as printing is concerned.

MR. EYNON. I think you will find when they come to figuring and making their estimates, even where they are making bids, that they would arrive at different conclusions. But that does not in any manner brush aside the fact that they are competitors with each other.

MR. HOWARD. You would be placed on the same basis as every other printer similarly situated. The law of competition would equalize things, so that the rush order would, in some way, be taken care of in the same hours. The purpose of my question was this: Your closing hour is 5 o'clock. A man who comes with an order after 5 o'clock now simply waits until the next day, and if you regulate the hours so as to make your closing time even earlier than that—make it that or earlier—it simply means the man who comes to your establishment can not go to the other fellow's establishment if you are not able to fill the rush order. So you are exactly in the same position from a competitive standpoint as now.

Mr. EYNON. Then by that you would mean the public would have to be educated to the point of—

Mr. HOWARD (interposing). Waiting for the next train.

Mr. EYNON. And not ahead of the next train. We can not do that.

Mr. HOWARD. For instance, some time ago it was the custom for stores to be open until 7 and 8 and 9 o'clock in the evening nearly all the nights in the week, and since that time the custom has changed very generally, and now 5 and 6 is a common hour for closing retail stores in the evening. The public has accustomed themselves to earlier closing, and my position is that, as all of your competitors are in the same position, you would not be injured by the earlier closing required, but if there was any additional expense the community would be required to bear it.

Mr. EYNON. I simply want to bring to your attention the fact that the women in our establishment would be displaced by men.

Mr. HOWARD. Your contention is the women would be injured by it?

Mr. EYNON. Most assuredly. Our business is of such a character that we will be called upon, after your law is passed, to produce the emergency work just the same. Our experience has been that the lawyers, especially the busy ones in town, have the utmost difficulty in getting their copy prepared in time for the proper filing of their briefs.

Mr. HOWARD. So the committee is to understand your interest in this hearing at the present time is for the benefit of your employees?

Mr. EYNON. Absolutely.

Mr. LEWIS. Have you an idea of the proportion of women engaged in the printing trade in this city?

Mr. EYNON. I am familiar with my own shop, and I would have to make a guess; I would say the proportion would be about one in five.

Mr. LEWIS. Of the whole city?

Mr. EYNON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You spoke of Congressmen coming with rush orders. What proportion of this rush business comes from Members of Congress?

Mr. EYNON. It is very material. Some weeks we do not receive an order from a Congressman, and then again we are very busy with work from Congressmen. Of course, in your short session you have only three months.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I mean when they are in session, what proportion of your rush work would be from Congressmen?

Mr. EYNON. I have no idea.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Are your employees organized?

Mr. EYNON. In what way do you mean?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do they belong to the union?

Mr. EYNON. No, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The reason I ask is that the eight-hour day, I believe, is the day the organization has established?

Mr. EYNON. We have an eight-hour day in our office.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And Congressmen, when they are seeking the votes of the laboring people of the country, usually get their printing done from the union labor.

Mr. EYNON. May I say something on that point?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. EYNON. I want to say that those Congressmen have been regarding the labor proposition through the wrong end of the opera glass. We operated a union shop some years ago, and the labor unions attempted to dictate to us how we should operate our office, and in three months it costs us \$30,000 to get away from the labor union. We operate to-day the same number of hours that the union shop operates. We have many employees in our shop who receive more than union wages, some as high as 50 per cent, and I would say they are 25 per cent more efficient—that is, the organization I have to-day than I had 10 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not true in union printing establishments there are many men paid above the minimum wage scale of the union?

Mr. EYNON. Not in what you call the open shop.

The CHAIRMAN. And not as large a proportion?

Mr. EYNON. No, sir; because in the union shop the efficient man receives the same wage as the inefficient man, and the efficient man is thereby helping the inefficient.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not true in the union shops in printing establishments that the wages vary? That there are some men paid much higher wages than others are paid, but that none are paid below the union scale?

Mr. EYNON. You are right. Our minimum wage in our office is the same as the minimum wage in the union offices, but our maximum wage is greater than in union offices in the city of Washington, and the reason for that is apparent. We pay for efficiency.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The union does not object to paying more than the scale of charges.

Mr. EYNON. But they object to having their men work in our office, even though we pay them more.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am talking about where they do work.

The CHAIRMAN. I judge the feeling is mutual, that they object to their men working in your shop, and you object to having them work in your shop.

Mr. EYNON. No; we have attempted to have them work in our shops, but it is against their rules to permit them to work there. I think they are narrowminded. I think the time will come when they will work in our shop. I think a man has a right to work for whom he pleases and at the wages he pleases.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Or not to work?

Mr. EYNON. Certainly.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you not think, Mr. Chairman, we are deviating somewhat from this investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I think the point is well taken. The subject matter under discussion is not pertinent to the bill before us.

STATEMENT OF MR. HARRY KING, KING'S PALACE DEPARTMENT STORE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, for me to say that this is a bad and vicious measure would be as unjust as for its advocates to insist that in its present form it is a fair and equitable one.

Speaking for myself, and I believe I voice the sentiment of the majority of Washington merchants, I have no objection to legislation that looks to the betterment of feminine labor conditions, and while I realize that a change from the present conditions will necessitate considerable expense and much work on our part, I, for one, am willing to meet the proposition halfway.

But it does not seem to me wise, and it certainly is unjust, to try and reach the millenium for one party with one fell swoop without any consideration as to how such a changed condition will affect two other parties, and even the party the legislation is trying to help, for there are three parties vitally concerned in this matter. The first is the women employees, the second is the merchant, and the third party is the public.

Instead of opposing this bill, I would suggest an amendment that would limit the employment of women to not more than 54 hours per week, an average of 9 hours per day. This would reduce the average present working day at least one hour. Congress is in session every year, and a goodly part of each year. If the experiment proves practicable and a further lessening of the working hour possible, we will be better equipped one year from now to decide upon the wisdom or unwisdom of reducing the working hours of women in the District to the minimum set by the United States Government.

Unless we are careful in regard to this legislation we are very likely to injure those whom we would help, the women employees. It would be an ideal condition if women did not have to labor for hire at all. But in most cases necessity compels their seeking employment, and the ever-increasing number of women entering the business world has created a new condition of affairs in the country. So many lines of endeavor are now open to women, and competition has increased their wages until to-day they are paid all that the quality and the quantity of their labor warrants. Already the number of women desiring positions in department stores far exceeds the demand. Every day we are compelled to turn down the applications of would-be sales-ladies.

Now, then, gentlemen, I come to what seems to me the most serious question that arises on account of this proposed legislation—not from the merchants' standpoint, but from the standpoint of those whom this bill is supposed to help.

I will begin by asking the question, "Who is going to pay for this time if a drastic change is made?" For it must be plain to you, gentlemen, that you can not produce the same amount of revenue in an 8-hour working day that can be produced in 10 hours, as the condition now exists, nor even in 9 hours that I suggest as a minimum.

The merchant is not going to, because he can not. Retail merchandising to-day is being done on a smaller margin of profit than ever before in the history of the country—and this is particularly true of the department store. With the cry of the high cost of living ringing throughout the land—and with as much gusto in Washington, if not more than in any other city in the Union—the public will be unwilling to shoulder this loss.

The people who will, in all probability, be most affected by this legislation, if it is made too drastic, will be the women it is intended to help, for such a lessening of the extent of their present services

will undoubtedly, of a necessity, be met by a lessening of the daily wage.

As to the effect of the present working hours on the morals of women, this seems to me to be a mere sentimental argument. Right here I wish to insist that the present standard of morals among department-store employees is as high, or higher, than that of the Government departments with their 8-hour regulations. It has been our experience, and I think the experience of other Washington merchants, that in cases where an early leave of absence is granted, the result the next day is more apt to be a sleepy-eyed, yawning saleswoman than on days when the regular hours are maintained.

I think your committee will find that it is in private offices and business offices of general character where the working hours of women employees are most excessive, and while it is a habit to make such regulations as these to apply more particularly to establishments like department stores, where the effect is most spectacular, I trust that whatever this committee sees fit to do will cover in every way every business institution of any kind whatsoever in the District.

This bill is prepared by people who are entirely strangers to the conditions that exist in Washington. You well know that Washington is not a manufacturing city. We are not the busy beehives you find in other cities. Washington is a residential city, and has been so for years, and will be for years to come. In the departments here are employed in the neighborhood of 40,000 or 45,000 people. So you can see how largely Washington is dependent upon the department employees for its livelihood and for the maintenance of its establishments.

Another thing to take into consideration is the character of our population. We have about 350,000 people, 100,000 of whom are negroes. As is a well-known fact, their work is not of the highest character, and must necessarily be of long hours. There must be some provision for them. These people must live, must shop, and be maintained. This is the condition that confronts us. The same conditions do not exist in other cities where they have manufacturing industries. You are trying to thrust a law upon Washington drawn by our people who are strangers here—an 8-hour law that does not exist in any State east of Colorado. We have it in Colorado and in California, and the greatest industry in California, which is the fruit-preserving industry, is exempt under this law. Why make an exception? It depends entirely whose ox is being gored. I will say right here that you will hurt the business industries of Washington, and not only that, you will hurt the very people it is intended to help, by passing this bill, because every merchant and business man and every professional man and lawyer who employs women will have to displace them by employing men where it can be done.

There is no limitation on any man's endeavors. You are going further than the union labor would go in this matter. The union labor provides for an 8-hour law, but they will allow the extra time. You are not even giving us half time. You would place us to a great disadvantage. You ought to give us an hour after the department stores close. It takes that long for the clerks to wash and get out. Under this bill if a woman is found in our place one minute after her time is up we are liable to arrest by a \$1,200 inspector.

The bill is not fair, and it was so interpreted in the other part of this building. I am speaking of the department stores, and when I speak of them, I speak of the other stores, and I also speak of the small stores. The conditions surrounding the employment of people in the department stores of Washington are not similar to those found in other cities—in the general manufacturing cities. I am not saying this in a disparaging sort of way. But the conditions that exist are as follows: Washington is a home city. Most of the people employed here have comfortable homes. They do not come from the country to this city seeking boarding houses, and are not compelled to maintain themselves. The employees here are in comfortable circumstances and have comfortable homes. That condition does not exist anywhere else in the country in a city of this size. That is a condition to be dwelt upon considerably.

The CHAIRMAN. Just at that point: Have you any statistics available, comparative statistics, showing the proportion of employees of merchantile establishments living at home with their parents as compared with that of other cities?

Mr. KING. I am 42 years old, sir. I was born and raised in Washington, and have been in business practically since my thirteenth year. My experience as a business man and having hired employees by the thousands in that time, leads me to that conclusion, and also from the different talks I have had with other merchants in regard to this system in this city. It is an absolute fact. That condition exists and can not be controverted.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be rather interesting to the committee if you could furnish us with any definite data. That is an interesting phase of the question.

Mr. KING. I think if this committee wants it they can get it. It would entail quite a lot of work, but you can have that. That is the condition in this city.

Miss GOLDBERG. We have here this morning the Government expert who has been making a study of the women employees here in Washington, and might it not, perhaps, be in place to ask whether she has any figures of the home conditions of women employees here? I think possibly she may have covered that phase of the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you for your suggestion. Later on I would suggest that we hear from the Government expert upon this particular phase of the subject, as suggested by Miss Goldberg.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You stated you would be liable to arrest if you violated this law by a \$1,200 inspector.

Mr. KING. I withdraw the \$1,200 part. What I meant was this: That anyone, a \$1,200 man or \$5,000 man or \$10,000 man, could arrest us. I take a man as I find him, irrespective of his earning powers. Does that suit better?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is not a question of what suits me. You are making the statement.

Mr. KING. I did not make it in any way against the man. A man's business could be disturbed by an inspector coming there any time. If one of my ladies was waiting on you, and the closing time comes, and she is in the midst of her selling, she would have to tell you to get out, under this law. There is no remedy for it. I think that is the condition, because this is an exact copy of the Peters bill, or La Follette bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is the Peters bill.

Mr. KING. The two bills are identical. Now, gentlemen, you are endeavoring to put on Washington an 8-hour law that does not exist in any city in the East. Why should we open our doors to more competition? Baltimore has a 10-hour law, and it would be the easiest thing in the world to drive our people over to Baltimore to shop.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to say that in Baltimore, or in Maryland, that by law they have limited the number of hours in these establishments to 10?

Mr. KING. I have been so told.

The CHAIRMAN. Would not the same criticism apply at the end of 10 hours relative to a clerk being in the midst of a sale, that you suggest might apply at the end of 8 hours?

Mr. KING. The condition would not exist, because we would not be liable to arrest. At the end of 10 hours we begin ringing our bell 10 minutes beforehand as a notification that we are closing. We do that now to give the girls time to go to the cloakroom and get their wraps and things and get out.

The CHAIRMAN. Why would that not apply under the 8-hour rule just the same as under the 10?

Mr. KING. Because the eight-hour rule is too short for us to do our business. We can not do it in eight hours. It altogether depends on the location. There are some stores that may be able to do that in six hours. We are so situated we are open on Saturday nights between 6 and 9, and a great portion of our business comes in between 6 and 9. That night is as busy to us as a busy day during the week. We trade with the popular class of people. But you take an exclusive establishment. They may open at 10 and close at 2. But that is the condition. But you can not make it work both ways, and you can not make people pay higher prices for goods. The women would suffer under this bill—the very people you intend to help. It is not a question, Mr. Chairman, of eight consecutive hours, as you may think it is. It was not intended for eight hours continuous work. We can put a girl on from 9 to 12 and from 6 to 12, until midnight of every night in the year. That is what we do not want to do. We are willing to help our labor in every way we can, but where is the advantage to come to the girl if we have two shifts? There is nothing to prevent us from keeping open until 12 o'clock at night. That would be defeating the very object we are striving for—to give the girls their evenings and afternoons—and I want to tell you that we in our store, when we have our girls on during the summer season we allow them half a day off one day in the week, and we close at 5 o'clock in the afternoons of the dull season, and we open at 8 or 8:30—I don't just remember—and there are other days we work from 8:30 to 6, and in the busy season during the winter from 8 to 6, and when they work on Saturday night they have a lunch hour and a supper hour also, and they have their millinery rooms and cloak rooms, and whenever they work overtime they are not only paid extra, but they are allowed three hours' work, and it is practically only from 7 to 9 and 6 to 7, and we furnish them with their supper.

You see the conditions are not warranted by this bill. The people of Washington do not want it. I know this Consumers' League has made efforts to get the merchants to come here for this bill, but they

did not come near. You are harming the very people you intend to protect.

Mr. LEWIS. Do you mean to speak personally to us in this matter? What do you mean by saying "you"?

Mr. KING. That you gentlemen of the committee have this matter in hand.

Mr. LEWIS. You do not mean to say we have made up our minds about it?

Mr. KING. Absolutely no.

Mr. LEWIS. Try and select your language a little more skillfully.

Mr. KING. If you recommend this bill. Is that better?

Mr. HOWARD. That is better.

Mr. KING. I hope you gentlemen will not be technical. I do not mean to object to anything here at all. I am merely defending my rights, the same as you would if you were placed in a similar position. I have my back against the wall. I have a family to support, myself, and by giving employment to a lot of other people I support a lot of people, and I think I am somewhat of a benefactor. I have a right to say what I think is proper in my Washington, just as the people in Colorado or California have.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do you mean to say that because you give somebody employment you support their families?

Mr. KING. It is helping them. Yes; I think that is the law of nature.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The people that do the work for you are giving something for value received.

Mr. KING. We pay people according to the value of the services they render, and we are more than willing to pay them higher wages than they are entitled to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You pay them for what they do, and you are not a benefactor in that sense.

Mr. KING. We are not in the Carnegie class yet. . . .

Mr. BUCHANAN. What wages do you pay?

Mr. KING. We pay our bundle wrappers from \$3 to \$4—little girls. Some are a little over 16. Other girls get from \$4 to \$5, and from there up to \$17 and \$18 and \$20 a week.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Can you tell us what per cent of these girls are getting \$4 or \$5 a week?

Mr. KING. I can not tell you.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How many do you employ?

Mr. KING. We employ during the seasons 150 to as many as 300.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not agree with you that because you give some one employment you are a benefactor.

Mr. KING. I am not here to discuss the labor question; but I am as good a friend of labor as anyone. We have everything done by union labor, no matter what it costs us. In Baltimore they have 10 hours a day; in New York, I think, they have 54 to 60 hours a week; in Massachusetts, I think, they have more than 54 hours, and I am opposed to this bill because of the fact that the merchants of Washington get a great deal of their trade from the department employees. The departments close at 4.30, and surely to help us you are not going to change the working hours of the departments.

The CHAIRMAN. I supposed, from the statement you made a few minutes ago in regard to the people of Colorado and California

having no interest in Washington, would exclude you from having any desire for the business that is created as a result of the people of California and Colorado and Massachusetts, and so on, having their residence here; or, in other words, these departments are created, not by Washington alone, but by the entire Government, including California and Colorado. Apparently, from your statement now, you are somewhat interested in what they are doing?

Mr. KING. That is a very narrow line to draw; but at the same time these people come here and live here, and they buy something to eat. What I said about these people coming from California and Colorado was that they come here without being familiar with the conditions that exist in Washington. We have no sweatshops here, and no manufacturing industries. This is a clean city, a good city for anyone to work in. Why do they not try this law out in Baltimore, Pennsylvania, or New York? I heard one man say before the Senate committee that they want this as a model law to hold up before the country, so that they can influence legislation in other States, and say, Here we have a model 8-hour law in Washington, and the other States must follow and do as Washington has done. That was the argument.

Mr. ROUSE. You were referring to those States because they have an 8-hour law?

Mr. KING. Yes, sir: without intending to be disrespectful to anyone. What I want to impress on you is this: That this law would hurt the people it is intended to help. If this 8-hour law goes into effect and the men are allowed to work, we certainly will displace any woman we can, either by a boy or man, at the same or more salary than the girl now gets.

STATEMENT OF MR. C. F. SOWERS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. SOWERS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I simply wish to briefly voice my protest against the passage of this 8-hour bill, as proposed, namely, upon the ground that it would work a hardship, first, on the employers of Washington; second, upon the employees; and last—and by no means least—upon the public of Washington.

Speaking from the standpoint of a laundryman, I would say that in the event of the passage of this bill the very nature of our business would demand that we be excepted. In our business we have no uniform amount of work to get out each day. Our conditions vary. In the mercantile business they can have their uniform closing hours, and the goods they do not sell to-day they can sell to-morrow. But not so in our business. To-day's work must be done to-day; and, as we have no way of regulating or dictating to the customers when and how they should send in their work, in order to meet competition and satisfy the public, we must conform to their habits. There are days when we work only 6 or 7 hours a day. On other days the exigencies of our business require 8, 10, and 12 hours, and, in some cases, possibly 14. There may be some breakdown or some unusual occasion in Washington. But I can safely say that we do not average the year around 8 hours a day. Washington is an exceptional city by reason of the seasons. We frequently close down our estab-

ishment at 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and at noontime on Saturdays many times, but our employees receive the same wages.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What are the wages of your employees?

Mr. SOWERS. Before answering that question I would like to make this request: I am going to place upon the stand, if you so desire, a sample of our employees—two ladies. You can understand that the question of wages paid to these ladies is very embarrassing if they are made a matter of public record, and I am going to make this request: As this bill does not refer to wages, but simply to the matter of hours and time, could not that feature of wages to employees be eliminated? I will say, so far as I am concerned, I will place a copy of our pay roll before you for your inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. So far as the chair is concerned, he looks upon the matter as being correlated with the question of hours of labor, and those who have opposed the passage of the measure, as well as those who have favored it, have taken the ground that they are related, and in opposition to the bill they have said that the reduction in the hours of labor set forth in the bill means a reduction in the daily compensation they will receive, so that the two questions seem to be so related to each other that you can scarcely get away from the two.

Mr. SOWERS. Perhaps so, but the bill itself does not speak of wages, and I think on that ground the question is irrelevant. Would it not, then, be sufficient to give the average wage instead of making it personal?

Mr. BUCHANAN. So far as I am concerned, I do not insist on the question being asked.

Mr. SOWERS. It is a delicate question; it gets in the newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. Then your question is withdrawn for the time being?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes. I did not think there would be any objection, or I would not have asked it.

Mr. SOWERS. Now, I was first stating that the restriction would mean a great loss of business to us and a great deal of annoyance to our patrons, because we would not be able to get out the work as is demanded by our customers. We get work from hotels and cafés after breakfast, and we are required to get it back by the lunch hour, and again we gather it up after the lunch hour and must get it back by the dinner hour, and if, by reason of extra increase in the work or some delay in the machinery or by a decrease of the force, we can not get that out for an hour longer, and we would have to close our shops down at a certain time, as set forth in this bill, we would have to withhold the work from these hotels and cafés, and you will see what a position that would put us in and the disadvantage that would result to the public.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the time has arrived when we must adjourn under the rules, and I would like to ask Mr. Andrews whether he expects to produce any additional witnesses?

Mr. ANDREWS. We have a number of both merchants and employees who have not yet been heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, if there is no objection on the part of the committee and it is satisfactory to those who desire to be heard, the committee will adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Friday, February 7, 1913.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. William B. Wilson (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Andrews, you may proceed.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have Mr. Sowers finish his remarks.

STATEMENT OF MR. C. F. SOWERS—Continued.

Mr. SOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I said yesterday that this bill affected three classes, namely, the employer, the employee, and the general public. As affecting the employers, the nature of our business makes it a physical impossibility—the laundry business I refer to—for us to meet the demands of the public under the restrictions set out in this bill. As an instance of the exigencies, I will cite the events taking place next month, the 4th of March, when thousands of visitors invade our city, a time when every housekeeper in Washington changes her linen, and some who do not particularly patronize these laundries will want a lot of work done, and the volume of local business is necessarily doubled, in addition to the transient business brought here by visitors. I ask you, gentlemen, if there is any suggestions by which, even by additional expense, shifts, or otherwise, the laundries can meet the demands of the public of Washington under such exigencies as that?

The CHAIRMAN. Is your machinery so constructed that it can be operated continuously 24 hours each day?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you ordinarily operate 24 hours?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How long do you ordinarily operate?

Mr. SOWERS. Ten hours are supposed to be our regular working hours during the busy season, including the lunch hour. I will say here that we find, upon investigation, that we do not average 10 hours the year around, taking the dull season and the busy season, and taking into consideration the half-day loss on Mondays—most departments half a day Saturdays—and holidays, for which we pay our help. Under those conditions we are necessarily required to operate our plants longer than if we could operate shorter hours by putting on additional help. We can not secure expert operators at such a time when they are in demand, and the only way we can increase our output is by additional hours. If we are compelled, in a great rush like that, when we are piled up with goods from hotels and institutions, to say nothing about private linens, to shut down on the hours, keeping all this work in the laundry, the result is obvious.

Mr. HOWARD. In connection with the half day loss on Monday, I want to ask you a question. Have you got your patrons educated to making deliveries to their laundrymen on Friday and Saturday, as they do down in my town—Atlanta—to provide against the loss of a half day on Monday?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir. Our experience in educating the public has not been very encouraging so far.

Mr. HOWARD. I know the system adopted by the laundries in Atlanta is to make their deliveries on Friday and Saturday.

Mr. SOWERS. You refer to individual work?

Mr. HOWARD. What is that?

Mr. SOWERS. I say, do you refer to individual work?

Mr. HOWARD. I am referring now to a system adopted in a town about half the size of this one; the laundries in that city have adopted a method of gathering their laundry up on Friday and Saturday, at the same time they are making deliveries, to prepare themselves against the loss of a half a day on Monday.

Mr. SOWERS. As far as practicable—in our business we have a number of branch stores through the city. We make a practice of encouraging the public, or instructing our clerks to instruct them to that end, to bring their work in on Friday, to give us a start, and we instruct our drivers to get all they can on Friday and Saturday to begin work on Monday, but that does not apply to hotels and cafes and other institutions, who give us only a few hours to do the work and return it. So I say I doubt if there is any such bill that could overcome those conditions except by additional hours and thereby increasing the expense and hardship upon the employers.

I say the employees are most of all affected by this bill, first, that we would displace the females with men as far as practicable, as far as possible, we might say, and in cases where we can meet the conditions by employing a double shift it would necessarily double our expenses; or if we double the force we have got to reduce the salary of those people we employ commensurate to the conditions, or raise the prices, or both—a little of both, I imagine, would be the result; so it would necessarily throw a great many out of employment, and those who are employed would not be as well off. As it is now, I said to the Senate committee yesterday, it is a give-and-take proposition. When it is slack we let them go home and pay for the time just the same, and when we are busy we require or expect them to stay as long as necessary; but there have been no unreasonable hours practiced in Washington, so far as I am concerned, and there has been no demand for shorter hours.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What do you consider reasonable hours? You say there have been no unreasonable hours. What do you consider reasonable hours for women to work?

Mr. SOWERS. I consider 8 or 9 hours very reasonable, and I consider 10 or 12 hours, in extreme cases, reasonable. I have worked 18 to 20 hours many a time myself.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am speaking of ladies just now.

Mr. SOWERS. I found no general complaint among the females where they are required to work 10 and 12 hours, especially when they were paid for overtime.

The CHAIRMAN. Would not that lack of complaint be, in a measure, accounted for by virtue of the fact that an employee hesitates about complaining lest his job be endangered?

Mr. SOWERS. I think not, sir, for the reason that when we have overtime work we leave it to the discretion, or as a matter of choice, with the employees. As a rule, we do not want all of them; we will say, "Girls, who wants to make overtime to-night," and as a rule, they are voluntary.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is not that desire for overtime work largely due to being underpaid for their service which they are giving—that is they are not receiving sufficient pay to make a comfortable living?

Mr. SOWERS. Not necessarily. I think it is a law of nature to get all we can, especially in this community where it is a great struggle to live on account of the high prices of everything.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You would not sacrifice their physical condition

Mr. SOWERS. There has been no indication that any physical conditions have been jeopardized. I ask you who has complained of the conditions in Washington in the laundries? You had here a witness for the advocates of this bill, an ex-employee of the laundries, in reference to the complaints about the unfavorable conditions in laundries about which so much was said in the hearing before the House committee, before we were advised of it. I want to cite you to the testimony of that witness before the Senate committee. Just a few questions. In answer to a question of Senator Dillingham, on page 51 of the record of the hearing before the Senate committee—the question was:

Do you know anything personally of the conditions in the other laundry during the last 2 years?

Mrs. COULON. No, sir; I do not.

Senator JONES. What are the hours in this laundry that you have been working in during the last 2 years?

Mrs. COULON. From half past 7 to 6 o'clock.

In case we had a breakdown or rush work we would have to work extra but we got our supper for it.

Senator JONES. You got your supper for the extra work?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir; the man furnished us our supper when we had to work overtime.

Senator JONES. The regular hours were from 7.30 o'clock until 6 o'clock at night.

Mrs. COULON. From 7.30 until 6 o'clock; yes, sir.

Senator JONES. Did you frequently have to work until 8 o'clock, 9 o'clock or 10 o'clock?

Mrs. COULON. No; we did not. Just once in a great while.

Senator JONES. If you did work until 9 o'clock, 10 o'clock, or 11 o'clock, you just got your supper?

Mrs. COULON. Yes; we got a very good supper.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Coulon, when you were a regular employee in laundry—a good many years ago, it seems—what was your observation as to the health of the girls, and the effect of the employment on the health of the girls?

Miss COULON. I really do not think it hurt any of the girls, because they all looked healthy.

The CHAIRMAN. Might I ask if you saw Mrs. Coulon when she was on the stand?

Mr. SOWERS. I was not present, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Mrs. Coulon?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir; she is an ex-employee of my establishment.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you consider her a healthy looking woman?

Mr. SOWERS. Well, sir, maybe not healthy looking, she is thin, but she apparently enjoys good health.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is it not a fact that she had to quit that work due to the strain on her nerves?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir; she made no such claim when she quit our service.

Mr. BUCHANAN. She made a statement to that effect before the committee here—that the strain was too hard—and that she could not stand it.

Mr. SOWERS. I did not hear any testimony to that effect. I heard of it indirectly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is a matter of record in our hearings.

Mr. SOWERS. I have not had access to those records. I read her testimony before the Senate committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do you want to cite her as a witness for long hours? I am of the opinion that she is a poor witness for that position.

Mr. SOWERS. She is the advocate's witness. I have read her testimony before the Senate committee. She admits that the hours are not incalculably long. If you will bear with me a moment——

Mr. HOWARD. In connection with what you have been reading about what Mrs. Coulon said, the chairman of the Senate committee said:

It was suggested to me by one lady that you would give us some rather startling information along that line, that it had a very injurious effect.

Mrs. COULON. No; I do not think it has much effect, except the machines. The girls that work on the machines, it may effect them, but you know all the girls do not work on machines.

In what way does it affect these girls in working on these machines, if you know? How many machines have you got and how many girls are working on machines?

Mr. SOWERS. I will introduce, if you please, some witnesses who do work on machines, to answer that question.

On page 52 the chairman said:

What about the shortest day?

Mrs. COULON. Summer months, the last laundry I worked at, we used to quit at 5 and sometimes at half-past 5. Senator, I will tell you the people think that from half past 7 to 6 o'clock is long. You have to be there at half past 6, but the time you pack and unpack your machine of a night, and then go there in the morning, it is 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning before you get to work. So I really do not think the laundry girls have a hard time of it.

Is that consistent testimony from their only witness?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is that testimony correct?

Mr. SOWERS. It is a matter of record.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is that correct?

Mr. SOWERS. Our contention is that they do not have a hard time, and we propose to show it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your evidence in the matter, that you testified that this statement is correct as to the actual facts?

Mr. SOWERS. In some points; yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I ask you if that statement is correct?

Mr. SOWERS. I read you her opinion as expressed there.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You also read as to the time she went to work.

Mr. SOWERS. That is rather meager; I would not say it is correct in detail.

Mr. HOWARD. What does the handling of a machine consist of; what physical exercise?

Mr. SOWERS. I could not tell you about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a method of covering up your machines when the girls leave at night?

Mr. SOWERS. We place a loose covering over them, just as the merchant does over his counter of goods, which requires just a moment of time to remove.

Mr. HOWARD. What is "packing" a machine and "unpacking" machine?

Mr. SOWERS. That is putting felts on rolls, which we do usually on Monday morning.

Mr. HOWARD. Does that require any physical exercise, any great physical exertion?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. Are those rolls taken out?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir; this piece is put on the revolving rolls.

Mr. HOWARD. The word should be "padding" instead of "packing"?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir; perhaps that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Relative to the testimony of Mrs. Coulon, I would like to read for your information just what she said in that connection before this committee [reading]:

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any people whom you have to support out of the wages you earn?

Mr. COULON. I have a little boy; I am a widow with a little boy.

The CHAIRMAN. Your little boy; any parents?

Mrs. COULON. I help to take care of my mother.

The CHAIRMAN. You help to take care of your mother?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir. The only reason why I left the laundry was because my nerves got all unstrung from the machines and the wear of the work; the work was too much for one woman to do.

The CHAIRMAN. You felt the strain was entirely too much on your nerves?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir; I felt that the strain was entirely too much on my nerves.

Mr. SOWERS. I thank you, sir. I wanted to remind you gentlemen that that was the only complaining witness, and that her testimony was practically refuted. I mean to say her testimony was not consistent; that she contradicts herself in some cases.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you think there is anything in this statement on page 52 of the Senate committee hearing:

Senator KENYON. Are you in favor of the proposed law?

Mrs. COULON. Yes, sir. I am in favor of the law.

Senator KENYON. Why?

Mrs. COULON. Because I think just as much work can be done in 8 hours as can be done in 9 or 10 hours, for the girls know they have got to do that work and they will go to work and do it, and not fool around like some of them do.

Mr. SOWERS. I have—of course, there are some girls who fool around, if they are given that privilege, and I guess Mrs. Coulon was speaking of that class when she said that.

Mr. SMITH. Do you have this rule in your establishment: "You have to be there at half-past 6?"

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir.

Mr. SMITH. That is a part of her testimony:

You have to be there at half-past 6, but the time you pack and unpack the machines of a night, and then go there in the morning, it is 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning before you get to work.

Mr. SOWERS. We do not start our plant until half-past 7.

I will read one more question from the Senate hearing:

Mr. LOWE. Ask her about the hours on Mondays and Saturdays.

The CHAIRMAN. If any person has a question to ask, let it be asked through the chairman, so as to prevent confusion.

What about the time on Mondays and Saturdays?

Mrs. COULON. On Mondays we went to work at 9 o'clock on the markers, and on Saturdays we were through at 3 o'clock. If I am able I will answer any questions.

Mr. LOWE. Ask her if she received full time during the summer and those short days?

Mrs. COULON. I certainly did get full time for the summer as well as the winter.

So there, we have this witness admitting that she got her supper when she worked overtime, and got full time during the dull season, and that she did not think the girls had a hard time of it, and that the girls were all healthy. There is the witness, an ex-employee, and I venture to say the laundrymen could bring hundreds of employees to refute the testimony that the girls are only treated fairly well, and that the hours are unreasonably long, and on the average they do not work over eight hours, except that we have the privilege of distributing these hours according to the conditions of our business, which, if we are restricted to eight or nine hours in any one day, we could not meet the demands of the public.

The CHAIRMAN. If you work your plant overtime, do you pay your force overtime?

Mr. SOWERS. If we work materially overtime, we do. In the case of holidays, we work the day previous a few hours later and get the work up, and we pay them for the entire holiday, so that the holiday they are paid for is only partly made up in actual work.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your custom in regard to allowing for overtime? Do you allow for overtime, say, for a quarter of an hour or a half an hour or an hour, or what is your rule?

Mr. SOWERS. Our custom is not to allow for overtime for a half hour or an hour because of the fact that so many days we are an hour short, or possibly two hours short, on the other side. As I said, it is a give-and-take proposition—that is, to those who are fair-minded—and we give them the benefit of the short days and let them go.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do you know of any employer who admits that he is not fair-minded?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. STERN. Is it not a fact that during the summer time the heat is so terrific in your laundries that it is almost unbearable at times; is that not a fact?

Mr. SOWERS. It is undoubtedly so; any hot machine is hotter when the natural heat is greater, but no more so than in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, or where there are machines used.

Mr. STERN. Yes; but in the bureau, they do not work but 8 hours there, and sometimes less.

Mr. SOWERS. We state that we do not work more than 8 hours on an average; some days only 5 or 6. The bureau keeps their employees there 8 hours every day.

The CHAIRMAN. About what is the temperature of your work-room, say, in January and in June time?

Mr. SOWERS. It varies. Our laundry establishments are all, to my knowledge, well ventilated, and even during the hot summer, while, of course, some of the machines themselves are warm, and if you keep in contact with the machines you feel the heat, but there is ventilation, and there is a draft, and often the doors and windows are open, and it is not suffocating or a close atmosphere.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You state that your employees do not average over 8 hours. What time are they required to be at the place of work to work 8 hours?

Mr. SOWERS. Half past 7 in the morning, except Mondays and other days, as we may foresee things do not require.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Half past 7 until what time in the evening?

Mr. SOWERS. Until 6 o'clock, if they do not get through sooner, until they get through.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is about every day they are there?

Mr. SOWERS. In the busy season, Saturdays excepted.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You do not average 8 hours' work, when they are required to be at their place of work 10 or 12 hours.

Mr. SOWERS. Not at all; when they are through they go home, and it is 3 o'clock in the afternoon. My statement was that we do not keep them on our premises more than 8 hours on an average, all the year around. We do not care what time they go home, if they are through with their work.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you keep a thermometer in your establishments in any of the rooms, so that you get any idea of what the temperature is in which the girls have to work?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir; we can generally judge that by our own feelings.

The CHAIRMAN. So that you have no means of getting an accurate record of what the temperature is?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Are there any weeks in the year in which you average more than 8 hours a day?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir; many of them.

Mr. SMITH. How many weeks?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir. In inauguration week.

Mr. SMITH. That is an exceptional week.

Mr. SOWERS. We average more than 8 hours a week during the busy season, but it is offset—

Mr. BUCHANAN. What do you call the busy season?

Mr. SOWERS. From January, I might say, until the 1st of June.

The CHAIRMAN. How many hours do you average during the busy season; how many hours a week?

Mr. SOWERS. We average possibly 9 hours; I have not figured that out in that particular period.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is a matter of mathematics, then?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You do not know of your own personal knowledge?

Mr. SOWERS. I do. I know in a general way.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Sowers, is it not a fact that during the month of June, July, August, and September there are more white goods worn by men and women that are sent to the laundry than in any other season of the year?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir; but they are not sent to Washington laundries; they are sent to Atlantic City laundries and laundries in other places. You gentlemen do not send us any of it during July and August.

Mr. HOWARD. I did last year; I expect I will this year. The question I was trying to get at was simply for information. I want

to know why during the months of June, July, August, and September there should be such a slump in the laundry business here. It is our busy season in Georgia.

Mr. SOWERS. Washington is an exception; it is merely a winter resort; people are not here to send their goods to us. It has not been shown that there is any demand on the part of the employees themselves for any changed conditions.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You say there is not on the part of the employees of Washington?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is possible there has been from the working people throughout the United States.

Mr. SOWERS. I expect so, because in other places their work is harder. There is no drudgery existing here; no manufacturing district where they work long hours.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I suppose you understand that the working people of this country, through organized labor, made great sacrifices to secure an 8-hour day? You are aware of that fact? They have spent large sums of money and lost a great deal of time throughout the country, and even some of them here in Washington seem to desire an 8-hour day, because they have made an effort to secure it through us.

Mr. SOWERS. A great many people desire not to work at all.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That probably is the reason why a great many are employers.

Mr. SOWERS. My experience has been that the employers have a hard time with the employees.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Let them tell it, they usually do.

Mr. SOWERS. In Massachusetts they have a 54-hour week, just what we are asking for. We would be satisfied with a 54-hour week. They say that there is no demand for the 8-hour day here; no need for it because the conditions here do not warrant it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. "They say"; who do you mean when you say "They say"? Where does the report come from; what source have you got it from? Are your employees organized so that they may speak for themselves as to the wrongs done them by their employers?

Mr. SOWERS. I have interviewed a great many employees.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You have, yourself?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir. I have got expressions, directly and indirectly, and without exception they are satisfied and desire no change in conditions, and it would work a hardship upon them.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Those who have worked know what this kind of a statement means to the employer.

Mr. SOWERS. We have had those who have worked to speak for themselves.

Mr. BUCHANAN. At the suggestion of the employer, probably.

Mr. SOWERS. Not in my case, sir.

Mr. HEBBARD. Those two ladies we brought here yesterday did not have any strings tied to them.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Sowers, you say that the commercial interests of Washington would be satisfied with 54 hours per week. Now, just for my own information and the information of the committee—

Mr. SOWERS. Excuse me. I am not speaking for the commercial interests at large. I am speaking for the laundry men; they would be satisfied.

Mr. HOWARD. Fifty-four hours per week?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. Now, can you give an estimate, in your own establishment, of the extra expense that would be incurred by your laundry in additional help to bring the hours down to 48 hours per week?

Mr. SOWERS. I would not like to do that offhand.

Mr. HOWARD. That is a mere arithmetical proposition, is it not?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. You know how many you have employed in your laundry?

Mr. SOWERS. No. It depends on conditions—how much overtime we have got to make and what department they are in, and how long the people have got to make that overtime. We know we can pick up an extra shift of girls.

Mr. HOWARD. I see. I did not mean change in the sense of temporary or extra employment. I meant regular employment.

Mr. SOWERS. If we had regular hours and a uniform amount of business we could meet those conditions much more conveniently but as I have stated before, our work is not uniform. There are extra orders to get out which we must complete, and we can not stop until that work is completed.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is a national association of laundrymen; is there not?

Mr. SOWERS. There has been, and is to-day, a social—

Mr. BUCHANAN. A national?

Mr. SOWERS. Oh, yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think I had the pleasure of seeing some of them in my city.

Mr. SOWERS. I thought you referred to the local situation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will you point out to us what conditions exist in the laundries of Washington as to this emergency work that we spoke of that are different from those of any other city of the United States that you might mention?

Mr. SOWERS. I might observe my judgment is that emergencies arise more or less in any city, but more so in Washington because of its fluctuating population and its winter population being so much greater and the occasions and events that occur here.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You have more employees in the winter than you do in the summer?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir; necessarily, we increase our employees according to our volume of work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You cut your pay roll to meet the volume of work that you get, do you not?

Mr. SOWERS. As far as practicable; but if we had to meet the requirements of this bill and put on a double shift, that would mean double expense, and the answer to that as it was made in the Senate committee was to increase the prices, and the whole tendency of the argument in response to our conditions was that the public pay the bill. Gentlemen, we have not found that we can tell the public what they must do; we can not dictate to the public as to their sending their work to us. We must realize that the public of Washington

the general public, the citizens of Washington who reside here, have their money invested here and raise their families here should have something to say, and it seems to me that this body of lawmakers who reside with us, representing this great, glorious country of ours, gentlemen who come here to make laws, to place restrictions upon us, and holding us to burdens that they are not willing to bear should consider what these people want. I believe you want to consider the interests of the people of Washington, the citizens here. Of course Members of Congress represent districts away from here, and a good many of them have no interests in common with us in Washington in these matters, unfortunately.

Mr. HOWARD. Right there, do you not think that a rather unfair statement to make to this committee that Congress has not any interests in common with you gentlemen here in the affairs of Washington, and that we are prejudging this case?

Mr. SOWERS. Not prejudging it. I did not state that you had no interests with us, but that your entire interest is not equal to ours. Your knowledge of conditions is not equal to ours, but I believe you will do us justice and give us a chance to be heard, and to acquaint yourselves with conditions before placing any burdens upon us.

Mr. HOWARD. Have you any complaint to make about a fair and a full hearing that you are having now before this committee?

Mr. SOWERS. Not at all. There is no need of this legislation, when the citizens of Washington do not cry out for it, when there is no demand for it from Washington here. And when the people here do not ask it, for why should it be imposed upon us by people from other States?

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to ask you another question: Do you think that there would ever be a cry for a change in any conditions where a certain class of citizens were profiting or making a profit from another class of citizens in the same community? Where would you think the wail would come from; from the class making the profit?

Mr. SOWERS. From the oppressed, sir, if they are oppressed. It has not been shown that there is any oppression here.

The CHAIRMAN. Would not your position be the old position that has long ago been declared to be untenable that we are not our brothers' keepers?

Mr. SOWERS. We are, and the law expressly provides—that is what we are arguing on now, that we interchange one with another here; an issue was taken with Mr. King that he was not a benefactor; of course not in the Carnegie sense, but I believe he is, and that every merchant who turns his goods over is a benefactor.

The CHAIRMAN. When you gave as one of the reasons why this legislation should not be enacted that it is being pressed, not by people of the District of Columbia, but by people from other parts of the country—

Mr. SOWERS (interposing). Exactly so, sir.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). That would put you in the position of assuming that they are not their brothers' keepers or we are not our brothers' keepers?

Mr. SOWERS. That is a good old adage which says "Charity begins at home."

Mr. BUCHANAN. You raised a question there about a matter which I probably brought to the attention of the gentleman who was making a statement yesterday before this committee, and I do not desire to put myself in the attitude of arguing with anyone appearing here and making a statement. I only brought this to the attention of Mr. King yesterday to find his position in regard to the proposition that the employer is the benefactor of the man who is working for him. I would like to call your attention to the fact that Abraham Lincoln, when he was President of the United States, said that the worker was the creator of the wealth, and if he had not created any wealth there would have been no capital to be employed and therefore labor should come first and be given first consideration.

I would like to know, in the face of all those things that have been stated by the great men of the country, whether you still maintain that an employer, because he happens to be an employer of some workingman, is therefore the benefactor and is contributing to the life of that man and his family, or whether the employer himself is earning that money and probably much more than he is entitled to. I do not want to unnecessarily interrupt anyone who is making a statement, and I am only making this statement to get the attitude of you gentlemen who are employers of the workingmen in the city of Washington. I would like to know where we are drifting to.

Mr. SOWERS. We do not presume to be on any higher plane than the employees. The employees' interest would be in the interests, necessarily, of the employer, and their mutual interests redound to them mutually. If there were not employers there would be no employment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is it not a fact that there was employment before there were any employers? In the early days of this country they found a way to get employment and employ themselves.

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir; but the wheels of commerce could not continue to revolve if there were not employers.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Probably watered stock and financial pirates would not continue to control the country as they have in the past.

Mr. SOWERS. Do not understand us as opposing the interests of labor. That is the strongest argument that we are making, that this law is against the interests of the employees, and they themselves do not desire it, and it is to our mutual interest to have unrestricted as to our conditions in Washington. We are all under more restrictions in this city than in any other that I have knowledge of. If there ever was a place in which it could be said that there was taxation without representation, that is Washington. We have double and triple taxation on the same property here; we have impossible laws imposed upon us, and we are made criminals by those laws because it is impossible to obey them. There is not a day that goes by that some of us are not violating the laws and compelled to become criminals. Washington is becoming a veritable Egypt and owing to our peculiar complex political position, we are denied the right of the ballot and we can not rule ourselves, and we ask for a hearing that we may consider these important measures that affect us and us only.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope in your comparison of Washington to Egypt that you do not mean to suggest that the workers have made brick without straw?

Mr. SOWERS. Very nearly so. The business man has to comply with the law, or is supposed to comply with a law which it is impossible to comply with, and which, if he does not comply with, he is made a criminal.

Mr. HOWARD. Nearly all of these oppressive laws have been saddled on you during the last 16 years, have they not?

Mr. SOWERS. All during the Republican administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it is the desire of the best men in this city to have the right of suffrage; do you think that is the universal desire?

Mr. SOWERS. The sentiment I have heard expressed is that way. It is my desire to have some voice in saying what the laws governing the District shall be.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is pretty general?

Mr. SOWERS. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. Just by way of encouragement, I would like to say that we hope you gentlemen in Washington will cheer up; we will try to give you better conditions.

Mr. SOWERS. If we had a voice to say who should rule we would soon determine whether the general masses of Washington people desire these restrictions.

Mr. HOWARD. I am afraid if we do that you would raise the price of our laundry bill in Atlanta, covering the difference in the prices here and there. You charge about 30 per cent more for your work here than we pay there.

Mr. SOWERS. Possibly our laundry work is worth 30 per cent more.

Mr. HOWARD. I do not think it is. You tore up a brand-new shirt in one washing for me.

Mr. SOWERS. You are driving a great deal of our business to Baltimore as it is. I dare say, Mr. Howard, that you gentlemen have as much faith in Atlanta as in Washington. I was in—

Mr. BUCHANAN (interposing). What sort of business is it that is being driven to Baltimore that you speak of?

Mr. SOWERS. There is some laundry work being sent to Baltimore by the small concerns who have not plants of their own.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is that due to restrictive laws—restrictive laws that they do not have in Maryland?

Mr. SOWERS. It must be due to the fact that the laundryman in Baltimore can produce work cheaper than we can here.

Mr. STERN. Labor is cheaper?

Mr. SOWERS. I presume so.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is competition keen here in Washington?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the laundries of Baltimore have agents in Washington to solicit business and collect work?

Mr. SOWERS. They have had; I do not know that they have now.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to know. You say this business is being driven to Baltimore. I would like to know what you think is the reason for that, whether you think it is due to restrictive measures here that they do not have in Maryland, and if so, what they are?

Mr. HEBBARD. I can speak for the tailoring trade; a great deal of the work goes to Baltimore because it can be made from 25 to 50 per cent cheaper.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Due to any restrictive measures?

Mr. HEBBARD. Because it is cheaper.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Why?

Mr. HEBBARD. Because the conditions for getting help are much easier than here.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What I wanted to find out was whether it was due to any laws that have been passed in the District and put into effect that do not exist in Maryland.

Mr. HEBBARD. I do not know that it is that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Sometimes, I understand, some concerns will do work cheaper than some other concerns in the same city. In Chicago we would consider Baltimore simply as a suburb of Chicago, if it were situated in respect to Chicago as it is in respect to Washington, and if work was done cheaper in the suburb, we would simply consider it as being done cheaper in one part of the city than in another part. What I was trying to get at was this, is it due to the laws being passed in the District that do not apply to Maryland, or if it was due to other conditions over which the laws have no control?

Mr. HEBBARD. It is principally on account of the question of help; the help we get here, so far as the women are concerned, a great many of their parents are connected with the departments, whereas in Baltimore a great many of them are wage earners in factories, and their children are raised differently and more apt to accept work in tailoring establishments.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is not due to the laws.

Mr. HEBBARD. It is due to the supply and demand for help.

Mr. HOWARD. The question I started to propound to you a while ago was this. Why is it that so many people of what we might call a medium class in the possession of wealth go over to Baltimore to trade; how can they afford to do it?

Mr. SOWERS. Perhaps Mr. King or some other merchant can answer that question better than I can.

Mr. HOWARD. With your experience, your personal experience, is it not a fact that it is known from one end of this country to another that Washington is the highest priced city in this country; is that not a fact?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir; I think so.

Mr. HOWARD. For everything you buy?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes, sir; except the price for laundry work.

Mr. KING. I take exception to that statement; the facts do not warrant it. The competition is very keen in Washington and goods can be purchased as cheap in Washington as in any city in the East, and 50 per cent cheaper than anywhere west of Chicago.

Mr. HOWARD. Then why is this condition true, and you know this condition is true, that so many people go to Baltimore to trade?

Mr. KING. So many people do not go to Baltimore to trade, and I made that statement before the Senate committee.

Mr. HOWARD. What is the source of your information; why is it better than the information of any other merchant?

Mr. KING. My information comes from actual experience. I do not know where these other people get theirs from.

Mr. HOWARD. I suppose any other merchant in the same line would have the same experience you have.

Mr. KING. The condition that you state possibly could have existed during a period possibly 12 or 18 years ago, but the standard of the stores has increased materially, and they compare favorably with any similar institutions in the United States now.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there many who come from Baltimore to Washington to trade?

Mr. KING. No, sir. But I think there are people—of course, it is not the rule, it is merely the exception, the same as there are some people who go to Baltimore to trade. You know, Mr. Chairman, that there are always some people who want to go out of their home city to shop. Some go to Philadelphia and some to New York, but that is the exception.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do your views agree with those of Mr. Sowers, that certain business is being driven to Baltimore?

Mr. KING. No; nothing is being driven to Baltimore.

Mr. BUCHANAN (addressing Mr. Sowers). Is that your statement?

Mr. SOWERS. I do not mean to convey that idea, but that competition is stronger in our line, and some work was going there by reason of competition, conditions being more economical over there; but that if this measure passes it would be driven there.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me that we are killing a great deal of time. I suggest the witness who has been recalled to the stand proceed with his statement, with such interrogatories as are made, until he concludes, and then if any other gentleman has any fact he wants to present to the committee we will consider the question of his submitting a statement.

Mr. SOWERS. I will conclude very briefly, then, and wish to substantiate what I have said in relation to a desire upon the part of the employees as to whether or not they are satisfied, and will introduce two ladies from my own establishment, one representing office work and the other machine operators. I know your time is limited, and I suppose two are sufficient.

I might say in reference to this work, a feature of which we emphasize, we have branch stores all over the city, especially for taking in quick work—taking in the work in the morning to be delivered the same day; and because of the fact that most of these people are in the departments, we must necessarily keep open until 6 o'clock to meet this demand: but the work is light, and the people in these branch stores have an hour's intermission for lunch. There is no complaint on the part of those girls, and I will now introduce Miss Langdon, who has charge of one of my offices.

Mr. STERN (addressing Mr. Sowers). You made the statement that nobody had complained about your laundries; I say I am here to complain about your laundry.

Mr. SOWERS. In what way?

Mr. STERN. I expect to appear before the committee and make a statement.

Mr. SOWERS. Naturally, the advocates of the bill in a general way say they complain, but they have not given us any evidence as to their information. I want, now, to introduce Miss Langdon.

The CHAIRMAN. Miss Langdon, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MISS LORETTA LANGDON, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

MISS LANGDON. As Mr. Sowers has just told you, the people want quick service, and it requires us to keep open until 6 o'clock; that means the office people who get out at 4.30 must have an hour and a half to get their laundry. Our branch office opens at 8 o'clock, which is an hour before the regular time of the department clerks going to office, and they leave the laundry, and it comes back the same day, and if we did not keep open until 6 o'clock in the evening, if we closed at 5.30, as we would have to do if this bill was passed, they would not be able to get their laundry, and the quick service would be useless for them, because the laundry does not get to the office until 5 o'clock or quarter after 5, and it really gives the people only about three-quarters of an hour to get their laundry in the evening.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by quick laundry service?

MISS LANGDON. The laundry that comes in in the morning to be gotten back the same day.

The CHAIRMAN. People call for it at the office, and you are one of the office force?

MISS LANGDON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And it is your duty to take charge of the laundry when it is brought in in the morning and deliver it when it is called for at night?

MISS LANGDON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Your duties require you to be there one hour before the laundry begins work in the morning and to be there for an hour after the laundry quits at night?

MISS LANGDON. No; my hours are from 8 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the evening, with an hour for lunch.

The CHAIRMAN. At what time does the laundry begin work?

MISS LANGDON. The plant?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

MISS LANGDON. Seven thirty.

The CHAIRMAN. You get there about half an hour after the plant opens?

MISS LANGDON. I am not in the same building. My office is in one of the branches. I am in one of the branches; my office is not at the plant.

The CHAIRMAN. Your office is not at the plant?

MISS LANGDON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In what way would it interfere with your business if you were not permitted to accept these packages for a longer period than eight hours in any one day?

MISS LANGDON. It would mean that Mr. Sowers would have to put on two forces, which would reduce my salary and, possibly, would put me out a great deal.

The CHAIRMAN. Then your judgment is that if Mr. Sowers was required to put on two forces that would result in your wages being reduced—cut in half, say?

MISS LANGDON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, that you would get just half as much if there were two employees as you are getting now?

MISS LANGDON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the fear you have in connection with this reduction to an eight-hour workday?

MISS LANGDON. Yes, sir.

MR. HOWARD. Did you state how long you had been employed in laundry work?

MISS LANGDON. A year and a half.

MR. BUCHANAN. You say you are not working at laundry work—just office work in the branch office?

MISS LANGDON. Yes, sir.

MR. BUCHANAN. Then you are not working in connection with the plant?

MISS LANGDON. No, sir.

MR. SOWERS. You open your office at 8 o'clock in the morning. Does not the bulk of your work come between the hours of 8 and 9 in the morning?

MISS LANGDON. Yes, sir.

MR. SOWERS. You have already stated that the bulk of that was called for in the evening, between 5 and 6. In the interim you have very little to do?

MISS LANGDON. Very little.

MR. SOWERS. You have an hour for lunch?

MISS LANGDON. Yes, sir.

MR. SOWERS. You are not complaining of any hard work?

MISS LANGDON. No, sir.

MR. SOWERS. Would you rather have your same hours and the same pay than shorter hours and take a chance on reduced wages, which you feel would necessarily come?

MISS LANGDON. Yes, sir.

MR. HOWARD. I would like to ask a question that has been suggested by the questions already propounded. When the people put the laundry in in the morning that is called for on that same evening, is it marked "Special"?

MISS LANGDON. Yes, sir.

MR. HOWARD. And you get more for that sort of laundry work than you do for regular laundry work which takes the ordinary course and is delivered in the ordinary way, in the ordinary time?

MISS LANGDON. In all the laundries, or in my office only?

MR. HOWARD. In your office only.

MISS LANGDON. Yes, sir.

MR. HOWARD. Your laundry is the only laundry in Washington that charges extra for special work?

MISS LANGDON. No.

MR. HOWARD. Suppose I had a hotel and put in some laundry at 10 o'clock in the morning and asked for it at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, what would be the additional charge which you would make?

MISS LANGDON. We have a standard price, the same standard price that the other laundries in the city have, and we give the benefit of reduced rates provided you leave the work from two to three days.

MR. HOWARD. Now, these girls that are engaged in this rush-order work; they have to work fast and dry quick and iron fast. Do they get any extra compensation for this work?

MISS LANGDON. The work of the plant is arranged so that the work which has come in before is put back, so that they may just have this special work to work on.

Mr. HOWARD. In other words, if I put my laundry in on Tuesday, which I ought to have gotten back on Friday, if there is any rush-order work which comes in you displace my laundry and make me wait and wear a dirty collar on Friday to get this extra compensation for doing this work. Do your workers in the laundry get any extra compensation for this special work? The public pays the extra price that these laundries get and are inconvenienced by the delay in receiving their laundry. Will you explain that situation?

Mr. SOWERS. May I be allowed to explain that? This lady knows nothing about the operation of the plant. She is off in another location. She is one of our clerks, representing one of our branch stores, whose business it is to receive the laundry and see that it is delivered to the customers. She has charge of that office. The feature of extra compensation can be explained in this way: We do not charge extra. We do everything we can to discourage quick work, and to this very end we have established this system of branch stores, and give a reduced rate below the standard rate if you bring your work and it is called for and you pay cash for it, giving us three days or more to do it; we think you are entitled to a reduction; we think you would be entitled to pay less than the man to whom we have to send a wagon and who has not his laundry ready, very often, when it is called for, and we often have to go back three or four times, with the same thing happening in the case of delivery, and possibly having a charge account and some of the charge accounts not collected; we think the customer who brings his work to us and gives us ample time to do it is entitled to a reduction over the man who brings his work to us and calls for it. We do all we can to discourage rush work, so that we may better regulate conditions in the laundry.

Mr. HOWARD. Do I understand you to say you do not discourage rush work?

Mr. SOWERS. We do as far as we can.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you mean to say that if I live on K Street and your place is, say, on Seventh Street, and your wagon calls for my laundry on Tuesday, to be delivered on Friday, that you charge me more than you do a man who lives three blocks away, if he leaves it at your place and brings it back himself?

Mr. SOWERS. We do if your work goes through the delivery department.

Mr. HOWARD. Would you mind putting in evidence for the information of this committee your price list for rush work and your price list for call work and your price list for delivery work?

Mr. SOWERS. We only have two prices; we have the standard price, which applies to all except this work, and where they give us sufficient time, we have given them a reduction to encourage them to save our delivery teams and avoid rushing.

The CHAIRMAN. Again, it occurs to me that we are getting away from the subject matter of this hearing. The Chair is unable to see what the prices charged by laundries for rush work, or for work that is not rush work, has to do with an eight-hour work day.

Mr. HOWARD. The relevancy of it is in this: They say that these people are adequately paid, and they say that they want to work longer hours, and that a majority of this work is rush work, for which they receive additional compensation. The question that

occurs to me is this: If they receive this extra compensation for special work, and it is a great part of the work of the laundries, if these girls are not benefited from that extra compensation that is received by laundries, then they would not want to work over eight hours, as they have testified they do.

The CHAIRMAN. If Mr. Sowers has no objection, he may file the lists, as stated.

Mr. SOWERS. I will. The idea is not that extra, but we charge less if you comply with our conditions. Our prices are standard.

COLUMBIA LAUNDRY CO.

[Main office and works, 623 G Street NW. Phone, Main 4687.]

Branch 5.

Mr. _____
 Mark _____ Date _____
 To be finished _____

No.	Gentlemen's list.	Price.	No.	Ladies' list.	Price
	Shirts, plain.....	10		Aprons.....	5 to 20
	Shirts, plaited.....	12		Collars, cape or emb.....	.3 up
	Shirts with cuffs.....	12		Caps, white.....	.5 to 15
	Collars.....	14		Chemise.....	.20 to \$1
	Cuffs, per pair.....	3		Chemisettes.....	5 to 10
	Drawers.....	8		Cuffs, per pair.....	.5
	Undershirts.....	8		Corsets.....	15 to 25
	Night shirts.....	10 to 12		Corset covers.....	.5 to 10
	Socks, per pair.....	5		Children's dresses.....	15 to 75
	Handkerchiefs.....	3		Drawers.....	10 to 25
	Handkerchiefs, silk.....	5		Dresses.....	.35 to \$5
	Neckties.....	5		Dressing sacques.....	10 to 35
	Coats, white.....	10 to 50		Handkerchiefs.....	.3
	Pants, white.....	25 to 50		Waists, ladies'.....	15 up
	Vests.....	20 to 50		Waists, boys'.....	12 up
				Hose, per pair.....	.5 up
	<i>Bed and table linen.</i>			Lace collars.....	15 to 35
	Napkins.....	1		Night dresses.....	15 to 50
	Tablecloths.....	10 up		Dress skirts.....	.50 up
	Spreads.....	25 up		Underskirts.....	15 to 50
	Sheets.....	6 up		Under vests.....	.5 up
	Pillowcases.....	4 up		Wrappers.....	25 to \$2.50
	Bolster cases.....	4 up		Overall suits.....	.25
	Towels.....	3 up		Lace curtains, per pair.....	.50 up
				Sofa covers.....	.25 up
	<i>In lots amounting to 25 and over.</i>			Blankets, single.....	.25
	Napkins.....	1		Blankets, double.....	.50
	Tablecloths.....	5 up		Pillow shams.....	.25
	Towels, hand.....	1		Splashes.....	.5
	Towels, roller.....	2			
	Towels, bath.....	2			
	Sheets.....	3			
	Pillowcases.....	2			
	Bolster cases.....	3			
	Spreads.....	10			
	Spreads, fringed.....	25			
	Scarfs, plain.....	2			

Please report any error as soon as possible with original list.
 A correct list of articles should accompany all work sent to the laundry; in the absence of such list our account must be taken as correct.

Claims for lost goods must be made within 24 hours, accompanied by original list. We do not guarantee colors, but utmost care is used. We are not responsible for goods left over 30 days. The above reduced prices on collars and cuffs do not apply to hurried work or where wagon service is required.
 No package laundered for less than 10 cents.

COLUMBIA LAUNDRY CO.

[Main office and plant, 623 G Street NW. Branch No. 2, 901 G Street NW. Branch No. 3, 620 Fourteenth Street NW. Branch No. 4, 612 Fifth Street NW. Branch No. 5, 471 Pennsylvania Avenue NW. Branch No. 6, 330 Pennsylvania Avenue SE. Branch No. 7, 3118 Fourteenth Street NW. Branch No. 8, 507 G Street NW. Branch No. 9, 23 H Street NW. Branch No. 10, 2007 Fourteenth Street NW.]

Mr. _____
 Residence _____
 Mark _____ Date _____
 To be returned _____

8.

Number.	Gentlemen's list.	Price.	Number.	Ladies' list.	Price.
	Shirts, plain.....	10		Aprons.....	5 to 20
	Shirts, open front.....	12		Collars, cape or emb.....	3 up
	Shirts, plaited hosom.....	15		Caps, white.....	5 to 15
	Shirts, with cuffs.....	15		Chemise.....	20 to \$1
	Collars.....	2 1/2		Chemisettes.....	5 to 10
	Cuffs, per pair.....	5		Cuffs, per pair.....	5
	Drawers.....	8		Corsets.....	15 to 25
	Undershirts.....	8		Corset covers.....	5 to 10
	Nightshirts.....	10 to 12		Children's dresses.....	15 to 75
	Socks, per pair.....	5		Drawers.....	10 to 25
	Handkerchiefs.....	3		Dresses.....	35 to \$5
	Handkerchiefs, silk.....	5		Dressing sacques.....	10 to 35
	Neckties.....	5		Handkerchiefs.....	3
	Coats, white.....	10 to 50		Waists, ladies'.....	20 up
	Pants, white.....	25 to 50		Waists, boys'.....	12 up
	Vests.....	20 to 50		Hose, per pair.....	5
	<i>Bed and table linen.</i>			Lace collars.....	15 to 35
	Napkins.....	3		Night dresses.....	15 to 50
	Tablecloths.....	10 up		Dress skirts.....	50 up
	Spreads.....	25 up		Underskirts.....	15 to 50
	Sheets.....	6 up		Undervests.....	5 up
	Pillowcases.....	4 up		Wrappers.....	25 to \$2.50
	Bolster cases.....	4 up		Overall suits.....	25
	Towels.....	3 up		Lace curtains, per pair.....	50 up
	<i>In lots amounting to 25 cents and over.</i>			Sofa covers.....	25 up
	Napkins.....	1		Blankets, single.....	25
	Tablecloths.....	5 up		Blankets, double.....	50
	Towels, hand.....	1		Pillow shams.....	25 up
	Towels, roller.....	2		Splashers.....	5
	Towels, bath.....	2			
	Sheets.....	3		Please report any error as soon as possible with original list.	
	Pillowcases.....	2		A correct list of articles should accompany all work sent to the laundry; in the absence of such list our account must be taken as correct	
	Bolster cases.....	3			
	Spreads.....	10			
	Spreads, fringed.....	25			
	Scarfs, plain.....	2			

Our motto: "Promptness and superior work."

We use filtered water. Our terms are cash. Drivers must return goods unless paid for.

The CHAIRMAN. I think I understood you to say that you fear that if an 8-hour workday was enforced in this District that your wages might be cut down. Now, would you prefer an 8-hour workday to a 9 or 10-hour workday if the wages were the same?

Miss LANGDON. Yes, sir; but the position that I am in now does not require any hard work, you might say; we do not object to it.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose you are engaged in a line of work where you may rest occasionally during the day?

Miss Langdon. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not required to stand up continuously during the day; you can sit down and rest for a long period, and consequently you do not feel that it is any great strain upon you. If an 8-hour day was required, do you not think that you could

deliver those packages just as conveniently between the hours of 4 and 5 o'clock as you now do between the hours of 5 and 6 o'clock?

Miss LANGDON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What would prevent you from doing so?

Miss LANGDON. Just the first statement; it would require two girls.

The CHAIRMAN. But if you were there between the hours of 4 and 5, as you now are between the hours of 5 and 6, could you not deliver the packages just as conveniently between those hours as between the hours of 5 and 6?

Miss LANGDON. They do not come back on time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I see Mr. Sowers telling her how to answer. You may as well ask him the questions.

Mr. SOWERS. She seemed a little confused. If you will permit—

Mr. GRAY. I would suggest that this witness is a child, and that we should find out what she knows as a child.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, I observed the fact that Mr. Sowers was prompting the witness, and I prefer that Mr. Sowers should not attempt to prompt the witness. Mr. Sowers, the witness is on the stand for the purpose of furnishing testimony for this committee, and the committee would prefer that Mr. Sowers should not be her mouthpiece in giving testimony.

What would be the reason that the laundry could not be delivered in time? Would that be due to the fact that the work of the laundry plant could not be gotten out in the length of time given? You start to work at 8 o'clock; you take these rush packages and send them at regular intervals, possibly up until noon. Do the packages that are delivered to you after, say 10 or 11 o'clock in the morning—are they delivered back to your office for distribution that same night?

Miss LANGDON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They must be there at what time?

Miss LANGDON. Up until 9 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. All rush packages that are delivered to you before 9 o'clock may be delivered between 5 and 6 o'clock in the afternoon?

Miss LANGDON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the reason, in your judgment, why these packages could not be delivered between 4 and 5 o'clock is that they could not do the work in the laundry in the brief time, or in the one hour less time?

Miss LANGDON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose you have never worked in a laundry?

Miss LANGDON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know the various processes of cleaning and drying and ironing?

Miss LANGDON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you would not know, of your own knowledge, whether they would be able to get the work out in that length of time? You would not know that of your own knowledge?

Miss LANGDON. No, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. Is it not a fact that most of that work, whether rush orders or not, most of that regular work is called for in the hours between 5 and 6 o'clock, after the departments are out?

Miss LANGDON. Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ELIZABETH HARRIS, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. SOWERS. I wish now to introduce as the next witness Mrs. Harris, who is a machine operator.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Harris, are you an operator in a laundry?

Mrs. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am going to object to Mr. Sowers in any manner whatever suggesting answers to this witness.

Mr. SOWERS. I will sit at the other end of the room to show that I am not suggesting answers to her.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It will please me very much to have you do that.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been a machine operator?

Mrs. HARRIS. Three years.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you find it a very difficult occupation to learn to be a machine operator?

Mrs. HARRIS. Well, some portions of it were very difficult. Of course, we have to be real particular to make the work a success, and the girls I have seen could not learn very easily.

The CHAIRMAN. There are some parts of machine operating that are rather difficult to learn?

Mrs. HARRIS. Yes, sir; there are, to do the work properly.

The CHAIRMAN. You might describe, for the benefit of the committee, just what machine operating is in laundry work.

Mrs. HARRIS. Well, in my department, we work in the mangle room. Of course, that work all has to be gotten out and put to the feeders, and then it has to be fed down, and then it goes to the packer and sorter, and then it has to be taken up and made ready to be sent out. After it comes from the wash it takes some time to get it all through. I was a feeder myself.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of a machine is a mangle? Is it a system of rolls?

Mrs. HARRIS. It is a large cylinder with the rolls over it.

The CHAIRMAN. And the laundry is to be put through those rolls?

Mrs. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are those rolls hot or kept warm?

Mrs. HARRIS. It is the cylinder that heats the rolls, and, to a certain extent, it is the cylinder that affords the most heat.

The CHAIRMAN. The cylinder is kept warm; how large is the cylinder?

Mrs. HARRIS. It is the size of a good-sized mangle. I have never taken the dimensions; I could not exactly say. It is a nice-proportioned mangle, though.

The CHAIRMAN. The cylinder is a cylinder, say, about 2 feet in diameter; 1 or 2 feet through?

Mrs. HARRIS. Yes; it is a good size; of course it would have to be to turn the linen out.

The CHAIRMAN. That cylinder is kept warm?

Mrs. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How warm?

Mrs. HARRIS. It is heated by steam, and I have never taken the temperature. It has to be hot enough to dry the linen as it passes down.

The CHAIRMAN. This steam is applied to the cylinder?

Mrs. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. About how large is the room in which you work?

Mrs. HARRIS. It is a large room and well ventilated.

The CHAIRMAN. Larger than this room?

Mrs. HARRIS. Oh, yes; twice the length of this.

The CHAIRMAN. Wider than this room?

Mrs. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many mangles are in that room?

Mrs. HARRIS. Sir?

The CHAIRMAN. How many mangles are in that room; how many machines are in there?

Mrs. HARRIS. There is no machinery except back next to the engine department is the washhouse, and there is no machine near the place where the mangle room is except mangles.

The CHAIRMAN. Just one mangle?

Mrs. HARRIS. Yes, sir. Then the other machinery is on the floor above.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the heat from the mangle make the room in which you work warm at times?

Mrs. HARRIS. Of course, in the extreme hot weather, it is warmer than it would be otherwise; but the room is the best-ventilated mangle room I know of, because there is a large hole that lets the light in, and there is a door and there is possibly a lot of windows on the floor above.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean by that ventilation or draft?

Mrs. HARRIS. There is plenty of fresh air.

The CHAIRMAN. There can be ventilation without draft, and ventilation with draft.

Mrs. HARRIS. It never seemed to do any injury to anybody in any way, and a draft generally makes people sick.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you have been employed at this work for three years?

Mrs. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you employed at some other part of the laundry work prior to that time?

Mrs. HARRIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So that all your work in laundry work has been the length of time you have been at this particular work?

Mrs. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the hours of labor that you now work—the number of hours you are required to work?

Mrs. HARRIS. I am supposed to be ready to go to work at half past seven; the machinery does not start up until that time, and it has to get hot before you can operate it; and then we have a lunch hour, and I do not think in the three years I have been there—one evening I worked until 8 o'clock, and another evening until 9, and one other evening, and that is all the overtime I have worked since I have been there. I can not complain of overwork.

The CHAIRMAN. So I understand that only on three occasions you have been required to work over the regular hours?

Mrs. HARRIS. That is the only time.

The CHAIRMAN. So that this extra demand for work during the rush period has not resulted in your having to do a great deal of overtime?

Mrs. HARRIS. I do not think we worked except those times—I do not think there has been any time, except those, when I have not been on the street going home when the 6 o'clock bell rang and when we did work we were served with a nice supper and paid for our time. There has not been a day since last September when there has not been a large urn of coffee made for the employees there, and I bet you will not find that in any other place of employment that I know of. Everybody had all the nice fresh coffee they wanted.

The CHAIRMAN. That is during the lunch hour?

Mrs. HARRIS. That is the lunch hour. My employer may not want me to tell you that, but I just wanted to tell you we are not ill used.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the wages that are paid in the laundries on the different classes of work?

Mrs. HARRIS. Well, I understood my employer to say that that question was not required to be answered by me.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking what your wages are.

Mrs. HARRIS. What the average wages are?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; what the general wage is.

Mrs. HARRIS. It is fairly good, I often hear the girls who work in the laundries say.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you call a fairly good wage?

Mrs. HARRIS. Eight to ten; something like that. Of course, it is not any big amount of money, but still it is as much as you make in anything you do in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your judgment that the workers in the laundries do not need any legislation in regard to the number of hours they should work?

Mrs. HARRIS. Well, of course, I can not answer for everyone. I am satisfied myself, so far as my time goes, and I have not heard any complaints from others. I have never been affected in any way; my health is not affected; I can not complain. It is nice, clean work, the cleanest work there is or that anyone can do. Everything is thoroughly washed before it comes to our hands.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that is not the case with those who first receive the laundry.

Mrs. HARRIS. Those who first receive it are the markers, and they have to mark it and make out the lists so that the things will not be misplaced. Then it goes to the washhouse, and then it comes to the shaking table, and after it goes to the shaking table it comes to us, to the mangle. You do not realize the processes which linen has to go through to get clean. It has to be handled by various people before we can get it, and it all takes time. On Monday I know there is not half an hour's work done in the forenoon. It is all sorted and marked. There are so many processes it is impossible to get it out early. I speak from my own knowledge of it and knowing the time it takes to get the work out. While that eight-hour system is very nice, I don't see where laundry work can be accomplished and gotten out in time, that way, to save my life.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Did you not know that they are doing that work successfully in some States where they have that law and doing it to the great advantage of the employees?

Mrs. HARRIS. Possibly so.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The States of California and Oregon, I believe.

Mrs. HARRIS. I know one thing—it would necessitate a great change to accomplish it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, you know the world has undergone a great change in recent years in regard to conditions of work, largely due to the results of the efforts of organized labor. To your knowledge, has there been any effort of the employees of the laundry where you work to organize, any time you were there?

Mrs. HARRIS. No, sir; I never heard any complaint among them at all.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I mean regardless of the complaint, have you any information, or have you heard any talk about an organization?

Mrs. HARRIS. No, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But women even organize sometimes.

Mrs. HARRIS. Yes; sometimes those that do not work organize.

Mr. SOWERS. We have very peaceable women in my establishment.

Mr. KING. May I ask one question?

The CHAIRMAN. No; not at this time.

Mr. KING. May I make this statement?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at this time; not until the witness is through.

Mr. HOWARD. What about section 2? Do you approve of this law that lets girls under 18 years out of their places of employment at 6 o'clock in the evening, so that they may go home to their parents?

Mrs. HARRIS. Of course, everybody wants to be home; but I think when they go and seek this employment and know the hours, know the restrictions, and are contented and accept the work and salary, I do not think they should get off sooner than their time requires them to. There are two ways of looking at that. I go voluntarily to take a place and am content with my salary and hours, and put in that work and I am satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, though, Mrs. Harris, you would not go seeking a place anywhere if it were not for the fact that the physical and mental necessities require you to find employment?

Mrs. HARRIS. I do not know that my mental faculties are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. People seek employment because their needs, their wants are such that they have to earn something.

Mrs. HARRIS. I have always worked; I always worked on the farm, and I always worked when I was in my home.

The CHAIRMAN. So that people do not seek employment voluntarily; they seek employment because their necessities impel them to find it?

Mrs. HARRIS. I do not think anyone would go to work who had plenty to live on. If you live in Washington City, or any other city, you have got to pay so much to get on that if you have not got anything you have to work.

The CHAIRMAN. So that you have to work because the necessities require you to seek employment?

Thereupon, at 11.55 o'clock a. m., the committee adjourned to meet at 10 o'clock a. m. Saturday, February 8, 1913.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, February 8, 1913.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. William B. Wilson (chairman presiding).

There were present before the committee Mr. King, representing King's Palace, 810-816 Seventh Street NW., Washington, D. C., and Miss M. L. Obenauer, of the Bureau of Labor, Department of Commerce and Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Are your witnesses here, Mr. King?

Mr. KING. They are not here yet, Mr. Chairman, but I think they will be in a very few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. We have some important matters coming up on the floor of the House at 10.30, and we ought to be there. There is a representative of the Bureau of Labor here, from whom we would like to get some definite statistics and figures. In all of the statements that have been made we have had but generalizations, and we would like to get some specific information if we can. Miss Obenauer, if you are ready to proceed, will you please give your full name and official position.

STATEMENT OF MISS M. L. OBENAUER, WASHINGTON, D. C., REPRESENTING THE BUREAU OF LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

MISS OBENAUER. I live at the Westminster Apartment, Seventeenth and Q NW., and I am connected with the Bureau of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Miss Obenauer, have you made any investigation of the labor conditions and housing conditions in the District of Columbia with regard to wageworkers?

MISS OBENAUER. We have made a study of the hours, the duration of employment of women engaged in the manufacturing, mechanical, and mercantile establishments in the city of Washington. We did not go into the housing question. The only data of that kind which we gathered had to do with the proportion of women living at home or boarding and lodging or living independently without the backing of the home, where the home might be regarded as an asset. When I say "living at home" I am referring not to women who were maintaining themselves in one or two rooms and spending the day in either mercantile or manufacturing establishments. We did not rate such a woman as living at home, even though she were doing her own cooking. She was classed as living independently.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state for the information of the committee what, in a concrete way, you found in connection with the hours of labor and wages and the proportionate number of women that lived at home or boarded?

MISS OBENAUER. May I state first, Mr. Chairman, that we called upon 332 women employed in stores—when I say "stores" I mean the large department stores and the specialty stores and retail stores. We compared our list as to occupations with the pay-roll data afterwards submitted by the employers in 11 different establishments, and we found that the percentage of each occupation—that is, for the girls and saleswomen and the other occupations prevailing in stores—was

substantially the same, so that we felt we had a fair list. I am only telling you this in order that you may know how much credence to give to our figures. We found in the stores that approximately 78 per cent of the women, nearly four-fifths, lived at home. That is, 22.3 per cent of the women were boarding and rooming or living independently, as I have described. In the mechanical and manufacturing industries we found that there were approximately 26 per cent who were boarding, rooming, or living independently—that is, 74 per cent were living at home.

Now, as to wages, Mr. Chairman, the material in this table was given to the Senate committee and made a part of their record. Do you wish me to leave it here to become a part of your record?

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have it included as a part of the record, but you might state briefly the substance of it.

Miss OBENAUER. I am going to give you what the individual schedules show, and then what the pay rolls show, because our method in getting this information was to get the statement of both the employers and employees. I wish to say also that in all except a few cases we met with no reluctance on the part of the employers. They gave us the information freely, and as a result there was very little difference in the figures shown by employees and employers. There is one exception that I may point out later on. The general average wage for the women upon whom we called, including all occupations, was \$6.55. The pay roll data showed \$6.75. I would call your attention to the fact that the pay roll refers to rates of pay. The individual schedules were earnings for the year previous to December 1, 1912. I also wish to say that four-fifths of the women in the individual schedules showed employment from 48 to 52 weeks. In the manufacturing and mechanical industries, I think it was 59 per cent; that is, 59 per cent showed so long a duration compared with 80 per cent in the stores. I think that should be taken into consideration in judging of the wage. That is the reason I am speaking of it here.

Now, if you wish the groups that were earning specified wages I can give them to you briefly. Over two-thirds of the women employed are employed as saleswomen. For saleswomen, the individual schedules showed an average wage of \$6.36; the pay-roll data showed an average of \$6.55. Now do you wish those by groups, Mr. Chairman, those that were earning \$10 and more, \$8.99, etc.?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; we would like to have them that way.

Miss OBENAUER. I will give you the pay-roll data, for the reason that in a list of 300 or so the higher paid people rather thin out. The pay rolls cover over 2,600 women. The individual schedules, while they show what the earnings were for the rank and file compared with the rates of pay, were not gathered in numbers large enough to include many representatives of the higher but less frequent wage grades. Of 1,760 saleswomen, averaging \$6.55, according to the pay roll, there were 225, or 12.8 per cent earning \$10 or more; there were 226, or approximately 12.8 per cent, earning from \$8 to \$9.99; 11 per cent, composing some 195 women; were earning from \$7 to \$7.99. There were 17 per cent, or 300 women, earning from \$6 to \$6.99. There were 358, or 20.4 per cent, earning from \$5 to \$5.99. There were 361 women, or 20.5 per cent, earning from \$4 to \$4.99. There were 95 women, or 5.4 per cent, earning from \$3 to \$3.99, and there

were none earning under \$3 per week. These are the groupings for the saleswomen only. I will say that our figures were substantially the same, and when I say "our own figures" I mean the figures given by individuals. I wish also to say that this \$6.75 general average for the 2,600 women includes all the buyers and assistant buyers, except nine, who were receiving \$4,200 a year. If you put in these buyers, who were receiving on the average \$4,200 a year, the pay-roll data will show an average of \$7 per week instead of \$6.75. Do you wish groupings for the other occupations?

The CHAIRMAN. No; I would suggest that it be put in the record, as our time is very brief this morning. Let it go in at this point.

The table referred to is as follows:

Average weekly earnings of 252 department-store women individually scheduled, compared with weekly rate of pay as given by 11 establishments.

Occupation.	Number of women earning specified weekly amounts.														Total number.	Average earnings.			
	\$2 to \$2.99.		\$3 to \$3.99.		\$4 to \$4.99.		\$5 to \$5.99.		\$6 to \$6.99.		\$7 to \$7.99.		\$8 to \$9.99.				\$10 or more.		
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.			Number.	Per cent.	
<i>From individual schedules.</i>																			
Cash girls, bundle wrappers, errand girls, etc.	9	47.4	9	47.4	1	5.2											19	\$2.93	
Inspectors and cashiers									1	(1)	4	(1)	1	(1)			6	7.16	
Saleswomen			13	73.0	36	20.1	34	19.0	27	15.1	19	10.6	36	20.1	14	7.8	179	6.36	
Office help (clerical)	1	(1)	2	(1)	6	(1)	4	(1)	2	(1)	6	(1)	5	(1)	3	(1)	29	6.53	
Other employees, including department heads and buyers ²									1	(1)			1	(1)	15	(1)	2	18	13.15
Total	10	4.0	24	9.5	44	17.5	38	15.1	31	12.3	30	11.9	43	17.0	32	12.7	252	6.55	
<i>From establishment pay rolls.</i>																			
Cash girls, messengers, bundle wrappers, errand girls, etc.	44	16.5	186	69.7	26	9.7	7	2.6	3	1.12	1	.4					267	3.20	
Inspectors and cashiers								5	11.1	18	40.0	11	24.4	8	17.8	3	6.7	45	7.30
Saleswomen			95	5.4	361	20.5	358	20.4	300	17.0	195	11.1	226	12.8	225	12.8	1,760	6.55	
Office help (clerical)			14	5.6	45	17.8	23	9.1	42	16.7	37	14.7	47	18.6	44	17.5	252	7.57	
Other employees, including department heads and buyers	12	3.5	18	5.2	14	4.1	5	1.4	43	12.4	62	17.9	73	21.1	119	34.4	346	11.76	
Total	56	2.1	313	11.7	446	16.7	398	15.0	406	15.2	306	11.5	354	13.2	391	14.6	2,670	6.75	

¹ Percentages not given, as numbers are too small to make percentages significant.

² Does not include workshop women, as they are tabulated under manufacturing industries.

³ Includes one whose occupation is not reported and does not include 17, wages not reported.

⁴ Includes the workshop women of one large department store, which included them with saleswomen in their pay-roll data.

⁵ In this average 9 buyers whose average wage was \$80.75 a week were not included, as among the individuals scheduled there were none of this grade. With these 9 buyers included, the average wage would be \$7.

Miss OBENAUER. Now, for the manufacturing establishments. I will say, first, however, as has been said here before, that there are not many women, comparatively speaking, employed in the manufacturing and mercantile industries. The census of 1910 gives an average of 828 in the manufacturing establishments, exclusive of the steam laundries. Including steam laundries there are about 1,500. We interviewed personally about 10 per cent of them—a fairly representative though not very large list. We adopted the same policy of calling upon the employers for information, in order that we might compare that with the information which we had received from the employees, and in all instances we received the hearty cooperation of the employers, except in the case of the laundries, and there we encountered some reluctance. In one case we had an absolute refusal; in others the information was given very reluctantly, and I must say that in those cases we had some very serious discrepancies between the information given us by the employers and that given us by the employees. May I say that our policy in this matter was this: We had 40 or 50 laundry girls and we grouped them according to hours. We tabulated their hours and earnings, and then we called upon their employers in order that we might have their statement. Now, I may ask, Mr. Chairman, that this reluctance ought not to be ascribed to the laundrymen as a whole. In fact, I am sure since this report has been closed that there are quite a number of laundrymen from whose establishments we did not have individual schedules, that would take the view that no matter what the conditions are, nothing could arouse more sinister suspicions than the refusal to give information when it is called for from a responsible and impartial source.

I hope that this statement may be made a part of the record, in order that this reluctance may not be charged against all the laundrymen. In regard to the earnings I wish to say that the discrepancies between the statements of employees and employers that I spoke of do not apply. We got from three of the laundrymen—proprietors of not very large laundries, for some of the most reluctant were proprietors of the largest laundries—we got from three laundries average earnings of \$5.47, according to the pay-roll data submitted, and our own schedules were approximately the same; a little lower, but about the same.

In the matter of working hours I think I have not as yet submitted data before this committee. Do you want that?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; we would like to have it.

Miss OBENAUER. I will give you first a summary of normal working hours in the laundries, reported by the individuals. We had 44 laundry girls who gave us definite information as to their working hours. There were 22.7 per cent of those who reported from 48 to 54 normal working hours. Twenty-one of the 44 reported from 55 to 59 hours.

Mr. GRAY. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, but it is evident that we will not be able to hear of the statement of this witness, and I am very anxious to get to the House. Could this be continued to some other time? I am willing to come back any number of times.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would suggest, Mr. Gray, that we get through with this particular phase of it, and then we can consider the question of whether we will go on.

MISS OBENAUER. I will talk a little faster. There were 18 per cent working 60 to 64 hours, and there were about 7 per cent working from 65 to 68 hours. That was for the normal working hours. Now, for the summary of working hours on the maximum day—I want to say that the maximum day in the laundries should be taken into consideration, so far as the working hours are concerned, with the two short days that usually do occur in the laundries everywhere, Mondays and Saturdays. The individual reports that we had do show some extreme maximum days, but in those laundries I want to make very sure that those days will not be taken as prevailing, but as the maximum days that occur in the sporadic rushes that come upon them when there is an extra convention or an extra hotel order. This is a summary of the working hours of maximum days during overtime weeks, as shown by the individual reports. There were 5 per cent that worked less than 11 hours during the entire overtime season. There were 15 per cent that worked just an even 11 hours. There were 44 per cent that worked 12 hours. There were 34 per cent that worked 13 hours on maximum days.

THE CHAIRMAN. Could you file those papers with the stenographer?

MISS OBENAUER. Yes, sir. Do you wish me to go any further?

THE CHAIRMAN. No; I think at this point would probably be as good a place as you could find. Will it be possible for you to be present on Monday?

MISS OBENAUER. Yes, sir.

MR. KING. I leave town to-morrow; I do not know about Mr. Andrews, but if the gentlemen will bear with me about three minutes I would like to read you a letter that will go in the record—

THE CHAIRMAN (interposing). I am afraid we will not have time for that now, Mr. King.

MR. KING. I will have it read Monday, then.

THE CHAIRMAN. Very well. Otherwise you can insert it in the record. The committee will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock Monday morning.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, February 10, 1913.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. William B. Wilson (chairman) presiding.

There were present before the committee Miss M. L. Obenauer, of the Bureau of Labor, Department of Commerce and Labor; C. F. Sowers, E. B. Farren, and others.

THE CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. You may proceed, Miss Obenauer.

STATEMENT OF MISS M. L. OBENAUER—Continued.

MISS OBENAUER. Mr. Chairman, may I say, before I go on with my statement—I suppose it is not within the jurisdiction of the committee to see that the papers do justice, but I feel as though a gross wrong has been done the laundrymen in the report that appeared in the paper Saturday night, and I wanted to make very sure that the

committee understood that what I said in the way of criticism of what you might call the reluctance of certain laundrymen should not be charged against all of the laundrymen. In the paper Saturday night the report appeared as a criticism of all the laundrymen in the city, and the criticism was inclosed in quotation marks, as if it was coming from me directly. I want to state here again this morning that we had from 40 to 50 laundry girls, and when we had their hours and earnings classified we called upon the proprietors of the establishments in which those girls were employed in order to have their statement of the hours and the earnings. There were 7 laundries of the 17 listed in the census of 1910. That list included some of the largest and some of the moderate laundries. One of those laundrymen refused outright to give us any information; three others were more or less reluctant. The others gave us the information, and I want to repeat that in those cases there were practically no discrepancies between the statements from the employees and the employers as to working hours and earnings. In the other cases there were some very serious discrepancies.

For example, one laundryman who stated the hours—after having refused to give any information—said they never exceeded 54. We had reports from 15 employees in his establishment reports taken by five or six agents in different parts of the city at the same time. These individual reports showed that the hours were in excess of those reported by the employer, from 6 to about 18 in the week. Inasmuch as the information was from individuals in different parts of the city, and there was no chance for collusion, and inasmuch as the laundryman was very reluctant and evasive in his answers, we felt that the information from the employees should stand. We have recorded the information from the employer, but we have in the report footnoted the fact that there were 15 people in the establishment who reported different hours. I want to say again, however, that this should not be charged against all of the laundrymen. It is grossly unfair to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN. I might say, Miss Obenauer, that your statement is exactly as I understood it when you made it here on Saturday.

MISS OBENAUER. I tried to make myself plain, and I was much distressed to see that statement in the paper.

MR. BUCHANAN. Is that your first experience of misrepresentation in the paper?

MISS OBENAUER. I have not had much experience in newspaper representations before.

MR. BUCHANAN. I have gotten to the point where I do not take time to notice them.

MR. SOWERS. Might I at this point ask the witness a question? Inasmuch as this conflicting information reflects upon the laundrymen who are in opposition to this bill, may I ask her if those cases where she met with reluctance, and the one case where they met with a flat refusal—if those laundrymen are the ones who have appeared here?

THE CHAIRMAN. I hardly think that question would be a proper question, unless Miss Obenauer specifies who the individuals were that refused, and I do not know that this committee cares particularly about that. For that reason, unless it was the purpose to state

specifically who the ones were that refused, I would object to the question as presented.

Mr. SOWERS. In the impressions made by the papers it would look—especially the Saturday accounts—that the attack was particularly on myself, as I was the laundryman who was reluctant. May I ask whether I was interviewed or not?

The CHAIRMAN. I would have the same objection to that question, unless the whole matter is to be taken up and specific statements made as to who were the ones that refused and the ones that were reluctant.

Miss OBENAUER. May I say there, as I understand it, I am under oath to give no information as to individuals or firms. I think that is my status.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood that to be the case, and for that reason I would not want to have enter into the record here any statement that by the process of elimination would result in the discovery of that which you are sworn to conceal. Hence my objection.

Mr. E. B. FARREN. The hours of the laundries, in the great majority of them that I am interested in, are about 54 hours a week. In my particular laundry we work on Mondays—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I must also object to any interjection of this matter at this time. Miss Obenauer is on the stand now.

Miss OBENAUER. I think on Saturday I stated the hours as given by 44 women from 7 laundries of the city. I gave the hours by the week and then I gave the maximum working day. I think I should say that the hours—that is, the daily hours—for 54 per cent of these workers were 10. Now, when I say the “usual” day, I mean that which occurred more than any other, according to their reports. I want to say also that this included a number of women who were employed in establishments doing a great deal of hotel flat work. The hours where the flat work prevailed seemed to be longer, and the employers themselves who gave us information reported longer hours where the flat work was heavy than where bundle work or specialty work prevailed.

Also, I want to call your attention to the fact that there are usually 2 short days in the laundry. Monday work and Saturday work, so that this “usual day” would apply to but 4 days. Now, that is the information given us by the women themselves. We had interviewed, as I said, seven laundrymen, and one man refused information altogether. From four of the other places the prevailing hours for the normal season were from 48 to 59 hours; that is, two of them gave from 48 to 54 and two gave from 55 to 59. When I say “normal,” perhaps I ought to explain to guard against confusion. The laundrymen who have appeared before you have spoken of their busy season. We have called that normal which occurs for a half or more of the year; that is, that which was usual we have called normal. It appears from the testimony given by the laundrymen that they divide their seasons into busy and dull, and they have nothing that we have called “normal,” so if you will simply bear in mind that when I say “normal” I mean that which we have regarded

as the level of their good business. Two of them gave from 48 to 54 and two others from 55 to 59.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have taken this laundry matter out of the general information concerning women in manufacturing and mercantile establishments, because there seemed to be some stressing of laundry information. I wanted to call your attention to the fact that some of the information before this committee made it plain that the hours were very different for different occupations. That is entirely true.

For example, the markers, who handle soiled clothes, would have different hours from the ironers. Their work involved certain occupational demands, that are not made upon the ironers. On the other hand, the ironers have some physical strain that the people in the offices and the markers do not have.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated, I believe, Miss Obenauer, that you found the average wage in the laundry to be \$5.47 per week?

MISS OBENAUER. There were three laundrymen who gave us their pay rolls, and there were 67 in those laundries that averaged \$5.47 a week. For the 44 women individually scheduled I think the average was a little bit less, but substantially the same.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you find to be the maximum wage and what the minimum wage upon which that average is based?

MISS OBENAUER. We had two of them that got \$10 or more. We had none that were getting less than \$4 on the pay roll. Now, I say we had none getting under \$4—we had none getting a rate of pay under \$4, but we had some whose average earnings for the period of employment were something under \$4—\$3.75, owing to lost time, but the rate of pay would substantially agree with this statement here from the pay rolls.

The CHAIRMAN. You found that practically the minimum rate of pay was \$4 per week and the maximum rate of pay was \$10 per week, with the exception of two individuals who were upward of \$10 per week?

MISS OBENAUER. No; this pay roll gives \$10 or more. If you will excuse me just a moment I can tell you whether we had any wage over \$10 a week [examining papers].

The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say that there were two that received \$10 or more.

MISS OBENAUER. The pay roll showed two that had \$10 or more, but I do not know without examining the records how much higher than \$10. Now was there anything further on the laundries that you wanted?

The CHAIRMAN. No; I think you have covered that very fully.

MISS OBENAUER. I might say right here that the number of women employed in steam laundries is about 700, between 600 and 700, and that the number of people employed in manufacturing establishments, such as paper boxes—and we have included there tailoring and dress-making—were 828, according to the 1910 census. So there are not many altogether. We interviewed about 10 per cent of them, and we grouped their hours altogether; that is, we treated them all as one group, as we treated all in the stores as one group—as I stated the other day.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not recall that you stated the whole number in mercantile establishments.

MISS OBENAUER. In the mercantile establishments there were on the pay rolls submitted to us nearly 2,700. The census of manufactures does not give the number of people employed in trade, because it is a census of manufacturing, not of trade. The population division has issued a bulletin, and in there they have a grouping of clerks and of saleswomen. They have reported 1,440 saleswomen, and then they have another grouping of some 5,000 clerks, and a footnote saying, "This probably includes a great many people in the stores." It is pretty hard to say how many people are included, but I would think, judging from our pay rolls—the firms included on these pay rolls—that we probably had in our pay roll data two-thirds of the women employed in the retail places of the city.

The CHAIRMAN. In the classification of clerks in which this 5,000 are included does that take in generally the clerks in offices?

MISS OBENAUER. Outside the Government. In fact, I think the purpose of the Population Division was to include in that only people known as clerks in offices, stenographers, and so forth, because the footnote would indicate that there had slipped in a good many that were really salespeople, and for that reason, as I say, it is pretty hard to state absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. This information had not been properly obtained by the enumerators.

MISS OBENAUER. Yes. Now, then, taking all these women included in the manufacturing and mechanical, which would include the laundries, the normal working hours for 55 per cent of them were from 48 to 54, the prevailing day being from 8 to 9. By "normal" I mean the level of good business.

The CHAIRMAN. That did not make it very clear to me, and I do not know that it does to the others, as to whether the normal period as included in your reports is similar to the busy period as stated here or to the dull period as stated here.

MISS OBENAUER. It was the same as the busy period as stated here. In the laundry business it covers about January 1 to July—the usual time that Congress is in session. Our purpose when we said "normal" was to get that which prevailed during the greater part of the year—

MR. BUCHANAN (interposing). If you speak of the time that Congress is in session, that is about all the time now.

MISS OBENAUER. Now, of those that worked in the busy seasons about 50 per cent worked overtime, and 60 per cent of those that were working overtime worked from 2 to 10 weeks. That does not mean every day in the week. I would call your attention to the fact that this 60 per cent is something of a contrast with the number of women in stores that worked overtime during the Christmas holidays. Something like 90 per cent of the women that were interviewed and were in the stores at Christmas time worked overtime. On the other hand, the women in the stores worked overtime for one week, and very few of them were paid for it—only about 8 per cent. In the manufacturing and mechanical, 60 per cent worked from 2 to 10 weeks overtime. You see, overtime is not so sharp there.

The CHAIRMAN. How much overtime did they work during that period of two to six weeks?

MISS OBENAUER. I will come back to that directly—well, I have it right here in this note. Twenty-eight per cent of the women that were working overtime—as compared with 65 per cent in the stores—worked from 70 to 79 hours. Let me state that again, Mr. Chairman, because one condition somewhat offsets the other. Sixty-five per cent of the people were working overtime in the stores during the Christmas holiday week and were working 70 to 79 hours. In the manufacturing industries there were 28 per cent that worked the hours I have named, 70 to 79 hours, but they worked a longer time—that is, from 2 to 10 weeks—whereas the people in the stores worked 1 week or at most 2 weeks.

There was no tendency in the manufacturing and mechanical establishments to lengthen the hours on Saturday. In the stores, over half of them had a long Saturday. Over 62 per cent worked 11 hours or over on Saturday in the normal season, and that occurs throughout the year exclusive of the dull summer months, the dull season lasting not more than 11 or 12 weeks. In the manufacturing and mechanical there is no tendency to lengthen the hours on Saturday during overtime seasons.

MR. BUCHANAN. In the manufacturing did they pay for overtime?

MISS OBENAUER. In the manufacturing and mechanical, yes; perhaps I had better single out the printing trades and the dressmaking and tailoring. It is the usual custom to pay for overtime. I think there was no exception to that.

MR. BUCHANAN. Did they pay anything more than the usual rate?

MISS OBENAUER. Time and a half seems to be the prevailing rate, although we found instances of double time.

The CHAIRMAN. I regret that we must cut off these hearings again at this point. We will adjourn now until 9.30 to-morrow morning.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, February 11, 1913.

The committee met at 9.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. William B. Wilson (chairman) presiding. There were present before the committee: Miss M. L. Obenauer, representing the Bureau of Labor; C. F. Sowers, 823 G Street NW., manager Columbia Laundry; R. P. Andrews, acting president, Retail Merchants Association; George F. Hebbard, secretary, Merchant Tailors Exchange; Archibald McSween, superintendent, National Publishing Co.; E. B. Farren, 1723 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., representing the West End Laundry; F. C. Chorley, 1018 Fourteenth Street NW.; A. P. Avalear, 2117 Fourteenth Street NW., representing the Elite Laundry Co.; John C. Wineman, 914 F Street NW.; L. A. Sterne, 701 Massachusetts Avenue NW., first vice president, Maryland State Federation of Labor, and D. F. Manning, 1524 Eighth Street NW., representing the Retail Clerks Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Miss Obenauer will proceed.

STATEMENT OF MISS M. L. OBENAUER, REPRESENTING THE
BUREAU OF LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR—
Continued.

MISS OBENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I think I was specifying the industries that were paying overtime for work when the committee had to adjourn yesterday. I have stated that it was the universal custom to pay for overtime in the manufacturing and mechanical industries. We found one exception to that—and I have made sure that I was right in what I am about to say, and that was that in the laundry work we did not find any instances of payment for overtime. That was the only exception affecting the women individually scheduled in the manufacturing and mechanical industries. I would like to put into the record, Mr. Chairman, the pay-roll data that we secured from the manufacturing and mechanical establishments, covering the rate of pay for about 326 women; also what we got from the women individually. I want to say before I put the tables in that I think the figures secured from the women individually are really fairer to the industries than the pay-roll data, for this reason: The pay rolls represent the flat rates of pay for a normal day and show an average for the 326 women of \$5.74, while the individual women that were scheduled reported pay for both normal and overtime hours and showed an average earning of \$7.13. I think I said before that in the case of the printing and the tailoring establishments, and also in the case of the laundries, the pay rolls and individual schedules showed a substantial agreement as to rates of pay. The printing trade showed an average of \$8.16 and the tailoring nearly \$10—\$9.86, the laundries \$5.47. These figures are the same as those submitted here to the committee by the representatives. The table based upon individual schedules is arranged in wage groups rather than by industries. The footnotes, however, throw some light upon the wage by industries. The table referred to is as follows:

Weekly rates of pay of women employed in selected manufacturing and mechanical establishments in Washington, D. C., as shown by establishment pay rolls.

Industry.	Number of establishments reporting. Total number of women.		Number of women earning specified weekly amounts.												Average rate of pay in each industry.		
			Less than \$4.		\$4 to \$4.99.		\$5 to \$5.99.		\$6 to \$6.99.		\$7 to \$7.99.		\$8 to \$9.99.			\$10 and more.	
			Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.		Number.	Per cent.
Laundry.....	3	67	8	11.90	40	59.7	11	16.40	6	8.90	2	2.98	\$5.47	
Printing.....	3	22	22	100.00	8.16	
Confectionery.....	2	57	1	1.8	23	40.35	22	38.60	11	19.30	7.14	
Tailoring.....	2	14	1	7.10	3	21.50	10	71.40	9.86	
Supply house.....	1	139	94	67.62	15	10.8	7	5.03	6	4.31	9	6.47	8	5.75	5.25	
Paper box.....	1	27	7	25.91	9	33.33	2	7.4	5	18.51	3	11.10	1	3.70	5.30
Total.....	12	326	7	2.1	111	34.00	58	17.8	46	14.1	35	10.8	37	11.4	32	9.80	5.74

Average weekly earnings of women employed in manufacturing and mechanical industries as shown by individual schedules.

Classified average weekly earnings.	Women earning specified weekly amounts.	
	Number.	Per cent.
\$2 to \$2.99.....	2	1.4
\$3 to \$3.99.....	7	4.9
\$4 to \$4.99.....	1 24	16.8
\$5 to \$5.99.....	2 34	23.8
\$6 to \$6.99.....	14	9.8
\$7 to \$7.99.....	18	12.6
\$8 to \$8.99.....	20	13.9
\$10 or more.....	2 24	16.8
Total.....	143	100.0

Average weekly earnings. \$7.13.

¹ 75 per cent were employed by laundries and drug companies.

² 55.9 per cent were employed by laundries.

³ 37.5 per cent were employed by tailoring establishments.

There is one other thing I wanted to say in connection with these earnings. Seven dollars and thirteen cents is about 35 cents higher than the average shown for the department and other retail stores. I think there should be taken into consideration with that the fact that 80 per cent of the women employed in the department stores showed employment of from 48 to 52 weeks, whereas in the mechanical and manufacturing only about 59 per cent showed so long a duration of employment. That is, I think, pertinent to the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand from that that the manufacturing establishments showed so much more lost time?

MISS OBENAUER. Yes, there is much more lost time there. The effect of the dull season in the manufacturing and mechanical industries in Washington is shown in the number of layoffs during the dull season. In the department stores that is not so noticeable. You find women employed much longer during the year in the stores, and of course the earnings have a direct bearing on that. Now I think the hours for the manufacturing and mechanical have been covered.

In the matter of the hotels I should say that the distinguishing feature is 7-day labor. Seventy per cent of the women that were interviewed were employed seven days of the week, though not always the same hours. They have short days, sometimes two short days in the week, but the distinguishing feature was the fact that they had to be on duty seven days in the week.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you find to be the average number of hours for hotel employees?

MISS OBENAUER. I will give you first the information we secured from individuals, and then what the employers themselves gave us. Let me say here, inasmuch as I called attention to reluctance on the part of employers before, that there was no reluctance on the part of the hotel or restaurant men, any more than there was upon the part of the department stores or manufacturing establishments. Of the women that we individually scheduled, those working under 48 hours constituted about 22 per cent; those working 48 to 54 hours constituted about 20 per cent; from 55 to 59, 30 per cent. That is the largest group. These are hours throughout the year, and not for any

one season. Those working 60 to 64 constitute 16 per cent; 65 to 69 hours 4 per cent, 70 hours and over—more definitely—70 to 72 hours, 4 per cent. In the table giving maximum hours there was a larger percentage working the longer periods, 10 per cent reporting their maximum hours as from 65 to 69. Mr. Chairman, I will leave this table to be made part of the record if you so desire.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. Might I ask at this point if the difference in hours is due to the different kinds of work that women are doing?

Miss OBENAUER. It is due to the different occupations. The glass washers, for instance, have a different set of hours from the other workers. The linen clerks are longer on duty than any of the others, but the demands on them are not so great. The cleaning women are on the shortest number of hours, but they have nightwork, beginning sometimes 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, and they are on duty a longer time in the week.

The CHAIRMAN. Hours that are inconvenient and unusual?

Miss OBENAUER. Yes.

Mr. ROUSE. Is that table for the record?

Miss OBENAUER. Yes.

Mr. ROUSE. Let me see it, please.

Miss OBENAUER (handing table to Mr. Rouse). These are from individuals. This table is from the establishments; and I will say that inasmuch as we could not put in one table the hours for all the different occupations, we made this table to show the longest set of hours required for any single group of people. If that is not the largest group, then there is set forth in the footnote the hours for the largest group. What we wanted to do was to mark the limit of demand on employees. I have the average weekly hours here throughout the year as reported by employees. For the first establishment it is 63 and 78. The figure ¹ refers to the footnote stating that the two figures represent alternate weeks. In the second establishment the figures are 77; in the third, 69 and 71; in the fourth, 70; in the fifth, 70; in the sixth, 60 and 70; in the seventh, 60 and 70; in the eighth, 70; in the ninth, 66½; in the tenth, 61 and 66; in the eleventh, 56 and 63; and in the twelfth, 30. The establishments represent about 382—nearly 400 women altogether.

Mr. ROUSE. Do you give the names of the establishments on that table?

Miss OBENAUER. No; we tell what kind of establishments they are, but we do not give any names.

Mr. ROUSE. Then we can not tell anything about this table.

Miss OBENAUER. Those are only the individuals working in hotels and restaurants, showing the average weekly hours of women at work in restaurants, hotels, and miscellaneous places.

Mr. ROUSE. Is that for the record?

Miss OBENAUER. I do not know whether we could put this in the record or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I think you can.

Miss OBENAUER. I will say that for the 50 women that we had individually scheduled, in 64 per cent of the cases the women received board and room in addition to the wage, and that should be carefully noted, because the wage apparently is much lower. May I say also that the hotels covered are the large down-town hotels? They do not cover the apartment houses out in the resident districts. I think

perhaps I could save time if I just give you the main figures and put this table in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I think that would be preferable.

Miss OBENAUER. Of these 50 women there are 33 getting \$3 to \$3.99 a week. Of the others there were two getting below that, and the others scattered along from \$8 to \$8.99 per week. We had none getting over \$10 a week; 64 per cent of them got both board and room; 6.2 per cent additional had meals, but no room; that is, practically 70 per cent of them got either meals or room or both in addition to the wage.

The CHAIRMAN. Among those who had rooms and board or board alone are there any of those that are included in the higher rates in your table? You have some there who are receiving nearly \$10. Are those that are receiving that higher rate also getting board and room?

Miss OBENAUER. No, sir; those that received \$8 and \$8.99 received cash only. That is true of those receiving \$7.99; they received cash only. The table shows that. I think that is all I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one other point that I would like to get information about, if you have it, and that is as to the temperatures in the laundries and in the kitchens of the hotels. Have you made any investigations of that?

Miss OBENAUER. Not in the kitchens of the hotels.

Working hours of women employed in selected hotels, restaurants, and at service work in miscellaneous establishments of Washington, D. C., as reported by employers.

[The longest hours worked by any set of women is given. Occasional overtime, occurring on special occasions, as banquets, halls, etc., is not included in the tabulations.]

Establishment No.	Character.	Women employed.	Regular working hours throughout the year.							Women affected.
			Hours usual day.	Hours short day.	Hours long day.	Average weekly hours.	Days worked per week.	Nights worked per week.	Maximum weekly hours.	
1	Hotel.....	37	10½	None.	15	{ 1 63 1 78	{ 1 6 1 7	{ 1 3 1 4	78	2 2
2	do.....	64	11	None.	11	{ 77 69	{ 7 7	{ 7 7	77	3 7
3	do.....	64	{ 11 9	None.	11	{ 1 69 1 71	{ 7 7	{ 7 7	71	5 6
4	do.....	17	10	None.	10	{ 70 70	{ 7 7	{ None. None.	70	6 1
5	Restaurant.....	10	10	None.	10	{ 70 60	{ 7 8 6	{ None. None.	70	10
6	do.....	6	10	None.	10	{ 8 70 8 70	{ 8 6 8 7	{ None. None.	70	2
7	Transportation...	65	10	None.	10	{ 1 60 1 70	{ 1 6 1 7	{ None. None.	70	60
8	do.....	46	10	None.	10	{ 70 70	{ 7 7	{ None. None.	70	46
9	Restaurant.....	24	9½	None.	9½	{ 66½ 66½	{ 7 7	{ None. None.	66½	6
10	Hotel.....	24	{ 9½ 10½	{ 5½ 8	10½	{ 1 61 1 66	{ 7 7	{ None. None.	66	9 2
11	do.....	18	{ 5 12	None.	12	{ 1 56 1 63	{ 7 7	{ 1 3 1 4	63	10 2
12	Restaurant.....	7	5	None.	3	{ 30	{ 6	{ None.	30	7

¹ Alternate weeks.

² 24, the largest group of women employed, have an average week of 54 hours, with a maximum week of 64 hours occurring every sixth week.

³ 27, the largest group of women employed, have an average week of 56 hours, with a maximum week of 64 hours occurring every fourth week.

⁴ Alternate days.

⁵ 32, the largest group of women employed, have an average week of 60 hours, with a maximum week of 64 hours every fourth week.

⁶ 8, the largest group of women employed, have an average week of 66½ hours, with a shorter week of 63 hours every fourth week.

⁷ Every tenth week have a 6½-hour day, or a 4½-hour week.

⁸ Have every tenth day off.

⁹ 15, the largest group of women employed, have an average week of 50½ hours, with a maximum week of 60 hours.

¹⁰ 10, the largest group of women employed, have an average week of 53 hours, with a maximum week of 60 hours.

100 HOURS OF LABOR FOR WOMEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Women earning specified weekly amounts and number in each wage group receiving board or room or both, in addition to specified wage.

	\$2 to \$2.99	\$3 to \$3.99	\$4 to \$4.99	\$5 to \$5.99	\$6 to \$6.99	\$7 to \$7.99	\$8 to \$9.99	Total number.	Per cent.
Number receiving specified cash amounts.....	2	33	1	6	2	2	2	48	100.0
Number receiving board and room in addition to wage....	2	26		3				31	64.6
Number receiving one or more meals only in addition to wage.....		2			1			3	6.2
Receiving cash earnings only.....		5	1	3	1	2	2	14	29.2
Total.....	2	33	1	6	2	2	2	48	100.0

¹ Two of the women individually scheduled did not report earnings.

Average and maximum weekly hours of women at work in hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous establishments.

Weekly hours.	Women working specified weekly hours.												
	Total women reporting.	Under 48.		48 to 54.		55 to 59.		60 to 64.		65 to 69.		70 and over.	
		No.	Per cent.	No.	Per cent.								
Average weekly hours.....	50	11	22	10	20	15	30	18	16	2	4	4	8
Maximum weekly hours..	50	11	22	6	12	16	32	8	16	5	10	4	8

We have just completed a rather exhaustive study of the occupational demands upon women in steam laundries. In order that I may not make any remarks that are not pertinent to your investigation, I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, whether the young woman who testified before the committee the other day as to the machine she was operating was describing a machine of the annihilator or trojan type? I think Mr. Sowers could tell that. Was it of the annihilator type?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes; it was.

Miss OBENAUER. In this study that we made in regard to occupational demands of steam laundries, it was our purpose not to go into the conditions of the workers at all, but to find out just what the measure of the demands of the various occupations were upon women. For instance, if a girl was operating a foot-treadle machine we did not have the agents attempt to run that machine and report as whether or not it was a light-running machine, but we had a scale made with an automatic measuring device; we put the scale on the machine to measure the force needed to operate the treadle. Then, when the work was running along in the ordinary level, the number of operations per minute were counted and recorded. We had a whirling hygrometer to take the temperature and humidity in the working place of the operator. Now, the reason I ask about the character of the machine described by the witness

before this committee is this: There is a great deal of difference in the temperature of the flat work ironers as shown by our records.

The annihilator, which the young woman who testified here was evidently running, had a pretty high temperature record if, in the establishment we visited, it was not properly equipped with an exhaust system. We took our records between the 27th of March and the 16th of April in the city of Milwaukee, Wis., where they have some 31 laundries. The highest outdoor temperature at any time was 75 degrees. We never took any temperatures inside that we did not take them at the same time outside, in order to distinguish between conditions chargeable to the industry and those chargeable to the weather. We did not wish to load all the sins of the weather man onto the laundryman. There were eight annihilators in the city of Milwaukee for which we had temperature records. For those not equipped with an exhaust system the temperature ranged from 69 to 94, the temperature outside at the same time being 75. That was the highest temperature that we had outside. At the same time we took the temperatures about annihilators where there was an exhaust system, and the highest record we had there was 76.

The CHAIRMAN. With the same temperature outside?

MISS OBENAUER. The temperature outside at that time was 46. The exhaust system makes a good deal of difference, although we have had cases where an exhaust system apparently failed. There were two machines of great radiating power close together, the operator of one machine getting the heat of the other machine because the exhaust system drew the heat away from one onto the operators of another. Consequently, although the rooms were adequately equipped with exhaust systems, the machines were badly placed and the operators were working in high degrees of temperature. I should say that these annihilators call for no occupational demand in the way of physical exertion. It is a machine driven by steam. It is, however, a dangerous machine if not properly guarded, because the hands of the operator may be caught in the rolls.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you found generally that they are properly guarded, or have you made any investigation?

MISS OBENAUER. No, not here in the city; but the accidents on these annihilators are so serious when they do occur that it is in the interests of the employer to keep them pretty well guarded. Accidents on flat-work ironers are generally very bad accidents. Do you have the automatic stop guards on your machines, Mr. Sowers?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes.

MISS OBENAUER. What I mean by the automatic stop guard is a device so placed that if the operator moves it toward the roller the machine automatically stops.

Mr. SOWERS. I can say that that is universally used here.

MISS OBENAUER. Do you have the doffer roll?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes.

MISS OBENAUER. The real strain in the laundry comes upon the operators of foot-treadle machines. In testing these machines with our scale we found that they registered 100 pounds or over. That was a frequent record on the cuff-press machine. This is a device upon which the girl puts the cuff or the yoke of the shirt and then brings down the upper press by foot pressure. We found that in

most cases the girls adjusted the tension of the machine themselves, and were under the impression that the tighter they made it the better finish they got on the garment and the less time it took. I will say that the laundrymen in Milwaukee were very helpful about this study, not only allowing us to make our investigations, but helping us in it. They were very much surprised when we put the scale to the machine to see how much pressure was being used in the operation. After the study was over we went back and made other tests, and the laundrymen themselves readjusted the machines and found that 50 pounds on the whole was all that was needed, except for unusually thick material. The highest amount of pressure that was needed was 72 pounds. You can realize what it means to take off that much pressure for each operation in a 10-hour day, with a machine calling for 16 operations per minute. It was not only a saving of the energy of the operator, but it was likewise a saving to the padding on the machine and the machine itself. After we got these records completed we submitted them to a committee of physicians. We stated exactly how many operations per minute the foot-treadle machines required, taking the body ironers and cuff-press machines as examples and giving the prevailing temperatures in which the girls worked. Then we asked what would be the tendencies of such labor on a young woman of average health, 21 years old and unmarried.

Our purpose was not to find out what it would do to the anemic and run-down. It has been my observation that most people employed in laundries were not exceptional one way or the other, and the thing that would be important would be the tendency that would be created in the average, because if it would have an injurious effect on the average young woman, it would certainly have a worse effect on those that were below the average. Dr. Ravenel, who is connected with the University of Wisconsin, was on this committee, and his statement I will read, if you wish it, with that of the other physicians.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; we would like to have it.

Miss OBENAUER (reading):

I would expect such work to be detrimental to the health of a young woman. It would almost certainly produce some distortion of the spine with one-sided development of the body.

The opinions of Dr. Copeland and of Dr. William Thorndike, both of Milwaukee, were practically identical, viz: If long continued the operation of such machines would have a strong tendency to create pelvic disorders. We did not ask opinions of workers at all, because we did not feel that they were competent to judge whether the work was harmful or not, because the pathological results are slow and devious. In justice to the laundry industry, I should say that of the 552 women individually scheduled in Milwaukee only a few over a hundred were running the foot-treadle machine. The others were running machines that made no excessive or exceptional demands at all, and should not be, and would not be, rated as doing excessive labor if the sanitary conditions are all right. Everything depends, of course, on the efficiency of management, and I will say for the benefit of the laundrymen here, that the foot-treadle machines are probably responsible more than anything else for giv-

ing the laundry industry the name of being an exceptionally hard employment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are those facts which you have stated here the result of an investigation in the city of Milwaukee?

Miss OBENAUER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you made any investigation in the city of Washington?

Miss OBENAUER. Not of the character of machines. May I say that we made a study of the question in Milwaukee, with the idea of extracting from the local conditions those facts which are common to the industry all over the country. We went from the laundries in Milwaukee to the foundries to see what kind of machines are being made, and sent all over the country in order that we might know what results would be likely to be produced anywhere in the industry. The results of the investigation of local conditions would be of value in other parts of the country where similar conditions prevailed.

The CHAIRMAN. In making your investigation relative to temperature, did you make investigation at different periods during the day? For instance, during the time when they were utilizing natural light, and during the time they were utilizing artificial light, did you note the effect that the artificial light had on the temperature?

Miss OBENAUER. In Milwaukee they have a 55-hour law, and we found practically no overtime there at all. We found some rather poorly lighted establishments, particularly in the wash rooms, where the humidity was higher than in other work rooms—in some cases on a dark day they would need artificial light, but as the days on which we were in such establishments were clear they were not using the artificial light, so we have no record of the effect of such light on the temperature.

Mr. SOWERS. In comparing the statistics regarding the different institutions in Washington did the bureau compare statistics covering domestics and employees of hospitals?

Miss OBENAUER. No.

Mr. SOWERS. In comparing these statistics, also, did you investigate the temperature and conditions of Chinese laundries?

Miss OBENAUER. I should say that this information applies only to steam laundries, and I believe that the foundry men sell no steam laundry machinery to the Chinese laundries at all, do they?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes; they do.

Miss OBENAUER. We have no information about the Chinese laundries, nor hand laundries.

Mr. SOWERS. I asked that question in view of the fact that the Chinese laundry is the hottest in the country, and they work the longest hours.

Miss OBENAUER. Our investigation has only to do with conditions under which women labor.

Mr. SOWERS. The Chinese laundries employ domestics to do a certain part of their work. They employ colored women.

Miss OBENAUER. They did not have them in the places that we investigated.

Mr. SOWERS. You will find it so in Washington.

Mr. ANDREWS. By request I wish to submit a petition handed me by the president of the Ladies' Tailors and Dressmakers Associa-

tion of America, Washington branch; and also a petition of the employees of the Ladies' Tailors Association of Washington. Then I would like to introduce Mr. Archibald McSween.

PETITION FROM THE LADIES' TAILORS AND DRESSMAKERS ASSOCIATION.

[Headquarters the Ladies' Tailors and Dressmakers Association of America Branch No. 3, Washington, D. C., 802 Fourteenth St. N. W.]

*To the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

GENTLEMEN: The Ladies' Tailors and Dressmakers Association of Washington, D. C., wish to enter protest against the proposed law for the elimination of female labor to eight hours per day, as it will ultimately work a hardship on both employers and employees.

The women employed in the ladies' tailoring and dressmaking industries are largely dependent upon the money they earn from extra work they perform during the busy season, as they are subject to very short seasons and long enforced vacations, and to take a part of their means of livelihood from them would be an injustice to them and to us. On the other hand, as we are very often called upon to produce garments on very short notice and by the use of skilled labor, which is not overly plentiful in this city, which makes it impossible to make other distribution of our employees or to introduce "shift work."

In view of the above reasons we recommend that the female employees of the ladies' tailoring and dressmaking establishments be excepted from the provisions of the proposed law.

Respectfully submitted.

Robert Plum, president; William S. Schwartz, vice president;
F. C. Chorley, secretary; Adolf Bode, financial secretary; E. W. Zea, treasurer; Paul Leibel; K. Schwab; Henry Müller; A. W. Lukei; N. Del Grosso; H. Pasternak.

PETITION FROM EMPLOYEES OF THE LADIES' TAILORING AND DRESSMAKING ESTABLISHMENTS.

To the Committee on Labor, House of Representatives:

We, the employees of the ladies' tailoring and dressmaking establishments of the city of Washington, D. C., protest against the enactment of the Peters bill now pending in Congress, into law, for the reason that we are largely dependent on the money we earn from overtime work.

The seasons in our business are very short, and our vacations are correspondingly long, and as we have no other method of obtaining funds to carry us over the periods of unemployment we are desirous of accepting such extra work as may come to us, which would be prohibited under such law.

Respectfully submitted.

M. R. Cinotti; M. G. Cattalano; Lulu Reeves; A. Schmidt; Elsie Blair; Ruth Colburn; Bertha Dewdmy, 914 F Street; K. Schwab, 801 Eleventh Street, 914 New York Avenue; Benjamin Shapiro; H. Pasternak; M. Hayes; Mrs. Phillips; J. Jennie Friedner; Fredy Fredmin; E. W. Zea, Myra Thompson, E. Rollins, 1017 Fifteenth Street; H. Müller, M. Moore, R. Heling, M. McMullen, Elizabeth Werner, 1111 Seventeenth Street; G. M. Norton, 1216 Connecticut Avenue; V. Schutz, 1752 M Street; Lukei, 1720 M Street; S. L. Searight, Seventeenth Street; B. L. Godwin; A. Roth, Miss Carper, Marie Smith, 1234 Fourteenth Street.

STATEMENT OF ARCHIBALD MCSWEEN, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Mr. McSween.

MR. MCSWEEN. Our office is a union office. We have always had an 8-hour day, and we employ a good many women in our bindery,

but our business is of such a nature that we can not always stop at 8 hours.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How many people do you employ?

Mr. MCSWEEN. Anywhere from 6 to 20. It is small in comparison with the other industries, but our business is of such a character that we could not employ women if we were not allowed to work more than 8 hours. For instance, we are under contract to furnish programs for a theater. The copy is late, and we have got to get those programs out for Monday night. Now, we could not do that if we had a force that would have to stop after exactly 8 hours. We have to have some elasticity so that if we are a little late we can work an extra hour or an hour and a half overtime. It is the same way with publications. We might be under a contract to put a publication out on a certain day, and we might have to work three or four hours overtime, and such a law as this would result in the elimination of women employees altogether. We would have to have men and boys only in our business. Our labor is skilled labor in a way, but boys and men can easily be trained to do it. I think that is about the main point that I wish to bring up, that we could not work with a force of that kind.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What percentage of your employees are ladies?

Mr. MCSWEEN. I suppose not more than 10 per cent.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Hebbard, representing the merchant tailors of this city, will be our next speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hebbard is recognized.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE E. HEBBARD, REPRESENTING THE RETAIL MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON, AND THE MERCHANT TAILORS' EXCHANGE OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. HEBBARD. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said as to what is considered sufficient pay, adequate pay, maximum and minimum pay, for females in the District of Columbia. Also, the Labor Bureau has submitted several statements and records of their office on the manufacturing and industrial industries in the District of Columbia. Upon inquiry, I found that they have no record of the largest plant, and the only place in the District of Columbia that in any way resembles a factory, where they employ over 1,900 females, one-half of which work at night from 3.30 to 11.30 p. m., and this institution is in competition with other industries.

The CHAIRMAN. What institution is that?

Mr. HEBBARD. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I have here a statement from Mr. Ralph, Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which I will read [reading]:

FEBRUARY 7, 1913.

Mr. GEORGE E. HEBBARD,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 7th instaut, requesting information relative to female employees of this bureau, I desire to state that they work eight hours a day, and the minimum and maximum wages of about 1,900 of them are \$1.50 and \$2.24 per day. There are a few, however, that are paid higher salaries, from \$2.31 a day to \$2,100 per year. Whenever occasion demands, they willingly work overtime, the pay for overtime being one-eighth of a regular day's pay for each hour of overtime worked. The employees at minimum wages have asked to have their wages increased, and the Secretary of the Treasury

has recommended it to be increased to \$1.75 per day, which is now being considered by the House committee having charge of the sundry civil appropriation act.

All employees of this bureau are granted, with pay, leave of absence for 30 days, all the legal holidays, and Saturday half-holidays in July, August, and September.

Respectfully,

J. E. RALPH,
Director.

Mr. SMITH. Is that a national organization?

Mr. HEBBARD. It is the only place in Washington resembling a factory, having, as shown by the record, 1,900 females employed. Mr. Ralph's report says they are allowed to work overtime, for which they are paid one-eighth of a day's pay per hour. The contention we make is that they are allowed to work overtime.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is that a violation of the law?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is an emergency it is not a violation of the law. The law provides for emergency conditions in which they may work overtime.

Mr. HEBBARD. That is exactly the point. We are asking for emergency conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The law relative to contract work provides for emergencies and also provides that the President shall have the power to declare what constitutes an emergency. Would you like to have a provision of that kind in this bill?

Mr. HEBBARD. Yes. Every time we have submitted that it has been opposed by the trade secretaries. We offered that amendment in the Senate, and just as soon as we offered it Miss Kelley knocked it out.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your amendment provide that the President of the United States should decide when an emergency existed?

Mr. HEBBARD. How can the President provide for an emergency in the tailoring business?

The CHAIRMAN. Whom do you want to determine what constitutes an emergency?

Mr. HEBBARD. I think this committee is able to frame this law themselves. I think they are perfectly capable of doing that.

The CHAIRMAN. You are here; as I understand it, for the purpose of advising the committee as to what is best to be done under the circumstances; otherwise there would be no need for the hearings. Whom, in your judgment, is the person who ought to be intrusted with authority of determining when an emergency arises?

Mr. HEBBARD. I think the employer should have something to say about an emergency in regard to his own business. The Bureau of Labor has shown that in the manufacturing industries just about half the year we are busy. There is only 59 per cent of the year that we are busy, and the other 41 per cent of the time is the off season with us. Now, I would like to submit, as secretary of the Merchant Tailors' Exchange, a list of prices in neighboring cities with which the tailors in Washington have to compete. I have some prices here that I would like to put in the record. The proposition I make is that if we get as strict a law in regard to overtime as this it will result in detriment to the female employees in Washington and to the employers also.

The CHAIRMAN. Does your table show that the rates of pay are higher here than they are in competing towns?

Mr. HEBBARD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to put in the record that patrons of your industry would be induced to go to other towns under these conditions?

Mr. HEBBARD. They would go; yes. I can take my stuff by parcels post and have it made in other places to better advantage than I could here.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection it can be put in the record at this time.

The tables referred to are as follows:

In the merchant-tailoring trade in Washington, D. C., prices for making only, to the best of my knowledge, are as follows:

Coats, sack	\$5.00-\$8.00
Overcoats	7.00-14.00
Cutaways	6.00-12.00
Double-breasted frock	8.00-14.00
Full dress	12.00-15.00
Waistcoats	1.25- 2.50
Trousers	1.00- 2.50

Above prices are subject to extras.

[The Baltimore Cut, Trim & Make Co., 409 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Md. Exclusive designers, trimmers, and makers for merchant tailors.]

PRICE LIST.

Cutting, trimming, and making.

Grade.	Coats and trousers, S. B. sack.	Suits, S. B. sacks.	Coats, S. B. sacks.	Vests, S. B.	Trousers.	Overcoats, S. B. plain.
1.....	\$6.00	\$7.00	\$4.50	\$1.25	\$1.50	\$7.00
2.....	7.00	8.00	5.50	1.50	1.75	8.00
3.....	8.00	9.50	6.50	1.75	2.00	9.50
4.....	9.00	10.50	7.50	2.00	2.50	10.
5.....	10.00	12.00	8.50	2.50	3.00	12.00

Extra charges on coats for cutting, trimming, and making.

Single-breasted Prince Albert or clerical frock	\$2.00
Double-breasted Prince Albert (silk or satin faced, \$3.50), plain	2.50
English walking coat or cutaway frock	2.00
Tuxedo (silk lined and face, \$6; silk faced, \$3.50), plain	1.50
Full-dress coats (silk lined and faced, \$6.50; silk faced, \$5), plain	3.50
Fry-on above styles	1.00
Norfolk coats	1.50
Silk-lined sack coat	3.50
Silk-lined Prince Albert, English walking, clerical, or frock coats	5.00
Skeleton coat, one-quarter lined (one-quarter lined with silk, \$2; one-half lined, no extra)	1.00
Patch pockets on coats	.50
Buff sleeves (not our fashion, 25 cents)	No charge.
Half-and-half binding on coat and vest	2.00
Best flat silk braid on coat and vest	3.50
Double-breasted sack coats	.50
Fry-on sack coats	.50

Extra charges on vests.

Double-breasted vest	\$0.25
Full-dress or cossack clerical vests	.50
Silk back in vest	1.00
Silk cord on vest	.25
Patch pockets on vest	.25
Panel vest	.50
Try-on vest	.25

Extra charges on trousers.

Belt of same material	\$0.25
Cuff bottom	No charge.
Half-lined trousers (full lined, 50 cents)	.25
Spring buckles, each	.10
Riding trousers	4.00
Reinforced seat in trousers	.50
Broad fall trousers (without fly bottom on side)	1.00
Braid on trousers (silk, \$1.50), mohair	1.00

Extra charges on overcoats.

Double-breasted overcoats	\$1.50
Double-breasted storm overcoats	2.00
Single-breasted automobile overcoat (double breasted, \$2.50)	1.50
Single-breasted raglan, paddock, or paletot overcoats (double breasted, \$3.50)	2.50
Overcoat (silk facing to edge, \$3; full silk lined to facing, \$5), full silk lined and facing to edge	7.00
Silk or satin yoke in overcoat	2.00
Satin sleeve lining in overcoat	1.00
Velvet collar, "Best"	1.00
Convertible collar on overcoat	2.00
Try-on overcoat	.75
Waterproofing (cravenette) suit or overcoat	1.00
Sponging overcoat, suit, or any part of suit	.10

Making and trimming only.

For making and trimming apply the prices for cutting, trimming, and making, except we allow you for cutting as follows:

Coats and trousers	\$0.40
Suits	.50
Coats	.25
Vests	.10
Trousers	.15
Overcoats	.50

Making only.

(It is understood that you furnish all trimmings; any trimmings short will be charged for.)

Grade.	Coats, S. B. sacks.	Vests, S. B.	Trousers.	Over- coats, S. B., plain.
1.	\$3.00	\$1.00	\$1.25	\$4.50
2.	4.00	1.25	1.50	5.50
3.	5.00	1.50	1.75	6.50
4.	6.00	1.75	2.00	7.50
5.	7.50	2.00	2.50	9.00

Extra charges on coats for making only.

Single-breasted Prince Albert, clerical frocks.....	
English walking coats or cutaway frocks.....	\$1. 50
Double-breasted Prince Alberts.....	2. 00
Tuxedo.....	1. 50
Full dress.....	3. 00
Try on above styles.....	1. 00
Norfolk coat.....	1. 50
Skeleton coat, one-fourth lined.....	1. 00
Patch pockets on coat.....	. 50
Cuff sleeves (special design, not our fashion, 25 cents).....	No charge
Double-breasted sack coat.....	. 50
Try on sack coats.....	. 50

Extra charges on vests for making only.

Double-breasted.....	\$0. 25
Full dress or cossack clerical.....	. 50
Patch pockets on vest.....	. 25
Panel vests.....	. 50
Try on vests.....	. 25

Extra charges on trousers for making only.

Belt of same material.....	\$0. 25
Cuff bottoms.....	No charge
Riding trousers.....	4. 00
Reenforced seat.....	. 25
Broad fall trousers (without fly-button side).....	1. 00
Braid on trousers.....	. 50

Extra charges on overcoats for making only.

Double-breasted.....	\$1. 00
Double-breasted storm overcoat.....	1. 50
Single-breasted automobile (double-breasted, \$1.50).....	1. 00
Single-breasted raglan, paddock, or paletot (double-breasted, \$2.50).....	2. 00
Silk or satin yoke in overcoat.....	1. 00
Convertible collar on overcoat.....	2. 00
Velvet collar.....	. 50
Try on overcoat.....	. 75

Proportional charges will be made for other extras not provided for in this list when additional material and labor is required.

Notice.—Clergymen's frocks, single and double breasted Prince Alberts, full dress, tuxedos, English walking coats, cutaway frocks, and white vests are not made in grade 1.

Terms.—All orders are C. O. D., unless accompanied by check, as our services consist principally of labor.

Dealers pay express on shipments to and from us.

Other Baltimore prices are:

Trousers as low as.....	\$0. 60 and \$0. 65
Waistcoats as low as.....	. 19 and . 65
Coats as low as.....	1. 50

These prices, I have been told, have been paid by some of the tailor shops in Washington that have their work manufactured in Baltimore.

OUR FACILITIES.

Our equipment for cut, trim, and make is the most complete and largest plant of its kind in the East.

Our workmen are skilled at their work, which not only insures the best of workmanship, but dispatches the work, which enables us to give extraordinary quick deliveries.

APPLYING OUR SERVICES.

Our various grades of work enable the merchant tailor to apply the class of work on order that is required for an even balanced garment of material and workmanship, which is to the best interest of each concerned.

Each grade is the best in every respect that can be produced at the price named, and our system of working is constantly probed for lost motions to protect our trade, that they get the best workmanship that can be produced in each class.

Grade 1.—Made with imitation hand buttonholes and is carefully cut, trimmed, and made in a substantial manner.

Grade 2.—Carefully drafted, durable trimmings, and we furnish better workmanship than is customary at that price.

Grade 3.—This seems to be the most popular class, and each detail of order is cared for in the strictest manner, and the improvements in workmanship and trimming are, of course, in accordance with the difference in price.

Grade 4.—The workmanship and trimming used on this class corresponds with the merchant tailors' \$30 to \$45 suits.

Grade 5.—This, the highest class, commands the best quality trimmings and workmanship, and equals a merchant tailor's \$50 to \$65 suit. It is the favorite class for fine semidress and dress suits and fine overcoats.

We use the best linings for the given price, either serge, mohair, or venetian.

MR. HEBBARD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will add to this report the statement of Mr. Ralph to me, that 800 of these employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing get only \$1.50 per day, for which an increase has been requested. In submitting this, I ask that the merchants of Washington be given the same privileges as to overtime as are pursued in the Government departments in emergencies, as this statement shows.

I will lay particular stress on the seasons in the merchant tailoring business here, as has been shown by the previous witnesses that have appeared before you.

The question as to overcoming quick orders, as shown, necessitates overtime in emergencies for the merchant tailor. His customers have redress in a ready-made garment or from a tailor having his waistcoats, etc., made in a distant city. Washington has a number of such tailors. This means a loss of trade to the Washington merchant and his employees less work. These garments—the ready-made—of course are made in a distant city; there is no ready-made factory in this city.

As to the conditions in the ready-made shops, you know as well as I do that time, etc., are generally regulated by unions. As said before, Washington is a peculiar city, and seasons are very short—the summer months extremely dull—where in a manufacturing city the summer months are the busy ones.

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, I will state that as far as I can see there is no demand for such a strict law as the advocates would make you believe and which they have not shown.

Mr. Chairman, now, as the burden of proof is upon them, ask that they bring in some of these overworked females, as they assume to speak for, and have advocated these changes, and prove the needs of such a drastic measure; and if there are such conditions, as the advocates would make you believe exists, remedy them, but do not put the burden of a few on all the merchants and employees. So far they have only presented one witness.

The workshops, laundries, and stores are open to your inspection, and your committee or the ladies advocating this measure are at liberty to summon any employee they desire to, and I can assure you this can be done without any fear of censure from an employer. This is a matter which concerns the wage earner more than the employer. Regulate the hours for a day's work and a week's work, but allow the privilege of overtime as now exercised by the male employees and in the Government departments where females are employed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as this is supposed to be a humanitarian movement, why not include domestics, whose work is never done; hospital nurses, who work from 12 to 18 hours; female employees in newspaper offices, of which there are a number in this city.

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit a few lists of prices paid for tailoring, and ask that you give them careful consideration; and in framing this bill do not increase our burden and drive more work out of the city, but allow us to meet competition fairly and give the female employees a chance for overtime as asked for; also reasonable hours.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Sowers would like to give some information to the committee in regard to laundry prices.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sowers, I believe you have filed with us a statement to go into the record?

Mr. SOWERS. That was with regard to my own prices, but I wish to give this information for the benefit of Mr. Howard, who made the statement that prices are higher here than in Atlanta, his own town. I have since received some information from one of the laundries in Atlanta, and I have price lists showing the prices that they charge. This is the Capital City Laundry—

Mr. HOWARD (interposing). That laundry does the club work out there, at high prices. That is not a poor man's laundry. I know all about that. That is one of those exclusive laundries.

Mr. SOWERS. They have a great many exclusive laundries in Atlanta from what I understand. I have a letter here from this laundryman in answer to a telegram. The letter is addressed to Mr. Killian and is as follows [reading]:

CAPITAL CITY LAUNDRY CO.,
Atlanta, Ga., February 8, 1913.

Mr. F. V. KILLIAN,
Franklin Laundry, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR Mr. KILLIAN: Replying to your wire of this date, I am inclosing you flat and starch work price list, which are in effect in Atlanta, and are the same list as used by all other laundries in this city except two. We are pretty well together on the house-hold flat work and starch work, as you can see, but there is still quite a difference in prices of hotel work. I would say that the average rate for hotel work would be about 60 cents per hundred. I think there are some that are down as low as 50 cents, and there are some that run to probably 75 cents. However, there are only one or two of the latter, and they are the smaller hotels.

Trusting that business is good with you, and that you are enjoying good health, I am with kind regards,

Very truly, yours,

GEO. H. FAUSS.

112 HOURS OF LABOR FOR WOMEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

CAPITAL CITY LAUNDRY CO.

[128-130-132 Whitehall Street. Geo. H. Fauss, president and manager. Both phones 1050. "One-O-Five-O."]

Marker,
 Drivers are not allowed to extend credit.
 Amount of this pkg, Balance Total

Shirts, plain (without cuffs).....	12½c	Ties.....	5c
Shirts, plaited, cuffs attached, or stiff-bosom open-front.....	12½c	Coats (waiters).....	10c
Pajamas.....	20c	Aprons (waiters).....	5c
Night shirts.....	10c	Vests.....	20c
Undershirts.....	8c	Shirt waists.....	15c up
Drawers.....	8c	Top skirts.....	35-50c
Union suits.....	15c	Underskirts.....	25c up
Socks, per pair.....	5c	Night gowns.....	15c up
Handkerchiefs.....	3c	Corset covers.....	10c up
Handkerchiefs, silk.....	5c	Ladies' belts.....	5c
Collars.....	2½c	Stoekings.....	5c
Cuffs, per pair.....	5c	Aprons, ladies'.....	10c up

Not responsible for loss of goods by fire.
 Send us your count. If you do not, our count must be accepted.
 Three days' time required on all work, unless otherwise agreed upon. Goods left over 30 days will be sold for charges.
 Claims for shortage must be made within 24 hours and accompanied by original list.
 Not responsible for valuables of any kind left in garments, or loss of goods by fire.

Bill rendered, Total

FLAT-WORK LIST CAPITAL CITY LAUNDRY CO.

128-130-132 Whitehall Street. Geo. H. Fauss, President and Manager. Both phones 1050. "One-O-Five-O."]

Marker, Assorter, Checker,
 Amt. of this pkg, Balance, Total,
 Drivers are not allowed to extend credit.

Customer's count.	Laundry's count.		Price.
		Sheets.....	3c
		Pillowcases.....	2c
		Spreads, plain.....	10c
		Hand towels.....	1c
		Bath towels.....	1c
		Roller towels.....	2c
		Napkins.....	1c
		Tablecloths.....	5c
		Table felts.....	5c
		Rags.....	1c
		Table tops.....	4c
		Spreads (fringed or colored).....	15c
		Blankets.....	

Single packages amounting to \$1.00, 20 per cent discount.....
 Single packages amounting to \$1.50, 25 per cent discount.....
 Single packages amounting to \$2.00, 30 per cent discount.....

No package taken for less than 25c. at these prices.
 Not responsible for loss of goods by fire.
 On this list we accept only ordinary linen in every-day use. In case of loss or damage we will be responsible only for such class of goods. Fine-grade table and bed linen can not be done for these prices, but will be charged for according to the value of the goods. Make out your list and send with bundle; otherwise we can not consider claims for shortage.
 Not responsible for valuables of any kind left in garments or loss of goods by fire.
 9.
 Bill rendered, Total,

Mr. HOWARD. Let me see one of those lists. [Mr. Sowers hands list to Mr. Howard.]
 Mr. BUCHANAN. What does it mean by "pretty well together"? Does he mean that they are organized down there?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir; I think he means that the prices are uniform.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How does he get them uniform without organization? Can you explain that? The labor people have been trying to get a uniform scale of wages for a good many years, and they have always had to organize to get any success whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are filed for the record?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes; those are not in the record before. I want to state that the prices on this list for starched work are practically the same in Washington, and the prices on flat work are a little higher than the average prices for that class of work in Washington; and at the same time we are putting our prices against Atlanta prices, down there in the South, where labor is almost 50 per cent cheaper than it is here, where the employer must exclusively employ colored women in the laundries. I know of my own personal experience, as far as North Carolina is concerned, that the cost of production of laundry work is much cheaper in the South than it is here. Labor down there is nearly 50 per cent cheaper than it is here, and even with those conditions they do not give a better price, or as good a price on the average, as we do.

Mr. HOWARD. I see some of your laundry work is 100 per cent higher than in Atlanta. You charge 3 cents for napkins, and they charge 1 cent.

Mr. SOWERS. We charge only half a cent for a great many of our napkins.

Mr. HOWARD. I am only going by your list.

Mr. SOWERS. That list has only individual prices, and this has them in quantities. We make a much lower price in quantities. I also have a price list from Pittsburgh.

FORT PITT HOTEL LAUNDRY LIST.

M..... Room..... Bellman No..... Pittsburgh....., 191.. Return..... Mark.....

Number of pieces.	Price.	Amount.	Number of pieces.	Price.	Amount.
GENTLEMEN'S LIST.			GENTLEMEN'S LIST—continued.		
.....	Bath robes.....	25 to 50	Trousers.....	50 to \$1
.....	Bosoms.....	10	Union suits.....	20
.....	Coats.....	25 to 50	Vests.....	30
.....	Collars.....	3	LADIES' LIST.		
.....	Cuffs, per pair.....	6	Aprons.....	10 to 20
.....	Drawers.....	10 to 15	Chemises.....	15 to 75
.....	Handkerchiefs.....	5	Chemisettes.....	10 to 25
.....	Neckties.....	5 to 10	Corset covers.....	15 to 25
.....	Pajamas.....	25 to 50	Combinations.....	15 to 75
.....	Stock ties.....	10 to 20	Drawers.....	15 to 75
.....	Shirts, plain.....	15	Dresses.....	50 to \$5
.....	Shirts, flannel.....	20	Dresses, night.....	15 to \$1.50
.....	Shirts, negligee.....	15	Kimonas.....	25 to \$2
.....	Shirts, silk.....	25	Napkins.....	5
.....	Shirts, dress, plaited or bosom, with cuffs.....	20	Sacques.....	25 to \$1
.....	Shirts, with collars and cuffs.....	25	Stockings, per pair.....	5 to 10
.....	Shirts, night.....	15 to 25	Skirts.....	25 to \$2
.....	Shirts, under.....	10 to 15	Waists.....	25 to \$1.50
.....	Socks, per pair.....	5 to 10			
.....	Towels.....	5			

Colored clothing will be taken only at owner's risk. Positively no claims allowed unless made within 24 hours after goods are returned and accompanied by original list.

I don't know whether that is pertinent here, but we could introduce prices from all over the country and show that prices in Washington laundries are lower than they are in cities where conditions would justify a lower price. We get $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents for collars here, and in Pittsburgh they get 3 cents. Where we get 12 cents for shirts they get 15 cents and up to 25 cents, according to style, and so on down their list. Our conditions here are such that we pay more for the production of our work and get less than the average city, and why under these conditions should we be made the model city? In other words, why should we be experimented with and made the goat here, you might say, for the benefit of other cities and other States whose conditions are more favorable than ours?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Sowers, the only real difference between you and Atlanta which I am able to see is on laundering plain shirts. You charge 10 cents, and they charge $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents. The Capital City Laundry in Atlanta charges $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents for shirts without cuffs. Now, you make that up on the very next item and more than balance the difference in the prices between Atlanta and Washington by charging 15 cents for plaited-bosom shirts where they charge $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents.

Mr. SOWERS. That is about the average. There is a discrepancy a little—some of the items are a little lower than ours and some are a little higher, but the average is about the same.

Mr. HOWARD. I get the general average, just taking the price list and going up and down it on flat stuff, as you call it, and on white goods what do you figure is the average difference between Washington and Atlanta on this laundry which I have just stated to you is a first-class high-priced laundry?

Mr. SOWERS. What is your question, Mr. Howard?

Mr. HOWARD. What is the difference in the average prices?

Mr. SOWERS. As I figure it, there is no material difference. That is just the point I want to make. Under these differences of operating, where we are in competition with them, we are producing at as low, if not lower prices, than they are.

Mr. HOWARD. I spoke the other day of the American Laundry Association or the National Laundry Association. Do all laundries belong to that association?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir; not by any means.

Mr. HOWARD. The Capital City Laundry Co. does, don't it?

Mr. SOWERS. I don't know.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you know why your friend telegraphed this particular laundry?

Mr. SOWERS. It was at my request. I knew no laundry in Atlanta personally, and I simply asked him to telegraph this one.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you know the Guthman Laundry there?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you know the Troy Laundry people?

Mr. SOWERS. I know of them, but I do not know them personally. I knew none personally.

Mr. HOWARD. Were you aware of the fact that the Guthman and Troy Laundries maintain prices exactly as yours on these plain shirts?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir. If they do, I maintain that our prices are about the same, from Mr. Fauss's letter, because those are average prices.

Mr. HOWARD. You have the long end of the stick in prices on laundering shirts, because this laundry in Atlanta charges 12½ cents for a shirt that you charge 15 cents for.

Mr. SOWERS. They charge 12½ cents for a shirt that we only charge 10 cents for.

Mr. HOWARD. Then you charge 15 cents for plaited shirts; and anything that has any sort of a seam on it is generally termed plaited, isn't it?

Mr. SOWERS. I will say that the majority of shirts are termed plain shirts, and they get 2½ cents more than we do for them.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. E. B. Farren is our next speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Farren, you will state your residence and business.

STATEMENT OF MR. E. B. FARREN, MANAGER OF WEST END LAUNDRY, 1723 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW.

Mr. FARREN. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Atlanta, Ga.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Atlanta, Ga., is not on the stand.

Mr. FARREN. Could I answer the question Mr. Sowers was unable to answer?

The CHAIRMAN. What concern do you represent?

Mr. FARREN. The West End Laundry, 1723 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. FARREN. A question has been asked about the national association, and if a certain laundry in Atlanta is a member of it. I presume the idea is involved that only the high-priced laundries are members of the association. That is not true. I am a member, and no price is established by the National Laundry Association. It makes no difference whether the prices are high or low, or whether it is a good or bad laundry. They do not ask any questions of the kind. You simply become a member and pay your dues, if you are in the laundry business.

Now, the main thing that I wanted to speak about with reference to this bill is the short Monday and Saturday. You give us a bill with a straight 8-hour day, and necessarily that will do away with that short Monday and Saturday. The girls want that short day, the laundrymen want it, and the public want it. Now, if you can give us a bill providing for 54 hours a week and not more than 10 hours in any one day, then we will reach this man that works these long hours; and the laundries want to reach him just as much as this committee and the people who are behind this bill. Fifty-four hours a week and not more than 10 hours in any one day is what we want, and it is pretty nearly along the lines on which this bill is drawn now. Under such an arrangement, the employees would not work until 8 or 9 or 10 o'clock at night; and the majority of laundries do not do that now. That would give our girls a short Saturday and a short Monday, but under this bill you do away with that point.

Mr. HOWARD. Right there I would like to ask a question. I asked this question the other day of Mr. Sowers. Have the laundries in Washington tried to educate the people up to make deliveries to the

laundries on Friday at the latest? Do you instruct any of your drivers to that effect?

Mr. FARREN. We instruct our drivers to do everything possible and not to take up on Friday and Saturday. We ask the people not to make calls on those days. We do that in order to get out early on Saturday, and anything that comes in after certain hours we carry over to the following Monday.

Mr. HOWARD. The proposition I am driving at is this: You complain of a short Monday—that you can not put in but half a day on Monday—and I presume that is occasioned by the fact that there is nothing in the laundry to do.

Mr. FARREN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. And the question I am trying to get at is, have the laundrymen made any effort to educate their customers up to the point to tell them when the driver comes in to deliver a package of clean laundry, to deliver the package of dirty laundry to him then?

Mr. FARREN. The customer will rarely hand a package of dirty laundry to the driver at the time they are receiving their clean laundry, as probably some of it is in that bundle which they have just received, unless they have lots of linen.

Mr. HOWARD. I understand, of course, but there are a great many poor people in this country who only have one shirt. I am pretty nearly in that class myself; but I am talking about the people that have more than one shirt.

Mr. FARREN. We can, of course, adjust our business in accordance with this regulation. We can get enough work to start Monday morning and work through until Saturday night under your bill, but we want the girls to have this short day, and they want to have it.

Mr. HOWARD. Don't they have a short day on Saturday?

Mr. FARREN. They would not have it under this bill, because the work that would come in on Saturday would have to be begun on Saturday. Under the present method we tell our customers that the work received on Saturday will be delivered the next week, and the girls go home on Saturday. That is the only thing the laundrymen have against this bill—not as to the hours, as to the way they are divided.

Mr. SMITH. Suppose it was arranged so that the laundrymen could divide the time according to their own view and make it 48 hours a week, not exceeding 10 hours in any one day, as you say, would you still have a short Saturday?

Mr. FARREN. Probably some of us would do that. Certainly we do not want to work at night if we can get away from it. The difference between the laundrymen and the bill is very slight—it is very narrow. You want us to take 8 hours a day continuously every day in the week, and we ask for 54 hours in a week, and not more than 10 hours in a day.

Under such a bill, suppose a girl worked five days a week 10 hours a day; necessarily she can not work more than 4 hours on the sixth day. That is all there is to it. You are disrupting the whole system and injuring the girls, I believe, more than anybody else, by making them work Saturday afternoon. Of course, Monday morning is not as valuable to the girls as Saturday afternoon, because Saturday afternoon is a day of recreation, especially in the hot summer months.

Mr. HOWARD. Under your present system you throw two days of rest together—a half day on Saturday, a whole day on Sunday, and a half a day on Monday.

Mr. FARREN. It is not quite a half a day; it is a short day, but not a half day. The average in the busy season, I should think, would be about 7 hours. Of course, the three short days do come together. Now, that is the only objection we have to this bill. It is not so much the 8 hours as it is the peculiar arrangement of it; and no man, no matter what his inclinations might be, could overwork his hands on a 10-hour limitation. The majority of laundrymen do not want to do it, and I know if there is such a man in the business we are just as anxious to get at him as the sponsors of this bill are.

Mr. ROUSE. I would like to ask Mr. Sowers a question. In your statement a moment ago, you stated that your prices were less than the Pittsburgh prices.

Mr. SOWERS. The average prices.

Mr. ROUSE. Is your average price less than the Pittsburgh average price?

Mr. SOWERS. Yes.

Mr. ROUSE. Now, if this bill would prevail and be enacted into law, could you meet these prices that you have now in your list? Could you still do work for the prices you now have, under this bill?

Mr. SOWERS. No, sir; not unless we should cut salaries very materially.

Mr. ROUSE. If you do not cut the salaries, who would have to pay for the increase in prices?

Mr. SOWERS. The public, of course, in that event would have to pay it. I might add to that that the public, generally, is the poor man—the one-shirt man.

Mr. ROUSE. In other words, you would be compelled to raise the prices on your list?

Mr. SOWERS. We would be compelled to raise the prices; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the injury would not fall on the laundryman. The injury, if any, would fall on the public at large?

Mr. SOWERS. And the injury would fall largely on the general public, and the employees would be struck harder than anyone else—not only our own employees, but the employees of all the other establishments. The prices would affect the people who have to watch the dollars and cents just as much as they would the rich man.

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't it a fact that a great many of those that work for wages do a great deal of their own work, and are not to a great extent patrons of the steam laundries?

Mr. SOWERS. There are a very few who have not a certain class of work in the laundry, such as starched collars and cuffs, and shirts, which go altogether to steam laundries or Chinese laundries.

Mr. HOWARD. I can not comprehend your logic about one thing. You just stated that most of this burden is going to fall on the one-shirt man.

Mr. SOWERS. I say he will feel the burden more. The burden will fall on all, but he will feel it more.

Mr. HOWARD. The man who has more shirts will suffer more by this bill, won't he?

Mr. SOWERS. But he can stand it better, and our patronage in Washington is composed largely of the poorer classes.

Now, what Mr. Farren said in reference to the short Saturday and short Monday is very true, and we find that the girls would very much prefer working these first five days and having their Saturdays off, especially in the summer time, when they can go on excursions, and for a large majority of them this is the only time they have for shopping, and I know they would much prefer to have their time all in one day.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Don't you think it would be a good thing to have an 8-hour day and a half holiday on Saturday, like some other trades have, that they have gotten through organized labor? Don't you think that would be a very good thing for the girls?

Mr. SOWERS. It would be very nice to have no work, if we could live without it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; that would not be nice.

Mr. SOWERS. Unless labor increased in some way, I do not know how this increased cost of living is going to be met.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not know where you get the idea that no work would be a good thing. Nature intended that human kind should be active physically, and that is what work is for.

Mr. SOWERS. Man must earn his bread by the sweat of his brow and the less he works the less he must eat; but there is a class of people who are never satisfied and want to work as little as possible.

Mr. BUCHANAN. They are very much in the minority. A large majority of those are the ones who are trying to make a certain part work more than they ought to.

Mr. SOWERS. That class we are just as willing to reach as you are. We are perfectly agreeable to 54 hours a week, and we have no sympathy with the brute that will work a girl 12 to 14 hours a day, and we want legislation that will protect those girls; but we want to set our conditions. I notice that none of you gentlemen answered me the other day when I referred to the inaugural occasion, when our work is increased from 50 to 100 per cent; how is it going to be met?

The CHAIRMAN. I want to call Mr. Sowers's attention to the fact that the committee is not here for the purpose of answering any interrogatories presented. We are here for the purpose of getting any facts that may be presented and then using those facts in connection with such legislation as may be advisable.

Mr. SOWERS. I asked for suggestions, and my natural conclusion is that there can be no remedy when such conditions arise on such occasions. If we didn't work overtime the result would be that a large number of visitors would go away from Washington calling it the greatest hole on earth because they could not get their linen laundered.

Mr. BUCHANAN. We do not intend to let you make mouthpieces of the witnesses that you brought here.

Mr. HOWARD. I just want to ask you this question: We are wanting information, as the chairman said, and that is all we do want. Every conceivable force in this town is doubled during inauguration as you know. They double the police force and they probably double the fire-department force, and I do not know what all they do not double. Now, then, to meet this emergency, with women wanting work, and there being nothing intricate about the laundry business why couldn't you double your force to meet that emergency?

Mr. SOWERS. Because, sir, competent skilled labor is not available. It comes at a time when every laundry needs additional help and it is impossible to get them.

Mr. HOWARD. Doesn't that bear me out in the suggestion that you double your force? Other laundries are doing the same thing.

Mr. SOWERS. I say it is impossible to double your force under those conditions, and even if it were possible the equipment would not be available, unless we maintained a double equipment, and possibly our building would not accommodate that. I want to make one explanation here, in answer to Representative Buchanan's statement about making mouthpieces of witnesses—

Mr. BUCHANAN (interposing). I think your position on that before this committee should be construed as contempt.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think the committee cares to hear any further discussion upon that phase of the question.

Mr. SOWERS. It was referred to, and that is the reason I wanted to answer it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Avalear has some information on the question of these mangling machines, which I think might of interest to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear Mr. Avalear.

STATEMENT OF MR. F. P. AVALEAR, 2117 FOURTEENTH STREET NW., REPRESENTING THE ELITE LAUNDRY CO.

Mr. AVALEAR. I am not opposing this bill, with the exception of the 8-hour per day clause. If you gentlemen see fit to give us 48 hours a week we will be perfectly satisfied with it. As Miss Obenauer has stated the foot treadle machines that the girls have been working, worked rather hard. That has been true of the machines that we have at present in some of the laundries, but the manufacturers today are manufacturing a machine operated by compressed air, so that the girls do not have to use the foot-pressure treadle. They simply put their foot on the lever and the compressed air gives sufficient pressure to the rolls to iron the linen smooth. When these two pressure rolls are heated they are opened up and the girl heretofore has had to put a certain amount of weight on them, which of course comes from her body, to iron the goods smooth. Now the compressed air machine has taken the place of what has been known as the lever machine. I might say that we have not any yet, but the next machine we order will be a compressed air machine, and I can state to you that there are a good many laundries in Washington that have them. The Yale laundry has some of these machines. Now, I want to say that last week I made a record of the time, because the discussion had been up over in the Senate. On Monday we worked 7 hours; that is, most of the employees did; on Saturday we worked from 2 to 3 hours; on Friday we worked 8 hours. We have about 100 employees in our plant, and about 20 of them left the establishment last Saturday from about half past 2 to half past 3, and 17 of those 20 that were left off at that hour did not return until between 11 and half past 11 and 12 o'clock yesterday morning, and they will be paid a full week's salary. In the summer time we give them more time than that off, and I wish some one in this committee would investigate my statements and see if they are not facts.

Mr. ANDREWS. We have Mr. Chorley, secretary of the Ladies Tailors Association, from whom that petition was presented. I would like to hear from him.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear Mr. Chorley.

**STATEMENT OF S. C. CHORLEY, 1018 FOURTEENTH STREET NW.,
SECRETARY OF THE LADIES' TAILORS ASSOCIATION.**

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business, Mr. Chorley?

Mr. CHORLEY. Ladies' tailoring. I have filed a brief here, I believe it was last Thursday morning, from the secretary of the Retail Merchants' Association, and I think that practically embodies the sentiment of the ladies' tailors. Our business is a peculiar line of work which comes in seasons, practically from about the 15th of September or a little later to a week prior to Christmas, and our season is then closed for a period of practically four or five weeks, and especially at this time of the year we have practically nothing to do. The girls in our employ work mostly 9 hours a day. I believe that is the general rule in Washington, and other places, in those three months, from the 15th of September or the 1st of October until Christmas, and if they are desirous of working overtime we allow them to do so; in fact, it is absolutely necessary at times to produce our garments that they work overtime. When a lady comes in with a wedding order or a funeral order—and they are always in a hurry—sometimes they are leaving the city and want the garment at once in order to leave on a certain train, and in such a case it is necessary to work overtime.

If the garment is not completed it is left on our hands, and we can scarcely afford to keep garments left in that way because our profits are not large. We are not opposing the 8-hour law so long as we have the privilege of allowing the girls to work overtime if they desire to—not that we force them to do it. There are occasions that arise where they have to work long hours, and they work possibly 6 or 8 or 10 hours, and they need to work overtime in busy seasons in order to tide them over the dull season. In the summer time there is practically no work at all—June, July, and August, and until the middle of September. There is a long period of time that they have nothing to do, and they are anxious to make overtime enough to carry them through this dull season, but if you enact this bill into law, this 8 hours will deprive them of the overtime that they are desirous of making.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Andrews presented a petition this morning from some 28 or 30 employees of ladies' tailoring and dressmaking establishments of the city. Are you interested in the circulation of this petition among the different establishments of the city?

Mr. CHORLEY. Yes; I am secretary of the Ladies' Tailors Association of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. That is an association of employers?

Mr. CHORLEY. An association of employers; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether or not those who signed this petition knew what they were signing?

Mr. CHORLEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The reason I ask is that information has been conveyed to me by employees who have signed this petition, and who for

obvious reasons do not desire their personality known, that numbers of those who signed this petition did not know what they were signing, and that when some of them asked what they were signing they were told that it was nothing, to just go on and sign it. Do you know anything about anything of that kind?

Mr. CHORLEY. I do not know anything about that. I do not know who could have started such a story as that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know if all those whose names appear on this petition signed it themselves?

Mr. CHORLEY. Of all the employing tailors?

The CHAIRMAN. No, the employees.

Mr. CHORLEY. The employees—to the best of my belief, they did. Let me say, the handwriting is very poor in many cases, because there are a great many foreigners that are able to write only a little English.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further?

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to ask you one question. What percentage of employees in your business are from foreign countries?

Mr. CHORLEY. I might say 70 per cent.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Can they all read and understand the English language?

Mr. CHORLEY. Most invariably, yes; those who come here to Washington can speak English fairly well, and a great number write it to a small degree. Our business is such that the American does not care to learn it. The hours are too long and the seasons are too short and we have to depend entirely on the foreign population to produce our garments.

Mr. MANNING. This petition you refer to here as having been presented to the merchants' association—is it true, as has been stated, that the merchants' association as a body has not indorsed the opposition to this bill?

Mr. CHORLEY. Every one of them whose signatures are on the petition.

Mr. MANNING. I am speaking of the merchants' association.

Mr. CHORLEY. You mean the Retail Merchants' Association. I have nothing to do with that. The petition is entirely from the Ladies' Tailors Association.

Mr. MANNING. I understood it was from the merchants' association.

Mr. CHORLEY. No; I came down here Thursday morning to be heard and the session lasted two hours but I could not be heard. I left on Thursday night for New York and just returned last night and during the interim I handed the petition over to Mr. Ellery, of the Retail Merchants' Association, for presentation to the committee, if necessary, before I returned.

Mr. MANNING. You do not know anything about the action of the retail merchants' association?

Mr. CHORLEY. No, sir; I do not know anything about that.

Mr. HOWARD. Did these employees sign this petition themselves?

Mr. CHORLEY. They certainly did, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. HOWARD. Now, following those two names at the top of that page [indicating], I wish you would look at the four signatures following them and see whether or not you think they signed them or one man

signed those four names. Start with the second name from the top and look at the four signatures.

Mr. CHORLEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have to admit the handwriting somewhat resembles one another.

Mr. HOWARD. Now, look down further and see if you do not see six more signatures in that same handwriting.

Mr. CHORLEY. No; I do not see any others that resemble that.

Mr. HOWARD. Well, the same man that wrote those four names wrote these six [indicating].

Mr. CHORLEY. No; that is from a different firm.

Mr. HOWARD. I know; but who circulated the petition?

Mr. CHORLEY. I sent it out by messenger boys, and of course I could not swear who made the signatures. Of course, the circumstances have been explained to these people, and it seems to me from what I gather they are all in accord in signing their names for the prevention of the execution of this law.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything further?

Mr. CHORLEY. No; nothing further.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Wineman is our next witness. Before Mr. Wineman goes on, Mr. Chairman, I wish to state regarding the question the gentleman asked the previous witness that I was acting president of the retail merchants' association in the absence of the president and vice president, and at the request of about a dozen merchants I called a special meeting of the board of directors to act in opposition to this bill. I asked what had been done previously, and I was informed by the secretary that at a previous meeting of the association the association had gone on record as opposed to the bill, and the president had appointed a committee of three or five, I do not remember just which. That was my authority for stating, as I did in my opening address, that as acting president of the association the representatives of the retail merchants had gone on record as being opposed to this bill. I was not present at the meeting, and I have no personal interest in it whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Mr. Wineman.

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN C. WINEMAN, 914 F STREET NW.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business, Mr. Wineman?

Mr. WINEMAN. Tailoring, to both men and women.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to oppose the 8-hour law; I am only here to oppose the clause with reference to overtime. Our girls work now 9 hours per day during the week, with the exception of Saturday. During the winter months our shops close at 5 o'clock on Saturday and pay off. In the summer months we try to get through the day and get out by 1 o'clock, so they generally work the entire 9 hours for the 6 days, but they do work overtime. There are cases where it is practically impossible to get along without overtime. We have emergencies come along that we can not avoid, and we must work overtime in order to get the work done. People come in in a hurry—a Member of Congress, for instance, comes here and leaves his full-dress suit at home, and he wants a dress suit in a short time, and, in order to complete the work, we have to work overtime. But if a girl works overtime we pay her for it. If she

is so inclined and desires to remain off the next day we let her do that in pursuance to her overtime. For instance, if she works three hours at night we furnish her with her supper, and the next morning she does not need to come back until 10 or 11 o'clock, depending on the time that she worked overtime the night before. A great many prefer to work overtime; they want the additional money they make. We pay about 20 per cent more for overtime than regular time, and in addition to that we buy them their dinner or supper. Here in Washington we are in very close competition with Baltimore.

Baltimore is the tailors' worst enemy, and we are within 40 minutes' ride of them, and they have a 10-hour system over there. The cost of living is a great deal lower in Baltimore than it is over here. Occasionally we go to Baltimore for help; we pay men \$22 a week here that work in Baltimore for \$18 a week. A great deal of our help is foreign help, but of course we employ a great many American girls and we pay very fair wages, from \$6 to \$18 a week. I have one girl who gets \$18 a week for 10 months in the year. There is a distinction in our business in that there are two months in the year that we are closed up entirely. That is in July and August, and they all get salaries sufficient to tide them over those two months. In the dull season we close at 5 o'clock during the week and at 1 o'clock on Saturdays. Now, we do have emergencies arise where we have to work overtime, and we have a great many of them. The inaugural ball is considered an emergency. Unfortunately we will not have it this year. The inaugural ball figured \$1,200 to me four years ago. Of course, I am very fortunate in having an emergency come in at this time—the suffragettes' parade. I am making uniforms and riding suits for the suffragettes now. We worked overtime last night and we expect to work overtime for the next two weeks on suffragettes' clothing. I am willing to comply with the 8-hour law provision if we can have an opportunity for those girls to work overtime.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you invariably close at 1 o'clock during the dull season?

Mr. WINEMAN. Yes; we find it best to do that in the summer time.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you take care of the person who comes in with a rush order in the summer time for clothing that they want to use in going to church on Sunday?

Mr. WINEMAN. In the summer time they are all sitting around there so hungry for work that we are always willing to do it immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you have a sufficient amount of force to get the work out so that it is all through by 1 o'clock.

Mr. WINEMAN. In the summer time only. I frequently go up to my workroom in the summer time and find some of the tailors up there who are getting from \$18 to \$25 a week smoking or playing cards. I have seen them many times when I come up hiding the cards away. We do not expect them to make their full salary in the summer time, but they have got to live, and we keep them during the summer season.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further?

MR. ANDREWS. I would like to ask Mr. McSween how the extra time paid to their female help compares with the extra time paid in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, a Government institution. They both work overtime, as has been stated by Mr. Ralph, and I believe he states how much they are paid. I want to bring out how much the National Government pays for overtime.

MR. MCSWEEN. The rate paid by us is time and a half. That is the rate fixed by the union, but I do not know what the bureau rate is at all.

THE CHAIRMAN. You pay time and a half for overtime?

MR. MCSWEEN. Yes.

MR. ANDREWS. I think Mr. Ralph stated in his letter that it is the same rate per day for overtime; that they do not pay time and a half or anything extra.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further, Mr. Andrews?

MR. ANDREWS. We have no other witnesses this morning.

**STATEMENT OF L. A. STERNE, 701 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE NE.,
FIRST VICE PRESIDENT OF THE MARYLAND STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR.**

MR. STERNE. I am first vice president of the Maryland State Federation of Labor, and I have been instructed to come here and favor this bill.

THE CHAIRMAN. What is the jurisdiction of the Maryland State Federation of Labor?

MR. STERNE. They have 100,000 trade unionists in the State of Maryland.

THE CHAIRMAN. What I want to get at is its jurisdiction.

MR. STERNE. It covers the entire State of Maryland and the District of Columbia and is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Since the District has no suffrage we are tacked onto Maryland, and that is how we come to be a part of it. I am also representing the stenographers' union. There are others who will be heard here who will no doubt vouch for what I say—that I am representing the stenographers' union, which is an organization composed of women in the city of Washington, 100 women and about 20 men—and they are in favor of the 8-hour working day for women. It has been suggested to me by the executive board of my State that the law which requires that the employers shall post and keep posted in a conspicuous place a statement that there are no women employed in their establishment under a certain age does not work out, and we believe that in that section ought to be the names of the employees and their ages. We believe that ought to be in there, because then the general public going through the stores and seeing, for instance, that Miss Doe is 18 years old, they can see for themselves whether she is 18 or not, because we are taking it for granted that there are some unscrupulous employees.

Now, I happen to have had some experience with the laundries in Washington in the last four years. We attempted to organize the laundry girls here and we got our charter, and the charter was smothered by the employers. The organization was killed before we could install it. I want to say to you gentlemen that I have no

personal fight with Mr. Sowers or any of the other laundrymen, but I am willing to make oath to what I say, that these are truths. Now, take for instance in the summer time—that is, through the months of June, July, and August—I have been into the laundries, and I can give you the names of them if you want them; and where the mangles, these irons are heated, and while it may not be so bad in the daytime, at night when they turn on the artificial light the heat is something unbearable.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you made any records by thermometers of the heat?

Mr. STERNE. I tried to. I made a couple of attempts, but the employers watched me too close and I could not do it; but the temperature in some of them runs up to 105 and 110. There are some laundries here that are not so bad, but there are some others that are not pleasure resorts to work in. Now, I tell these laundrymen that they can work under the 8-hour law. I know something about the employers' position on legislation, and of course they are going to defend their side of the question. I say that you can work your laundry from half-past 8 to 5 in the evening and have your engineer there in the morning to have your mangles heated and have your work begin as soon as the girls come.

Now, if it is proven to the satisfaction of this committee that only 5 per cent of the girls are oppressed this bill ought to be passed if it will help these unfortunates. We have only 20 per cent of these women in the District of Columbia and Maryland that are organized. They have told me that they do not dare to organize; they have come to my home and my office and have told me that they do not dare to testify before this committee. They have told me that they were told if they came up here and testified the way their employers wanted them to testify it would be all right. I know that that is true because I know the girls and I know where they work. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am astounded at the position of the employers on this bill. This is a humane bill. It is asking only 8 hours' work for the women of this city. I have never forgotten that my mother was a woman and I would hate to think that my mother had to work under some of the conditions that exist in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose, Mr. Sterne, that you proceed to tell us some of these conditions in order that the committee may be able to judge of them.

Mr. ANDREWS. Might I ask Mr. Sterne to mention some of the places?

The CHAIRMAN. No; that would scarcely be permissible. I think objection was raised some time ago on the part of those representing various employers relative to specifying the wage rates of particular individuals and the committee out of courtesy to the employers declined to interrogate as to the particular wages or as to the wages of particular individuals and the same rule would apply in this instance. If it becomes necessary the committee will ultimately go into that, but for the present they do not deem it necessary. But I suggest to the witness that he give to the committee such facts as he has in his possession so that we will be in a position to do what the conditions seem to warrant.

Mr. STERNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, to get right down to the matter plain, these girls have informed me that the work is injurious to their health; that the humidity and heat is very bad, especially in these overtime laundries that work at night. Another evidence that it is injurious is the fact that there is a continual change in the help. Of course, there is some skilled help, but there is a continual change going on all the time and the girls tell me that they have a good deal of negro help that they pay from \$3 to \$3.50 a week. They work two or three weeks and somebody else takes their place. That is the information they give me. That is about all I have to say about the laundries, but it is very evident to me from what they have told me that this overtime work in the summer time is injurious.

Mr. SOWERS. As Mr. Sterne is testifying as a laundry expert I would like to ask if he has had any experience in the laundry business?

Mr. STERNE. I am testifying as a man who is charged to help the condition of the working girls and has been prevented by the laundrymen in the city of Washington.

Mr. SOWERS. You are testifying as an expert in this business. Are you qualified to speak as an expert laundryman?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think the witness has attempted to qualify as an expert laundryman. As I understand it he is not qualifying as an expert either as a laundryman or as to mercantile establishments. He is testifying as a representative of certain organizations.

Mr. ANDREWS. May I ask him if he attempted to get any of those girls to come here and tell this committee the conditions?

Mr. STERNE. Yes; and they refused to come because they said they would lose their jobs if they came.

Mr. SOWERS. Are you in a position to give the committee the names of the employees that were told that they should not come here and if they did so they would lose their positions?

Mr. STERNE. I am not going to give their names.

Mr. ANDREWS. You stated that the employees said that they would lose their positions if they came up here to testify.

Mr. STERNE. Yes; that was their statement.

Mr. SOWERS. It has been stated here that there are some 700 or 800 females employed in the steam laundries in the city of Washington. May I ask you how many cases of complaint you have from those 700 or 800?

Mr. STERNE. I have had girls come from several different laundries and they said that was the sentiment of the girls working in those particular laundries.

Mr. SOWERS. Do you know how many laundries there are in Washington?

Mr. STERNE. Off-hand, I should say 10 or 12. I can give you 10 or 12 right off.

Mr. SOWERS. You have had several girls out of this 700 or 800 complain to you?

Mr. STERNE. Yes.

Mr. ROUSE. How many?

Mr. STERNE. They have come to me several times.

Mr. ROUSE. How many times?

Mr. STERNE. Several came to my home a couple of times, and several came to the office, and others have seen me on the outside.

Mr. ROUSE. Have you their names?

Mr. STERNE. They refused to give me their names in several cases, because they thought if they came and testified they would lose their positions. I can furnish the names if necessary. I am very sure they would give them to me.

Mr. ROUSE. You could locate them, could you?

Mr. STERNE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOWERS. They are working now, are they?

Mr. STERNE. Some of them have quit the laundry business because you oppressed them—not you personally; I won't say that—but the laundries. One of them that I wanted to get here is working to-day cleaning cars, and I could not get her, but I will get her if these hearings are continued indefinitely.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not likely to be continued indefinitely, but there has been a great deal of irrelevant matter injected into the hearings, and we would like to have definite facts.

Mr. HEBBARD. Mr. Sterne said that he represented 20 males and 100 females in the stenographers' union.

Mr. STERNE. One hundred females and 20 males.

Mr. HEBBARD. You do not get paid for that?

Mr. STERNE. No, sir.

Mr. HEBBARD. You are paid by the American Federation of Labor, are you not?

Mr. STERNE. I do not know whether I ought to tell the history of my life to these people.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know what particular bearing that has on this matter, whether he is being paid or whether he is a member of these bodies.

Mr. HEBBARD. These hearings are losing time. Every one that we bring up here loses the time that he comes, and we are trying to show what is behind it.

The CHAIRMAN. So far as this committee is concerned it has not invited anyone to appear before it. Anyone who comes here comes of his own volition, and we are not asking the merchants to lose time or the employees to lose time. We are patiently listening to what each of you have to say in order that we may get at the facts.

Mr. HEBBARD. It is simply a question that we have to defend our rights, and we just want to bring out some statements in order that we may do that.

Mr. STERNE. You understand I was not speaking about the tailors; I am speaking about laundries. I would like to put in here this bill of mine, "1 shirt, 1 collar. 18 cents," and see how it compares with the other prices.

F. V. KILLIAN, FRANKLIN LAUNDRY.

[Phones Main 1342-1343. 504-508 Thirteenth Street, Washington, D. C.]

Mr. Sterne.
 Mark, S212. Date, February 3, 1913.
 Residence, Eighth and C N E.
 M.—P. W.—P.

1	Collars (embroidered).....	5c and up
	Collars.....	24c	\$0.00
	Cuffs, each.....	24c
	Shirts, plain.....	10c
	Shirts, open front.....	12c
1	Shirts, plaited.....	15c
	Shirts, with cuffs (C.).....	15c	.1
	Shirts, with collars.....	18c
	Ladies' waists.....	25c and up
	Handkerchiefs.....	3c
	Handkerchiefs, silk.....	5c
	Socks, per pair.....	5c
	Undershirts.....	8c
	Drawers.....	8c
	Night shirts.....	10c and up
	Union suits.....	16c and up
	Night suits.....	16c and up
	Vests.....	25c
	Neckties.....	5c to 10c
	Coats.....	10c and up
	Aprons.....	5c and up
			.1

N. B.—Not responsible for loss or damage of linen in case of fire. All articles promptly called for and delivered. Losses must be reported in 24 hours with list or no allowance will be made. All colored goods laundered at owner's risk.

My purpose in that is that my position is—I challenge the laundry people to prove to this committee that they are not making profit enough to work under the 8-hour system. I challenge that statement. I would like to see a sworn statement that they can not work at a profit at these prices under the 8-hour law. Now, Mr. Chairman, unless there are any more questions on the laundry business I will leave that.

The waitresses are very anxious for this legislation to go through. There are waitresses in this town, Mr. Chairman, who are working from 7 o'clock in the morning until 9 o'clock at night for \$4 a week. The waitress to-day in Washington who gets \$5 a week is getting big money. You can investigate that for yourself—take any of the cafés in Washington employing female help, and you will find that their hours are excessive and their wages are very low, and my organizations believe that this bill ought to be passed because of the moral effect, the uplift it would bring to the homes of these women after they are taken out of the shops and stores and go to their homes at night. We realize, Mr. Chairman, and I am instructed to say that the morality of the women would be much better if the wages were better and the hours were less. That can be supported, no doubt, by statistics of the Department of Labor that the lower the wage the lower the morality. A girl can not live on \$5 a week. It is impossible. Now, in support of the argument for the 8-hour law, that they can work under the 8-hour law, I will call attention to the coal yards of Washington, which close at 6 o'clock in the evening. I have made an investigation of most of the coal yards in the city, and I find that they close at 6 o'clock at night, and coal is more of a necessity than anything you can buy in a department store or a laundry either.

We believe it is a matter of education, and if the people of the District of Columbia are given to understand that they can get their laundry only at a certain hour, that they can not get anything after a certain hour, they will get it within that time. When the 8-hour labor law was before this Congress several years ago they said they could not operate under it on account of the Christmas shopping. The stores in Los Angeles, Cal., made the same howl, but my mother had worked in a department store in Los Angeles, and I know that the law is operating in Los Angeles, Cal., to-day satisfactorily. It went into effect last January and is operating satisfactorily in Colorado and California, and it can operate here. The whole question is, Mr. Chairman, that they do not want it to operate. They do not want to do anything that will assist the down-trodden women. They will work them long hours and at low wages if you will let them. A lot of these stores on Seventh Street would be working their employees on Sunday if the law would let them. There are some fair employers in this town, but they are in the minority, and I want to say that the main kick of these people is that they do not get paid for overtime. They are fined 1 cent a minute for being late in the morning, but they do not give them 1 cent more for overtime. They fine every girl 1 cent a minute for being late, but last week when the girls went back to take stock at night they did not get 1 cent for overtime. At Christmas they give them a paltry 25-cent supper and work them until 10 or 11 o'clock at night; but when we want to take the matter into our hands we are told that we are anarchists; but I say that we are the only force in the District of Columbia to-day that is protecting these women against these employers. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that these employers have held the club over these girls and said, "If this bill goes through, we will reduce your salary"; but I say they dare not reduce their salary any lower than it is and expect the public of Washington to continue to uphold them in what they are doing, because the salaries that exist now are absolutely at the minimum.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that so far as the salaries are concerned they will be either higher or lower, just as supply and demand regulates it?

Mr. STERNE. No, sir; I believe salaries will be just as low as the employer can get the girls to work for them. That has been my experience for 13 years.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be true under the 8-hour workday or the 10-hour workday; that they will employ the girls at the lowest possible rate that they can get them, will they not?

Mr. STERNE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If they could get girls for less than they are getting them now, whether on an 8-hour basis, a 10-hour basis, or a 12-hour basis, don't you think they would dare to employ them? What would prevent them employing them if they could get them?

Mr. STERNE. They would not dare to face public opinion by driving down wages any lower, because they are down to the minimum now. Of course they have some at \$10 and \$12 a week, but let us go down to the bundle wrappers that are getting \$3 or \$4 a week. I am going to close now by saying that there is nothing in this bill, if it goes through, that will injure the employer. What is to prevent the

employer from paying his help on Friday? What is going to prevent paying them on Friday, so that they can shop on Saturday morning? There is nothing in this Saturday-night business, anyhow. Most of the people that go down town Saturday night do what the shopgirls call "pilling," going from store to store and buying nothing.

I would like to have the members of this committee, if they could, go through the stores of this town and see the conditions for themselves. In closing I want to say that we hope this bill will be passed at this session; and if not passed at this session, we at least hope it will be reported favorably for the consideration of the next Congress. Now, I trust you will give Mr. John B. Colpoys, secretary of the Central Labor Union of Washington, a few minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to ask one question, inasmuch as you have made an investigation of the conditions in Washington. What percentage have you discovered of the girls and women in Washington receive as much as \$10 a week for their services? Have you any figures on that?

Mr. STERNE. I haven't the figures, but I can get them. I have the data on that, but I have been so busy that I have not had time to compile it. I believe that is brought out in the testimony of the ladies. My idea is that there is a whole lot of them who are getting way down low—\$1.50 and \$1.75—and there are very few getting \$10 or \$11 or \$12.

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to get an idea of what is the average wage of these girls in Washington and other cities.

Mr. STERNE. My idea is that the average wage is between \$4 and \$5 a week. When a shopgirl gets \$5 a week she thinks she is getting pretty fair wages. I know about that, because my wife and my sister-in-law and my mother have been shopgirls, and I happen to come from a family of shopgirls employed in other cities—members of my family—and they tell me that if they are getting \$5 a week they are getting good wages. Of course they have to live at home on that salary.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would you be in favor of the household employees—the working girls, the domestics—being included in this 8-hour bill? Would you be in favor of including them also?

Mr. STERNE. Absolutely, yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say for the benefit of the committee that the coal companies—some of them—work all night delivering coal to their customers.

Mr. STERNE. I am speaking of the retail trade now.

Mr. HEBBARD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he will go on record as opposed to overtime?

Mr. STERNE. We leave that to the judgment of the committee.

Mr. HEBBARD. We would like to have the Federation of Labor go on record as to overtime.

Mr. STERNE. May I answer the question?

The CHAIRMAN. That is what you are here for, I suppose.

Mr. STERNE. We are absolutely opposed to overtime except in emergencies.

Mr. HEBBARD. In my statement here I have absolutely proved that all of my employees get paid for overtime, and I am willing to have anybody down here to testify to that fact. I would also like to go on record as repeating the statement from the Department of Labor

at the average wage in the tailoring business is \$9.88—practically 0—which is more than they pay in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me say that this witness is on the stand. You are recognized for the purpose of asking the witness a question. You have asked the question, and if you have any further questions to ask the chair will be ready to recognize you for the asking of those questions. Such statements as you have to make the chair will recognize you for and they will go into the record in your own time.

Are there any further questions?

Mr. HEBBARD. If it is necessary, we can get the positive testimony that the girls are paid overtime by the ladies' tailors in Washington; that they are even paid time and a half on Sundays, and that the girls are not opposed to that practice. That is the reason we are desirous to have prevail the rule of overtime—not that we are opposed to the 8-hour provision.

Mr. STERNE. There is a gentleman here that knows more about these questions, and he can give you full information. In closing, Mr. Chairman, I ask you in the interest of these women in Washington, for the betterment of their health, that you please report this bill to the House before the 4th of March.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many of the 100 members of the stenographers' union that you represent—how many reside in the city of Washington?

Mr. STERNE. Every one of them.

Mr. SOWERS. I understood Mr. Sterne to say just a minute ago that he was in favor of protecting alike the domestic in the household the same as the girls that work in the stores.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you stand on that? Would you make this bill apply to domestic service, or are you opposed to that?

Mr. STERNE. There is an old saying that "man works from sun to sun, but woman's work is never done." Now, I know that you cannot take that into the home and expect the housewife to work 8 hours and no more.

Mr. ANDREWS. I mean the domestics who work in the house.

Mr. STERNE. I have a domestic in my house, and she works 8 hours.

Mr. ANDREWS. Are you in favor of having this bill protect alike the domestics who work in these homes these long hours?

Mr. STERNE. Yes, I am.

Mr. ANDREWS. Then you have asked the committee to act favorably on this bill. Do we understand that you want to offer an amendment to the bill to include domestics?

Mr. STERNE. I do not undertake to dictate to the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. You seek to protect these domestics in the home, and yet you let this bill go along without that provision in it?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that would be a good thing if we had an 8-hour bill for domestic servants?

Mr. STERNE. Yes; for Congressmen, too.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not suggesting to this committee that they make that amendment?

Mr. STERNE. No, sir: we are glad to have a half loaf. We consider that better than none.

Mr. WINEMAN. Now, you go over here to Baltimore, and they have 10 hours over there. If we have 8 hours here in the District, how are we going to compete with them?

Mr. STERNE. I want you to understand that Baltimore is the worst organized city in the United States. We have been working for 15 years to get some regulation, and we have only been successful in the last year in getting a 10-hour day for women, but we expect the next legislature, in 1914, to pass an 8-hour law, the same as we are trying to get it here. I want to say that I do not believe that there are very many people in Washington that will go to Baltimore to buy, because I believe Washington has better skilled help than Baltimore, and I do not believe the poor man who is getting \$9 or \$10 a week is going to jump on the cars and go to Baltimore when he wants to buy a pair of shoes. I want to say also that organized labor will work with the merchants, but it will not work with them if they are going to take the lives of the women and girls that work in the stores and factories.

Mr. ANDREWS. There is just one question I would like to ask the gentleman. What would be the effect, in your opinion, on the stenographers, the 100 stenographers that you represent, if this bill became a law, and the men stenographers in the city of Washington could work as long as they always could and night work too, wouldn't that result in the ladies not being able to get as much work as they now do?

Mr. STERNE. Seventy-five per cent of our girls work 7 hours a day now.

Mr. ANDREWS. They could not work overtime, no matter how badly they might be needed. Suppose a lawyer had an employee in his office, a woman that had been there a long time, and he had an important brief to get up at night, which he could not intrust to anyone else, under this law he would not be able to employ that woman. He simply could not under this law. Now, under those circumstances, wouldn't he feel like replacing her as soon as possible with a man who was not affected by the law?

Mr. STERNE. It is the same old story, double your shift; get two stenographers instead of one.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further?

Mr. STERNE. No, sir; thank you.

**STATEMENT OF D. F. MANNING, 1524 EIGHTH STREET, NW.,
REPRESENTING THE RETAIL CLERKS' UNION.**

Mr. MANNING. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, it was not the intention of the retail clerks' union, which I have the honor to represent, to take up your time in presenting arguments or reasons why such a just, worthy, and humane bill should be enacted into law. We felt that the cause of the retail clerks of our city could be well and ably taken care of by our good friends, the ladies composing the consumers' league, who are responsible for the introduction of this bill, and to whom should be given great credit for their untiring efforts and zeal to promote the well-being, safeguard and protect the health of the female employees of our city.

We realized that to enter into protracted hearings and discussions of this subject might be the earnest desire of the opponents of this

ill, in the hope that by this method its favorable consideration, endorsement, and passage would be prevented at this session of Congress.

In view, however, of the reported statement of one of the worthy gentlemen opposing this measure, who is also an employer of quite a number of females, to the effect "that not a single clerk or employee in any retail, mercantile establishment in Washington was interested in the bill, or desired its passage," we have felt compelled to present our views on this very important proposed legislation. The members of our association could not afford, and do not propose that this statement be placed in the record unchallenged or undisputed.

We concede the right of any employer, or body of employers, to their opinion or conviction on matters of this character, but we question their right to speak for the clerks or employees, or the correctness of their information when they state "that not a single clerk or employee in any retail mercantile establishment in Washington was interested in the bill or desired its passage." Permit me to say that the union I represent, composed of nearly 400 employees in the retail stores, selling clothing, shoes, dry goods, etc., have previously, at their regular meetings, unanimously indorsed this, as well as a companion bill introduced in the Senate by Senator La Follette. The Central Labor Union of Washington, composed of representatives of 70-odd various industrial organizations, with a total membership of approximately 25,000, after due deliberation and consideration, has also unanimously indorsed these bills, and in addition to these indorsements the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, representing 2,000,000 organized wage earners of our country, after careful and painstaking investigation, has likewise given their unanimous approval to these measures.

Lest there be any misunderstanding as to our right to speak in behalf of the employees of the retail mercantile establishments of our city, our union, composed of all nationalities, creeds, and opinions, makes the assertion that since its organization, more than 15 years ago, it has been responsible for the institution and successful establishment of any and every general early closing or shorter-hour reform which has been brought about in the retail trade. In years one by one, when it was a rule rather than the exception that retail stores of Washington opened early in the morning and closed late at night, till midnight on Saturdays, with a half-day's work on Sunday in many instances, our union was the first to espouse the cause of the underpaid and overworked retail clerk. In the early years of our organization it was no uncommon custom for clerks to report at 6 o'clock in the morning, work daily until 7, 8, and half-past 8 in the evening for the first 5 days of the week, and invariably midnight on Saturdays. In addition to this, we were also required in many instances to work one-half day on Sundays, and nearly all legal holidays. Since that time, however, through the continued efforts of our union, we have been successful in reducing the hours of labor during the week days and on Saturdays, eliminating to the minimum work on Sundays and legal holidays.

It might be interesting to your committee to know that up until a few years back the retail mercantile establishments of Washington, including nearly all the large department stores, kept open from 8 in the morning until 11 and 11.30 on Saturday nights, and 6 o'clock

in most instances being the rule during the week days. Our union, true to its concepts, and in accordance with its avowed purposes and declaration of principles, inaugurated a campaign for the improvement of conditions of our sales-people, and it affords me much pleasure to say that after years of sacrifice and toil and the expenditure of large sums of money we have been successful through the kind and generous cooperation of the shopping public in reducing the hours of labor, so that to-day few if any of the reputable establishments of our city employing any great number of women require their employees to work later than 6 p. m. on week days and 9 p. m. on Saturday nights. In addition to this, through our campaign of agitation and education, it has been made possible for many of our mercantile establishments during the winter months to open at 8.30 a. m. and close at 5.30 in the evenings on week days, and in the summer months to close at 5 p. m. on week days and 6 p. m. on Saturdays. There are, in addition, quite a number of uptown stores which close at 1 o'clock Saturday during the summer months. While I am no prophet, nor am I disclosing any confidences, I feel absolutely assured that our continued agitation and education, coupled with the awakened public conscience, brought about through the consideration and discussion of this measure, will see in the very near future, perhaps nearer than we realize, the closing of our department stores at 6 o'clock during the entire year.

I can but very poorly express the feelings of the members of my union as to the justice and importance of this humane legislation. In my humble opinion there need be no stronger nor appropriate reasons for its passage than the arguments of its opponents, who, in their misguided zeal and biased opinion can see no good in the legislation, which perchance might disarrange their present methods of doing business. The apparent selfish, personal, and ulterior motives of this opposition is so plain that it needs no comment from me. I believe your committee is fully capable, and has had sufficient experience in matters of this kind, to differentiate between the opposition to a method and the opposition to a principle. I have no hesitancy in believing that the members of this committee, who have patiently listened to the statements of the various individuals appearing before you, are thoroughly conversant with the situation of the mercantile establishments in Washington, and are fully competent and capable of passing judgment upon the statements made that this proposed measure is a bad and vicious piece of legislation, and should not be enacted into law. That it should be approved is the almost universal opinion of those who have given it any measure of consideration. If enacted into law it will not, unquestionably, as some of its opponents seem to think, drive the retail merchants out of business; it will not be a burden upon the retail salesladies; it will not have the effect of reducing the earning power of our retail clerks. True, it might prove a source of inconvenience for a time, but in the end it will serve the purpose of affording the greatest good to the greatest number, which is certainly in accord with our American institutions and form of Government.

After all is said and done, in the final analysis of this proposition, it is merely a question of arrangement between the merchant and his employees. When our union took up the early-closing proposition

was proclaimed that it was impossible to close their establishments at 9 o'clock Saturday nights; that it would be their ruination if they closed at 5 o'clock during the week days; yet, notwithstanding these protestations, the merchants in some sections of the city, whose places of business were kept open at late hours at night, on Sundays, and holidays are now closing at the early hours referred to above, and it has been our experience that these self-same merchants, notwithstanding their shorter hours and improved conditions, are doing more business, are getting better results from a more satisfied set of employees, and are more thoroughly satisfied themselves than under the old régime; so much so, in fact, that some of these self-same merchants have stated that under no circumstances would they return to the old conditions. As I say, it is all a matter of arrangement, and as a matter of further information to the committee I incorporate herewith a copy of a letter which was addressed to our union during its campaign to close the mercantile establishments at an earlier hour on Saturday nights:

JUNE 11, 1900.

Secretary Retail Clerks' Union, Washington.

DEAR SIR: YOUR favor to hand, and has had our thoughtful consideration. When we signed the agreement to close at 9 o'clock we stipulated in writing opposite our signature "provided all other concerns do likewise," and we further specified "in view of the fact that we are a department house, that clothing stores, hatters, and furnishers were included."

We were the first to observe the understanding, and have acted in good faith, and it is still our intention to do so, provided your organization keeps its agreement with us, namely, to see to it that other concerns are placed on the same footing, as it is unfair and unjust to discriminate, which you know is being done, competing houses on the Avenue are open and getting the benefit of our early closing. It is not an unusual sight to see certain stores—whose names it is needless for us to mention, as they are well known to you—crowded from 9 o'clock until midnight. Do you call that keeping faith, and do you think it good form to call our attention to the violation of agreement? We had concluded to call attention to this matter and are therefore glad that you anticipated us, but if it is your impression that we are going to remain silent and look on while our competitors keep their establishments open you are simply under a misapprehension.

We heartily favor the early closing and are perfectly willing to continue it, like the other stores—and we refer principally to the Avenue—have to do likewise, and if you fail in securing their cooperation you fail with the rest. The majority of dealers are anxious to reopen on this account and are simply waiting for us to lead, which we have refused to do, but unless the matter receives our early attention you will discover a break in the ranks.

(Signed)

Merchant.

The above letter, which is self-explanatory, was received from one of our leading mercantile establishments. It is sufficient to say that this same establishment is now closing promptly at 6 o'clock during the week and at 9 o'clock Saturday nights, and during the summer months (and draw your attention to the fact that this complaint was lodged during the summer months) this establishment closes at 5 o'clock on week days and 6 o'clock on Saturday nights. It is, to my mind at least, clearly demonstrated that where there is a will there is a way, and the letter is incorporated herewith solely for the purpose of proving that assertion.

As a matter of further information for the committee, I desire to add you an article from the Retail Clerks' International Advocate,

the official journal of the Retail Clerks' International Association, of which my union is a part.

Now getting back to the proposed 8-hour work day for women in our mercantile establishments, I can state positively from direct first-hand information, that the proprietors or managers of a majority of our largest department stores absolutely are not opposed to this bill, and I can further state from positive knowledge that the sales people of these self-same large department stores, approximating 2,000 in number, are desirous of having this legislation passed, feeling that it would be a great help and benefit to them. In talking to the proprietors and managers of these department stores, not a single one has expressed opposition to the bill, whereas one of the largest employers of our female sales people expressed the hope that it would be adopted. To use the expression of these merchants, and I might say in passing that these self-same merchants are members of the Retail Merchants' Association, whom it has been stated are pledged to oppose this bill, they propose to remain neutral; they state that they will not oppose the adoption of this bill, nor will they constitute themselves a lobby, or adopt any other method to secure its defeat, although they frankly admit that they have been importuned to appear in opposition to the measure, and some even have been asked if they would donate funds to be used in defraying the necessary expenses of the campaign of opposition. These various department store proprietors and managers, without exception, are content to leave the entire matter to the best judgment of this committee and the Members of Congress. They say that if the bill is enacted and becomes a law, they will govern themselves accordingly. The only drawback or hardship which they anticipate, would be the disarrangement of their present method of doing business, and the consequent confusion in the establishment of a system which would meet the requirements of this law; and this is purely speculative.

Now, just a few words in connection with the wages paid salesladies in our department stores and retail establishments. If I understood correctly, the representative from the Department of Commerce and Labor gave the average earnings of saleswomen as \$6.36 per week, while the pay roll submitted to her would indicate an average of \$6.55 per week. I have no desire to controvert that statement. Her sources of information may have enabled her to secure correct data on this subject. Our union, however, not long since, having this question under consideration and investigation, referred the matter to a special committee, who reported the average wages paid retail salesladies as four dollars and seventy-odd cents, as well as I can remember. This, however, included salesladies only, not heads of departments or buyers.

The sources of the information furnished the committee, I am unable to vouch for. We have endeavored to secure correct information in this respect, even so far as adopting a law in our union, which stipulated that members receiving less than a certain wage, should pay a certain amount of dues per month; other members receiving over and above that stipulated wage should pay so much more dues per month. To entitle a member to be classed in a lower rate of dues, we required that such member must present a statement in writing that they receive less than the stipulated salary. This

method was adopted for the twofold purpose of endeavoring to ascertain the amount of wages paid as well as to avoid making it burdensome on our members who received a small salary. In endeavoring to follow out this law and secure the desired information, we were invariably met with the statement that such member or members were prohibited from stating the salary received; that the amount paid in salary was confidential between the employer and employe, and under no circumstances could the amount of wage received be divulged. And in this connection permit me to say that it has been my experience that very few of our sales people received adequate wages for labor performed. In seeking work it is not a question of how much can they get, but how little will they take. And in this connection it might be a matter of information to this committee to know that under existing conditions in Washington to-day, no merchant will hire or employ a clerk who, at that time, is employed in another retail establishment; the statement of some of the opponents to this bill to the contrary notwithstanding. There is said to be a "gentlemen's" agreement, which has been in existence for years, which makes it a rule prohibiting one employer from taking the services of an employe from another employer. The retail clerk must be out of employment before their services will be acceptable to the merchant who desires such services. The purpose of such a "gentlemen's" agreement is so apparent that I hardly believe it requires any extended explanation on my part. I am satisfied that the intelligence of this committee is sufficient to fathom and analyze its motive.

Mr. MANNING. Now, I had intended, Mr. Chairman, to include a more detailed statement as to wages, but I feel that the committee has had sufficient enlightenment on that. As I stated in starting out, it was our intention to leave the entire matter to the committee. So many statements have been made that not a single representative of the clerks was in favor of the bill or advocated it, that I wanted our union to take a position and go on record that they were in favor of it. I want to file, Mr. Chairman, a little paper that I prepared, showing the hours of employment in some of the large retail establishments.

The CHAIRMAN. From what source is the table drawn?

Mr. MANNING. Both from employees and employers. We attempted to get it from employers, and where they would give it I used it. Where I could not get it from the employers I took the word of the employees.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the table itself show the address of employees on which the table is based and the address of the establishments upon which it is based?

Mr. MANNING. No; it just enumerates the establishments. It names them individually, taking them as the representatives, the largest establishments. I do not suppose that these establishments would have any objection to having this published. And if there is any objection the names could be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it will be included in the record, and the committee will determine later whether it will permit the use of the name of the particular establishments.

	Week days.			Saturday.				Hours per day.		Hours per week.
	Opening hour.	Closing hour.	Launch hour.	Opening hour.	Closing hour.	Launch hour.	Supper hour.	Week days.	Satur-day.	
Palais Royal:										
Winter season.....	8.30	6.00		8.30	6.00			9	9	54
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00		8.00	1.00			8½	5	47½
Busy season.....	8.00	6.00		8.00	6.00			9½	9½	57
Woodward & Lothrop:										
Winter season.....	8.30	5.30		8.30	5.30			8½	8½	49½
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00		8.00	1.00			8½	5	41½
Busy season.....	8.00	6.00		8.00	6.00			9½	9½	55½
S. Kann Sons & Co.:										
Winter season.....	8.30	6.00		8.30	9.00			8½	11	54½
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00		8.00	6.00			8½	9½	50½
Busy season.....	8.00	6.00		8.00	9.00			9½	11½	57½
Lansburgh & Bro.:										
Winter season.....	8.30	5.30		8.30	9.00		1.00	8½	10½	52
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00		8.00	6.00			8½	9½	50½
Busy season.....	8.00	6.00		8.00	9.00			9½	11½	57½
Garfinkle:										
Winter season.....	8.00	6.00	1.00	8.00	6.00	1.00		9	9	54
Summer season.....	8.00	5.30	1.00	8.00	12.00			8½	4	46½
Busy season.....	8.00	6.00	1.00	8.00	6.00	1.00		9	9	54
Hecht & Co.:										
Winter season.....	8.30	6.00		8.30	9.00			8½	11	54½
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00		8.00	6.00			8½	9½	50½
Busy season.....	8.00	6.00		8.00	9.00			9½	11½	58
Kings Palace:										
Winter season.....	8.00	6.00	1.00	8.00	9.00 or 9.30	1	1	9	11½-12	56½-57
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00	1.00	8.00	9.00 or 9.30	1	1	8	11½-12	51½-52
Busy season.....	8.00	6.00	1.00	8.00	9.00 or 9.30	1	1	9	11½-12	56½-57
Goldenberg's:										
Winter season.....	8.30	6.00		8.30	9.00			8½	11	54½
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00		8.00	6.00			8½	9½	50½
Busy season.....	8.00	6.00		8.00	9.00			9½	11½	57½
Hahn's shoe store:										
Winter season.....	8.00	6.00		8.00	10.00			9½	12½	59
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00		8.00	10.00			8½	12½	5½
Berberich's Shoe Store:										
Winter season.....	8.00	6.00	1.00	8.00	10.00	1	1	9	12½	57½
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00	1.00	8.00	10.00	1	1	8	12½	52½
Family Shoe Store:										
Winter season.....	8.00	6.00		8.00	10.00			9½	12½	58½
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00		8.00	10.00			8½	12½	43½
Saks & Co.:										
Winter season.....	8.00	6.00		8.00	9.00			9½	12½	58½
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00		8.00	6.00			8½	9½	50½
Parker, Bridgett & Co.:										
Winter season.....	8.00	6.00	1.00	8.00	9.00	1	1	9	11	56
Summer season.....	8.00	5.00	1.00	8.00	6.00	1		8	9	49

Miss OBENAUER. Mr. Chairman, there were some slight errors in quoting some figures that I gave to the committee, but I am sure that they are right in the record, and if you are willing I will take up the time of the committee to make the correction now.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not quite understand the reference the gentleman made there to the fund. Did I understand him to say that there had been a fund that had been raised by the Retail Merchants' Association, or attempted to be raised, to oppose this bill?

Mr. MANNING. No, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. It sounded very much like that.

Mr. MANNING. What I did say was that some of them informed me that they had been asked if they would subscribe funds for a campaign of opposition.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to state, as acting president of the Retail Merchants' Association, that my interest in this matter is nothing personal at all, and, to the best of my knowledge, such a question has not entered the mind of anyone who had anything to do with these hearings or this bill.

Mr. MANNING. I am simply giving that as a statement that was made to me by the manager of one of our largest retail establishments.

Mr. ANDREWS. Could you give me his name?

Mr. MANNING. I would not like to give the name.

The CHAIRMAN. You can give Mr. Andrews the name if you care to.

Mr. MANNING. Later on, if necessary, I can produce the name.

Mr. SOWERS. These various labor organizations to which you refer as having gone on record indorsing this bill, were they comprised of men or women?

Mr. MANNING. Both.

Mr. SOWERS. Largely of men, were they not?

Mr. MANNING. At times there have been 1,100 women in the Retail Clerks, but because of the fact that the wages they received were so small—I refer to the retail and department stores—they were compelled to drop their membership.

Mr. SOWERS. What percentage is that of the total number?

Mr. MANNING. You mean the employees in the retail stores?

Mr. SOWERS. The total number of members of your union—what percentage of your membership is female?

Mr. MANNING. I would be unable to state that offhand.

Mr. SOWERS. The larger percentage are males, are they not?

Mr. MANNING. I would not say that they were.

Mr. SOWERS. Your union recognizes the fact that they are in competition with the female classes, does it not?

Mr. MANNING. Yes.

Mr. SOWERS. And they recognize that by reason of the enactment of this law they would be put in a fairer competition with the females. Your unions demand an 8-hour day, and therefore, if this regulation were enacted forbidding females to work longer than 8 hours, they would be on a fairer basis of competition?

Mr. MANNING. Our union demands an 8-hour law for male clerks. I want to answer your question, but I do not know that I get it right.

Mr. SOWERS. It is a fact that your unions demand an 8-hour day in most lines, do they not?

Mr. MANNING. In many industries they do. In the retail trade, we advocate an 8-hour law, but by agreement we, at certain times of the year, allowed longer hours. We are now working 8 hours.

Mr. SOWERS. You recognize that competition would be less sharp if the females were put on the same basis and required to work only 8 hours, that that would give more places to the males?

Mr. MANNING. I am, of course, speaking of the retail trade. It is a fact that, if all things were equal, I believe the majority of employees in retail establishments would be men.

The CHAIRMAN. By saying, "If all things were equal," you include that the number of hours and wages paid? Both of those are included? Suppose they were equal, the tendency would be to employ males instead of females?

Mr. MANNING. What I had in mind was the fact that it is invariably the case that women are employed in some departments and some industries because they will work for less money than men will. Our union requires equal work requirements for both sexes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is no competition in the union, is there?

Mr. MANNING. Oh, no.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Your union invites membership of women, do they not? They have lady members, do they not?

Mr. MANNING. We do more than that. We go out and beg them to come in.

Mr. BUCHANAN. So far as your organization is concerned, it is not competition, the organization is for the purpose of improving the condition of the lady clerks as well as the men?

Mr. MANNING. Yes; because the conditions apply equally to both. The competition I referred to was between the cost of selling goods, between the male and female help.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Sowers asked you if you were in competition there, and I thought you said you were.

Mr. MANNING. Oh, no.

Mr. SOWERS. I think the witness understood that I referred to the condition in the mercantile world in which the men are forbidden to work longer than 8 hours by their unions, and the females, not being under that restriction, have an advantage in securing positions over the males. You understood I said that, did you not?

Mr. MANNING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In taking a stand for an 8-hour work day for women, have you at any time taken that position because it might result in the employment of a larger number of men?

Mr. MANNING. We have considered that and have arrived at the conclusion that the less number of hours we work the more employment it gives to people who seek it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You think the same number of hours for women that you do for men?

Mr. MANNING. Yes; and the cash girls and cash boys; in fact, all the employees, down to the fireman and engineer. I might say that our agreement between the merchants and the union regulates the conditions of employees in their establishment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In other words, you have the same agreement for lady members that you do for men?

Mr. MANNING. Yes. I might say, also, that in our new agreement we have provided an 8-hour day covering certain periods of the year. I might say, further, that in this table it shows that in many of the very large mercantile establishments they are working less than 8 hours per day and they are managing to do their business all right.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I took it from Mr. Sowers's question that his position is that through your organization you are trying to make it a disadvantage for the ladies to work in competition with the men?

Mr. MANNING. No; it was Mr. Sowers—he might have meant to make such a statement as that.

Mr. SOWERS. But you believe that by reason of this enactment a great many females will be replaced by men?

Mr. MANNING. No; I do not believe there would be a single one. It has been my experience in handling these matters that the adoption of the 5 o'clock closing during the summer months, and during the entire months, that the shorter hours instead of proving a detriment; instead of displacing female clerks it has had the tendency to put more to work, to make employment for a greater number of both men and women, in order to handle the increased volume of business.

Mr. SOWERS. I understand that if male and female alike were forbidden alike to work longer than 8 hours that would be the

result, but if the men are allowed to work as long as they please, and the females are forbidden to work longer than 8 hours, don't you believe that in many cases where there was an extra hour and a half required that men would be found more available, and would be retained under those conditions?

Mr. MANNING. I would like to say to Mr. Sowers that in our unions we do not permit people to work as long as they please.

Mr. SOWERS. If you do, do you not fine them for working overtime?

Mr. MANNING. We prohibit them by agreement with the employers.

Mr. SOWERS. In cases where they desire to work overtime, you prohibit them, and impose a fine if they violate that prohibition, don't you?

Mr. MANNING. We have never had occasion to go that far. What might occur, of course, I can not answer.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you know of any dry goods or grocery stores that are kept open here on Sunday?

Mr. MANNING. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. Is that the practice in some sections of the city?

Mr. MANNING. Absolutely; not only in the morning, but also at night. Any time of day you can get any kind of an article you wish.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you know of industries that work their men on Sunday?

Mr. MANNING. Leaving out the retail trade, of course. The Government institutions sometimes, I believe, work men on Sundays, but, generally speaking, I do not believe they do.

Mr. HOWARD. I am talking about institutions outside of Government work.

Mr. MANNING. They were working on the Riggs Building last Sunday.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is a case where they had a permit for working on Sunday. That is a special case.

Mr. HOWARD. They do work on Sunday sometimes?

Mr. MANNING. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you know of any law in the District prohibiting that?

Mr. MANNING. No, sir. We have been endeavoring for 10 years to secure the adoption of such a law.

Mr. HOWARD. I introduced one a year and a half ago, but it never got anywhere.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to say, in regard to overtime on building construction work, that they generally pay double time for Sunday work and holiday work, and that, in itself, is an evidence of emergency existing, because it costs so much more to do the work.

Mr. MANNING. While we are on this question, we have Capt. Estes here, representing the District government as an inspector of child-labor conditions, and he is better able to give you specific information on this than anyone else in the District.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will have to adjourn. There are a number of others here, I understand, who want to be heard by the committee, but we will be unable to hear Capt. Estes this morning.

If there are no objections, we will adjourn until 9.30 to-morrow morning.

EIGHT-HOUR LAW FOR WOMEN IN CALIFORNIA.

SEVENTY-FIVE PER CENT OF THE EMPLOYERS ARE IN FAVOR OF THE REDUCTION OF THE HOURS OF LABOR FOR WOMEN AS AIDING IN THEIR EFFICIENCY—GREAT BENEFIT TO WORKERS.

The 8-hour law for women is a boon not only to all women employed, but to the employers of women.

This is the gist of a report on labor conditions in California prepared by the bureau of labor statistics for Gov. Hiram W. Johnson, so that he may have accurate information with which to meet the tremendous influence that will be brought to bear to have the law repealed at the next session of the legislature.

The report, more than 4,000 words long, was drafted from figures furnished by 18 competent investigators, and deals with the period of six months ending January 1, 1912.

During the investigations the men visited hundreds of places where women are employed all over the State, and talked to thousands of employed women. In addition to obtaining information on the 8-hour law for women they investigated conditions affected by every State law on labor, and obtained much information that will aid in the passing of laws dealing with phases of the labor situation not yet legislated for.

Some of the most specific findings are:

Less than a dozen women have been discharged as a result of the enforcement of the law.

There has been practically no reduction of wages following the shortening of hours.

Women do as much now in 8 hours as they formerly did in 8½ or 9.

Seventy-five per cent of the employers of women do not object to the law.

Of the remainder, 20 per cent object to the 8-hour a day provision, but not to the 48-hour a week clause.

Less than 5 per cent of the employers of women are lined up strongly against the law.

The operation of the law has increased, rather than diminished, the opportunity for women to obtain employment.

Opposition to the law was founded for the most part on preconceived erroneous ideas as to its effect.

"A great deal of comment," reads the report in part, "was made by both prominent persons and the press as to the effect of the 8-hour law upon the economic conditions of the women themselves and upon business in general. In order to ascertain whether there was any merit in these contentions, our special agents were instructed to ask the following questions from each establishment employing women:

"First. Have any women been discharged as a result of the 8-hour law?

"Second. Have the wages of women been reduced?

"Third. Statements of views of the employer on the 8-hour law.

"Fourth. Statement of views of the women on the 8-hour law.

"While our work along this line is not yet complete, the answers obtained in over 2,000 establishments employing women up to January 1 show that less than a dozen women have been actually discharged on account of the 8-hour law. Further, that there has been practically no reduction of wages even in the case of women doing piecework. We were informed that these women accomplished as much in 8 hours as they did formerly in 8½ and 9 hours. The majority of employers informed us that they accomplish more in a shorter period of time.

"Over 75 per cent of the employers of women stated that they had no objection to offer against the law, while about 20 per cent stated that they had no objection to the 48-hour a week law, but were opposed to a strict 8-hour a day law. This objection was based principally upon the inconvenience caused in office departments around the first of the month. Less than 5 per cent voiced any opposition to the 8-hour law. Numerous statements appeared that women were being displaced by men. In our investigation we have run across only two or three instances of this kind.

"While, as stated before, our work is not yet complete, I believe that our investigation will show that the 8-hour law has not driven women out of in-

dustrial ranks, but, on the contrary, that it has furnished employment for a greater number of women."

The substance on the finding on holiday trade conditions is: "The law was an inconvenience during the season of 1911 because it necessitated a radical change from the method of handling the Christmas trade heretofore. In almost all cases conditions were met successfully. Though a general increase, in gross cost of selling, of from 2½ to 10 per cent, was experienced, it was compensated for in a large measure by an increase of from 15 to 20 per cent in the volume of trade.

"If the women shoppers, who should be in sympathy with the law, will attempt to do their shopping at hours convenient to the storekeepers, no difficulty will be experienced during the rush season to come.

"The bitter minority," said Henry H. Lyon, assistant deputy labor commissioner, "is preparing to make a desperate fight to have the law repealed at the next session of the legislature, and this is our answer to them."

COMMITTEE ON LABOR,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, February 12, 1913.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. William B. Wilson (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear from Mr. Roberts this morning. Mr. Roberts, give us your name and address.

STATEMENT OF MR. W. F. ROBERTS, PRESIDENT OF THE W. F. ROBERTS CO.

MR. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I am W. F. Roberts, president of the W. F. Roberts Co., in the printing and engraving business at 1413 New York Avenue. I have in my employ 27 women. I will state first that the requirements of my business often call for extra work. There are a great many occasions when work is not coming into our office until 4 or 5 o'clock in the day. Five o'clock is our quitting time. It is work of the utmost importance, and it requires that we keep some of the help to finish it up that night. We very frequently have papers concerning decisions, mandamus proceedings, and briefs that come along, and the work has to be done during the night. Our regular hours of work are eight, and the girls who work on this work receive a 50 per cent increase for the overtime that they work.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, they are paid a time and a half?

MR. ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. For overtime?

MR. ROBERTS. Yes, sir. I have consulted a number of girls in my office about how they felt about this 8-hour law, and I find that they are really very anxious to get the extra money. Frequently we call for a number of girls to work—that is, we only require four or five—and there are always more volunteers than are required to do the work. I find that out of the 27 girls in my employ one-third of them are in families where there is neither father, brother, nor husband. They are really in menless families. One woman works in the bindery at a dollar and a half a day, supporting her mother, sister, and sister's child. That woman has been in my employ for quite a number of years. She is not an expert workwoman by any means, and in a case of that kind it would be a great hardship for the reason

that on account of the exigencies of the business that I am in I would have to dispense with that woman's labor. You see, there is a great deal of competition in this city, and a man in business can not afford to let the other man beat him out on anything where time is an adjunct.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the difference in the rate of pay that you pay to men as compared with women in your line of business?

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, in my office merit counts, and there is very little difference in pay. I have men working for me who are getting \$12 to \$35 a week. I have women working who are getting from \$6 to \$28.80 a week.

The CHAIRMAN. In the bindery—

Mr. ROBERTS (interposing). No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). Is the work entirely day work there?

Mr. ROBERTS. The bindery is really the place where we require the extra help more than we do in the other departments, for the reason that after the compositors and pressmen have finished up their work the finishing touches are put on in the bindery.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all day work?

Mr. ROBERTS. No, sir; it is not. That is where we require the overtime.

The CHAIRMAN. You pay so much per day instead of so much per piece?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it principally women who are employed in the bindery?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes; I have several men there to do the heavy work—cutting and lifting.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the men paid?

Mr. ROBERTS. \$3 a day. They are helpers. One gets \$12 a week.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the women paid?

Mr. ROBERTS. The women are paid from \$6 to \$12. Pardon me, I should have said from \$7.50 a day in the bindery to \$12. Of course, I was thinking of the bundle wrappers who are working in the stores at \$6.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that the difference in the hours of labor that would be necessitated by this bill for the women would overcome the difference in the wages that you would have to pay for men, as compared with the women?

Mr. ROBERTS. I would not put high-priced men at the work that the women are doing now. I would train in boys to do that. On account of the competition we could not afford to put in men to do that work.

The CHAIRMAN. Does not it require considerable skill in the bindery?

Mr. ROBERTS. No; not so much skill as deftness of hand, and I want to say that the women are usually more deft.

The CHAIRMAN. And that requires the training of the fingers as well as the brain to do that work?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, sir. I have no machine folder in my office and if I did not have the girls, I would have to put in a folder because one folder would do the work of a number of girls.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further statement that you desire to make?

Mr. ROBERTS. No, sir; except that I just wish to impress upon you that on account of the exigencies of the business I would possibly have to dispense with a good deal of the woman labor that I have which I would very much regret to do on account of the statement that I have just made that they are the sole support of their families. They have no men to appeal to.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, one-third of them?

Mr. ROBERTS. One-third of them in my office. I asked the girls to appoint one or two of their number to come up here and appear before you but they were reluctant and timid and asked me to come.

Mr. ROUSE. You are opposed to this bill in its present form?

Mr. ROBERTS. In its present form, for this reason: That there are no exceptions. In California, I think, there is an 8-hour law for women but there are exceptions for businesses where emergency work is done.

Mr. ROUSE. Suppose this bill could be amended to provide for 8 hours in 10 or in 20?

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, let me see now. Eight hours in 10. No, sir, that would hardly fill the bill, sir, because frequently we have to work until 12 or 1 o'clock at night. Well, not frequently but often. You know that sometimes work comes into a printing office that requires work straight through.

Mr. ROUSE. How many hours are they employed?

Mr. ROBERTS. Oh, sometimes they work 10 or 12 hours.

Mr. ROUSE. Out of the 24?

Mr. ROBERTS. Out of the 24.

Mr. ROUSE. What time do they begin work in the morning?

Mr. ROBERTS. 8.30.

Mr. ROUSE. What time do they usually stop work?

Mr. ROBERTS. 12.30.

Mr. ROUSE. When they work overtime it is until 12 and 1 o'clock at night?

Mr. ROBERTS. That does not happen very often.

Mr. ROUSE. If that were so, they would work 15 or 16 hours.

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, as I stated, the final touches to the work are put on in the bindery, and the girls are kept there rather than be sent home. They can lie down, take a nap, and read. We just want to be able to call on them.

Mr. ROUSE. You would object to any limit on the number of hours? You want the right to employ them at any hour that they would be willing to work?

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, I think a fair limit would be 12 o'clock a night.

Mr. ROUSE. Twelve o'clock at night?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, to begin at 8 o'clock, or whatever the time was for starting in the morning, and continue until 12 o'clock at night?

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, not on a continuous stretch—not in my office—because we lay them off and let them take a nap.

The CHAIRMAN. Speaking of a legal limitation as to when the work should cease, you want the privilege of beginning your work in your establishment at 8.30 and continuing through, if your business required it, until 12 o'clock at night?

Mr. ROBERTS. That is difficult for me to answer. I can easily see that if the law was so worded it might be abused by some persons.

Mr. ROUSE. You have that right now?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROUSE. Provided the employees are willing?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, sir; we have that right now, but I am speaking of the limitations of the bill. I will admit that some persons will abuse the law because in that event they might feel they could keep the girls at work all the time, but now that they are perfectly free they are more liberal with their employees.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that you could regulate your establishment so that no rush work could be hurried through?

Mr. ROBERTS. A customer is the buyer and a mighty hard man to control.

The CHAIRMAN. And your business with the customer is to get the best trade at the best prices you can?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If your competitor is in the same position in which you are and the customer is not able to get any better terms from your competitor, then he is just as likely to deal with you. What objection would you have to the limitation of this bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. There would be no objection except that I would try to beat out the other fellow by getting all men, and I think the most of them would try the same thing if I retained the women.

The CHAIRMAN. You have your theory, and that is that it will lead to the dismissal of the women that are employed and the employment of men in their stead?

Mr. ROBERTS. That is the only reason I am here now.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think the increased cost of securing men would offset that?

Mr. ROBERTS. No, sir; I would offset that by putting in machinery to do the folding.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of your competitors use machinery for doing the folding now.

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, sir; but they do a little different work from what I do now. I run an office where there are not many big runs, over 25,000 copies or something like that. I really make little or no attempt to get that kind of work.

The CHAIRMAN. So that your folding work is principally done by hand?

Mr. ROBERTS. It is all done by hand.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a very usual condition in the printing establishments in the city of Washington, is it?

Mr. ROBERTS. No, sir; it is not. I think only about three offices in this city have folding machines; a large majority of them are folded by hand, because folding work is not steady work in a printing office. There are a great many girls in the other offices who respond to calls from other offices. I mean girls who work in two or three printing offices.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, you have folding to do now and you employ those girls and you get them to do your work, and immediately thereafter some other printing establishment has some folding work to do and they employ the same girls, and immediately afterwards another establishment has some folding work to do and they get in their folding work by the same girls?

Mr. ROBERTS. That is it.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other questions?

Mr. STERN. You say you will educate boys to do the work. What ages?

Mr. ROBERTS. The ages provided by the laws of the country.

Mr. STERN. May I ask you if you have members of organized labor employed in your establishment?

Mr. ROBERTS. I have not. Mr. Chairman, now that that question has been asked, I will state that for 30 years I employed organized labor, and in 1906 they walked out of my office in a body and I immediately provided other forces and have so carried on the office. Some of those men who walked out of my office had been employed by me for 15 or 16 years.

Mr. SOWERS. I would like to ask Mr. Roberts a question. These conditions of which you speak, where you worked possibly as late as 12 or 1 o'clock at night, do not occur very often?

Mr. ROBERTS. Very seldom.

Mr. SOWERS. Possibly not more than once a week?

Mr. ROBERTS. Oh, no; once or twice a month.

Mr. SOWERS. Then, would you not be agreeable to an amendment providing 54 or 60 hours a week? Would not that permit you to work a long or a short day?

Mr. ROBERTS. That would restrict the labor to 9 hours a day.

Mr. SOWERS. If it was 60 hours a week it would be 10 hours a day.

Mr. ROBERTS. No. For regular work I do not believe in it. I believe in 8 hours a day. But I am speaking only for urgent work that is required without notice.

The CHAIRMAN. You think that in emergencies you ought to be permitted to work overtime?

Mr. ROBERTS. I do, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You or the manager of the establishment having the right to determine what constitutes an emergency?

Mr. ROBERTS. No; the emergency is created by the customer, Mr. Chairman, and I try to comply with his wants.

The CHAIRMAN. But finally the question of whether it constitutes an emergency or does not constitute an emergency would be in the judgment of the manager. Your customer could not compel you to run your establishment if you did not want to run your establishment. So that the final determination of whether or not an emergency existed would, in your judgment, remain with the manager?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes; it would. But if I applied it to a customer he would never come back.

The CHAIRMAN. Your fear of losing the customer would be one of the inducements to cause you to decide that it was an emergency?

Mr. ROBERTS. I think it would.

The CHAIRMAN. But you would be the party to decide?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FARREN. Is not there considerable of your work now going to Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York?

Mr. ROBERTS. What do you mean by my work?

Mr. FARREN. Printing work—bank checks and things of that kind?

Mr. ROBERTS. No, sir; I take no orders whatever except what I can fill in my office.

Mr. FARREN. No; I do not mean that you send it there, but I mean, does not the customer in Washington have considerable printing work in New York or Philadelphia?

Mr. ROBERTS. Oh, yes; I can speak on that.

Mr. FARREN. You are in competition with New York?

Mr. ROBERTS. With New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Waynesboro and several other outlying towns. Several years ago I was on a committee of a board of trade to look into that matter and it was really ascertained that nearly 50 per cent of the printing is done on the outside.

The CHAIRMAN. Does not Washington also do some printing for outside cities?

Mr. ROBERTS. To what extent I do not know, but in my office I have had printing for outside cities. I do a very small amount of it for New York and some for Boston. They are principally persons who have resided in this city and have transferred their residence to other places. In my engraving department I think I have sent work into every State in the United States nearly every month in the year.

Mr. FARREN. I have had quotations from Niagara Falls for printing, 35 cents as against 50 cents in Washington. I just happen to have a bill on my desk now from a Washington printer for 75 cents as against 38 at Niagara Falls, although my printing is all done in Washington by union labor, but those are the prices that have been quoted at Niagara Falls and Conshohocken, Pa., and bank checks have the mark "New York Printing office."

The CHAIRMAN. Anything further?

Mr. ROBERTS. No, sir. Mr. Chairman, I am very much obliged to you.

STATEMENT OF CAPT. CHARLES C. ESTES, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, INSPECTOR OF CHILD LABOR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The CHAIRMAN. Captain, give us your name and address and your position.

Capt. ESTES. Charles C. Estes, 1339 Irving Street NW., Washington, D. C., member of the Metropolitan police department, detailed as inspector of child labor in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. Captain, the bill we have pending before us now, the Peters 8-hour bill, makes a provision excluding the employment of females under 18 years of age, I believe, before the hour of 7 o'clock in the morning and after the hour of 6 o'clock in the evening. In your work in connection with the enforcement of the child-labor law, will you tell the committee what in your judgment the effect of that provision would be?

Capt. ESTES. Mr. Chairman, my work has been limited to the minor under 16 years of age, both male and female, but while doing that

work I have had access to all of the stores of the District of Columbia, workshops, factories, laundries, and so forth, where child labor has been used and is being used. The law, as you know, sir, is that no minor under 16 years of age can be employed without first having obtained a permit either from the superintendent of the public schools or an authorized deputy or a judge of the juvenile court. That is, between 14 and 16 from the superintendent of public schools and between 12 and 14 from the judge of the juvenile court. That is in cases where it is absolutely necessary for the child to work for its own maintenance in part or in whole or for its mother, who may be a widow, or an invalid father. As I said, that law has been in force now since 1898, as I recall it, and I have been on that work since the passage of that bill, and it has worked and is being worked now very successfully with, practically speaking, no opposition. The merchants are in favor of it, and I think that every father and mother who is worthy of being called such is in favor of that law.

I know a great many of the lady clerks in the large stores and I have yet to hear, since this bill has been spoken of, a single one desiring to work longer than 8 hours. The larger stores in the District of Columbia are coming to the point where they would like to see the public educated up to the point of doing their shopping before 6 o'clock. Some of our very best stores close at the very latest at half-past 5, opening at half-past 8, and give their clerks from three-quarters of an hour to an hour for lunch, which makes it, practically speaking, 8 hours a day. Mr. Garfinkle closes all the year around at 6 o'clock except through the summer, when he closes at 1 o'clock on Saturday. It has been customary heretofore for the other stores to keep open as late as 8 or 9 o'clock on Saturdays at night except during the holidays, and then they kept open until 9 or 10 or 11, or as late as they thought necessary. Last year there were only a very few of the better class of stores that kept open late. Woodward & Lothrop kept open 2 nights during the holidays, but, as I said before, Mr. Garfinkle did not keep open at all. I was in Mr. Kann's, that is, Kann & Sons, Eighth and Pennsylvania Avenue, Lansburgh's, the Palais Royal, and the Boston House, and those gentlemen told me that the business they did during the holidays by keeping open after 6 o'clock did not pay their expenses, because the public is becoming educated up to the point where it prefers doing its shopping in the daytime. So that I say that while I know but little about the work of those over 16, I consider that I am conversant with the employment of minors under 16. I believe there are 600 girls and boys employed in the District of Columbia under 16 years of age. I should say about one-third of that number are girls, and they are being used as bundle wrappers and floor messengers and such like in the department stores. The messenger companies, of course, use all boys.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you consider it wise, Captain, from a standpoint of morality to have a condition where those girls under 16 years of age could be employed in the evenings, in the nighttime? Do you think that is a wise thing from the standpoint of morality?

Capt. ESTES. No, sir; I do not. I think that girls under 16 years of age should be at home. My experience in the police department for 20-odd years, with the two exceptions that I went to Cuba for about a year as captain of volunteers and later went to the Philip-

piners and stayed there 2 years as a lieutenant—my experience with girls working at night, going to and from their places of business, is that it leads to loitering around the streets with their companions, and their parents are under the impression that they are at work. I could name several cases where girls have been led astray. I mentioned in my report recently, when I was called upon during the agitation of the curfew law, four different girls, to my personal knowledge, from having been allowed to loiter around the streets, who are now leading lives that are anything but proper.

Mr. ROUSE. Captain, did I understand you a moment ago to say that the girls that you have talked to regarding this bill were unanimously in favor of it, or did you say that they were in favor of the 8-hour principle?

Capt. ESTES. In favor of the 8-hour proposition.

Mr. ROUSE. Have you talked with many about this bill?

Capt. ESTES. Yes, sir; frequently. I am in the stores every day.

Mr. ROUSE. Have you visited any of these tailor shops where they have lady employees?

Capt. ESTES. I have not recently. Of course, I have another man with me.

Mr. ROUSE. I have reference to the time since the introduction of this bill?

Capt. ESTES. No, sir.

Mr. ROUSE. Have you questioned any of the employees of the laundries as to their opinion in regard to the bill?

Capt. ESTES. I have talked with a few. One or two of the Franklin people, the Manhattan, and the Elite.

Mr. ROUSE. Do they object to working overtime?

Capt. ESTES. I can not say that I spoke of that point, but I confined my conversation to the number of hours that they would like to have, and without exception they were all in favor of the 8-hour law.

Mr. ROUSE. But are they opposed to working overtime if they are paid for it?

Capt. ESTES. No, sir; the question of overtime was not spoken of. In my experience with laundries eight hours is rather a long day in the average laundry in the summer time, because it is intensely hot and in many cases ventilation is very poor.

Mr. ROUSE. Have you talked to any female employees in the printing establishments?

Capt. ESTES. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. ROUSE. The reason I asked you about those particular places is that we have had representatives of those classes of business before the committee.

Capt. ESTES. I can not recall having spoken to any female employees engaged in any of the printing establishments. We have one or two printing establishments here that employ boys.

Mr. ROUSE. Well, that does not have anything to do with this bill.

Capt. ESTES. No, sir.

Mr. ROUSE. The ones that you have talked to are employed in the department stores?

Capt. ESTES. Principally.

Mr. ROUSE. Have you talked to any of the restaurant people?

Capt. ESTES. Yes, sir; yesterday I spoke to a maid who waited on me in the Crown Restaurant and she was in favor of the bill. I was in the restaurant business myself once.

Mr. ROUSE. Was she in favor of the strict 8-hour proposition?

Capt. ESTES. She said, "Eight hours is long enough for me to work. I do not care to work any longer than that."

Mr. ROUSE. As to the question put to these ladies, is it just "Are you in favor of 8 hours?"

Capt. ESTES. No, sir; I frequently go in the Crown Restaurant, and I spoke to the young lady who waited on me about the bill being before the committee now, and said, "What are you in favor of, 8 hours, or would you like to work as you are now?" She said, "Eight hours is long enough for me to work."

Mr. ROUSE. It is long enough for most people to work. That has been the trend of the conversation: "Are you in favor of 8 hours?" And the answer has been universally, "I am"?

Capt. ESTES. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROUSE. You would not expect anything else?

Capt. ESTES. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROUSE. If you would ask them if they were in favor of 6 hours, they would say the same thing?

Capt. ESTES. I would not answer that. I know of some people here who are willing to give value received for their wages.

Mr. ROUSE. Captain, on your rounds from now on—after you have asked the first question and the second question, "Are you in favor of the 8-hour bill?" and then, "If you work overtime, a reasonable length of time, and are paid for that time"—ask them if they would be in favor of 54 or 60 hours a week, provided they would be paid for the extra time over 48.

Capt. ESTES. I will do that, sir.

Mr. MANNING. After this law became effective, the 8-hour law governing the employment of children or those under 16 years of age, what was the usual method or custom governing their employment in the department stores?

Capt. ESTES. Well, as to time?

Mr. MANNING. As to the method or arrangement governing their 8-hour employment?

Capt. ESTES. Well, they would regulate their time something like this: Some of the bundle wrappers would come on at 8 o'clock and others at half past 8, and they would give them a little longer time for lunch and allow them to quit earlier.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, they had some of the wrappers come on at 8 o'clock?

Capt. ESTES. Yes, sir. That is, during the season they opened at 8.

The CHAIRMAN. And others would come at 8.30, and they would both have a workday of 8 hours?

Capt. ESTES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the ones that came at 8.30 would stay a half hour longer?

Capt. ESTES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But both would work 8 hours?

Capt. ESTES. Yes, sir. The merchants here are not so rushed at that early hour as they are later on in the day, but it would about

equal up itself, and also just before closing, probably, the rush is not quite so heavy. They try to have the larger force on during the busiest hours of the day. In fact, I know that Mr. Garfinkle has absolutely nothing to do up until about 10 o'clock in the morning. I know that some of his girls do not get there until 9 o'clock, although they are required to get there at 8. My personal knowledge is that some of his girls do not get there until 9, and they frequently go off—probably get excused—a half hour earlier. That is, in a very few cases. I know that two of his girls did live in Baltimore, and he allowed them to come at 9 o'clock in the morning, and they never did work more than 8 hours a day.

Mr. MANNING. With the idea of showing, if this bill is favorably reported and becomes a law, that there would be no hardship, I would like to ask the Captain if in the enforcement of the 8-hour law for children he has met with any difficulty from the employers, and I refer especially to the department stores?

Capt. ESTES. No, sir. The only complaint is as to the arrangement that I had spoken of, the arrangement of the hours, and some of the clerks did not like the idea because they were giving the advantage to the minors under 16; that is, some of the bundle wrappers over 16 entered a mild protest against it.

Mr. MANNING. There has been practically no opposition?

Capt. ESTES. No, sir; I have met with practically no opposition in enforcing the child-labor law. The merchants seem to be in favor of it, as a rule.

Mr. HEBBARD. You laid particular stress upon Mr. Garfinkle and Woodward & Lothrop closing at 6 o'clock. Has Mr. Garfinkle ever paid any attention to the manufacturing department—alterations on millinery? I know of some cases where they have worked as late as 11 or 12 o'clock.

Capt. ESTES. Mr. Garfinkle has an alteration department. They sell a good many ladies' suits and in most cases they have to be altered, so I would judge he has paid attention to that particular part of the business.

Mr. HEBBARD. I asked you whether they ever worked overtime?

Capt. ESTES. I have never known of it; I do not say that they have never worked overtime, but I say that his closing time is half past 5 and they never work after 6 o'clock. I have frequently called up there at a later hour for Mr. Johnson, who is the manager, and no one is there but the janitor.

Mr. HEBBARD. Do you know anything about the tailoring business, about the seasons; about working overtime?

Capt. ESTES. Well, probably as every other man does, I know that there are busy seasons and dull seasons for every branch of business and I presume they have theirs.

Mr. HEBBARD. That is the only branch I am interested in myself, the tailoring and the overtime. I said yesterday that if they decide on an 8-hour law I would rather have a 9-hour law, and I would rather have the privilege of overtime work to meet the extra rush work. I would like to have some investigation of the tailoring establishments here. The stores can easily overcome the rush, but we would like to have the privilege of meeting this rush in the same manner.

Capt. ESTES. I might do that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We are anxious to conclude these hearings as soon as possible and so far as the committee is concerned we shall not ask it.

Mr. HEBBARD. As secretary of the exchange I offer my services to investigate the tailoring shops, in any way.

Capt. ESTES. Of course, it is outside of my business, Mr. Chairman, but I could do it every day. I drop into tailoring shops to see whether they have persons under 16 years of age there, especially if I receive an anonymous communication saying that they have. Of course, we do not do that very frequently. Recently I had a communication of that kind and I investigated it and found that one of the boys in a messenger service was working from half past 5 to 8 o'clock at night. He was awfully behind in his studies and his teacher complained of it and a few days afterwards I received the anonymous complaint that he was working for a messenger company and I investigated it and found that it was true.

Mr. STERN. Did you have occasion to go into the steam laundries after sundown in the summer time?

Capt. ESTES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STERN. Do you think, Captain, during the heated season that it is injurious to the workers to work after sundown in the laundry?

Capt. ESTES. I could not give expert testimony, but from my view I should not care to do it. In fact, I would not care to work in a laundry at any time.

Mr. FARREN. Might I answer that question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FARREN. The laundries will admit that it is injurious in the summer time, but where is the steam laundry that works after sundown in summer time? The bill that we have asked for prohibits it. We have never worked after sundown in summer time. It is a very hot place in a laundry and we do not want to work after sundown.

Mr. SOWERS. I would like to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. SOWERS. You stated that you considered 8 hours a long period of work in the busy season. I want to ask whether, in your observation, you have not ascertained that the laundries, as a rule, do not work as long as 8 hours. Is it not a fact that they do not work 8 hours in the heated season?

Capt. ESTES. In my statement I said I considered 8 hours rather long for the laundries I visited.

Mr. SOWERS. In your conversation with laundry employees, did you learn that it is customary for laundrymen to omit as much work as possible during the extreme hot days, possibly only working 4 or 5 hours and making it up on cooler days? In other words, they adjust their work as much as possible to suit the weather and take advantage of conditions, having the privilege of working long hours some days and making it up on hot days out of compassion for their employees, allowing them to go home earlier on the hot days.

Capt. ESTES. I can not say that I have observed that condition. I can only say that my experience with laundries is that they are anxious to get their work out of the way as quickly as they can. When I want my laundry in a hurry they tell me, "We will get it out just as soon as possible." I do not know anything about the time

that they work, how long they work, or anything of that kind. My business is simply this: If they employ a minor under 16 years of age I go to the manager and say, "You have a boy or a girl employed here and the law says that you can not work them more than 8 hours a day and if you do we will have to proceed against you," and I will see that they do not work a minor under 16 years of age more than 8 hours a day.

Mr. SOWERS. Actually, you know very little about the length of hours?

Capt. ESTES. I know absolutely nothing about them, except as to minors. They may work 20 hours as far as I know. I am only concerned with the minors. I simply said that I considered 8 hours a long day.

Mr. SOWERS. In your duties and official capacity or otherwise, have you been in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing on summer nights and observed the conditions there?

Capt. ESTES. Yes; I have been there, but they have no minors under 16 years of age there. But I have been in the bureau at night.

Mr. SOWERS. You know that they work a double shift, even including the hot weather?

Capt. ESTES. Yes; I know that they work three shifts of 8 hours sometimes.

Mr. SOWERS. You know from observation that that is a very hot building down there?

Capt. ESTES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say for the information of the gentlemen present and for the record that there are some of the members of the committee that know of those things also, and are perfectly willing to add to the record that it is one of the worst sweatshops that exists anywhere in the world. If it is of any benefit to the gentlemen who have been asking that line of questions, I will make that statement for the record. Anything further?

Capt. ESTES. No, sir. Thank you.

Mr. HOWARD. It might be well to let it go in the record in connection with what you stated, that the Government is spending quite a large sum of money on a building to relieve the conditions down there.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true. They are building a new building, trying to get away from the sweatshop conditions that exist in the present Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN B. COLPOYS, SECRETARY OF THE WASHINGTON CENTRAL LABOR UNION, 604 FIFTH STREET, NW., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. COLPOYS. Mr. Chairman, in appearing here to-day and advocating the passage of this bill I appear for the Washington Central Labor Union, as secretary of the union and also as a member of the legislative committee. The legislative committee first considered the La Follette bill, which is the same bill as the Peters bill, on which hearings are now being held, and the legislative committee reported to the Central Labor Union that the Central Labor Union should indorse and instruct the legislative committee to work for the passage of this particular bill, which seeks to give to the women

workers of the District an 8-hour law. I was somewhat interested in the hearings that were held before the Senate District Committee, and some of the arguments that were advanced there and also some of the arguments that have been advanced here against the passage of the bill. They are nothing new. They are the same old arguments that have been advanced in every State in the Union, especially before committees that have similar bills under consideration. The employer can not conform his business to meet the requirements of an 8-hour law, but it is strange that the employer can conform his business to meet the requirements that come up in every other line of his business with the exception of the labor end. In almost every business of late there have been increases in the cost of material, yet the employer can meet those increases and carry on his business, but as he treats labor as a commodity, he can not conform his business to what the labor movement considers a sufficient length of time for anybody to work.

It has been the aim of the labor movement to establish a universal 8-hour law, because we believe that better results will come to both the employer and employee from an 8-hour work day. Some years ago, when it was usual for men and women both to work a 10-hour day, through organization—that is, through organized labor—we established first a 9-hour day. At that time the employers made the same statements that were made here to-day, that it would be impossible to do the work on a 9-hour basis, and yet they found that the men do as much work and in most cases better work in a 9-hour day than in a 10-hour day. It has been demonstrated in the building trade especially that the men employed under an 8-hour day have done better and more work under the 8-hour day than they did under the 9-hour day or the 10-hour day, and some years back, before my time, under the 12-hour day. So that if this bill was passed I fail to see how it can work a hardship on anybody. I believe that since we are situated in Washington as we are, deprived of the right that is given to every other citizen in every other section of the country, the right to participate in his own government, since Congress is responsible for the passage of laws affecting the interests of the citizens of this District, I believe that it is their duty to enact what some of the people who opposed this bill called a "model" bill. They all admit, even in their opposition, that it is a model bill, and they do not want to be made the goat. In other words, they realize that the bill will bring about model conditions, and they oppose it. Now, if the bill should bring about model conditions, it is the duty of Congress to enact it. It is not only the effect that it will have upon the women with regard to the District, but throughout the country, having this very question under consideration, and if Congress enacts such a law, it will be a model for other States to follow, and the effect that it will have will not be only on the other States, but it will affect the whole world.

We boast that we are a great, free, untrammled country, one of the richest in the world, and we ought also to have conditions commensurate with those boasts. I have been very much interested in the people who have opposed this bill. I might call the attention of the committee to the fact that the largest employers of labor in the District—women workers—have not appeared either before

this committee or the Senate committee in opposition to this bill. Those that employ practically 75 per cent of the women in the District have not appeared in opposition to the bill because they would be only too pleased to know that such a bill if passed would place their competitors on the same footing as themselves. We know that those of us in the District who have fought for what is known as the early-closing period, especially during the summer months, did not get it without somewhat of a struggle. We had to fight for it, and yet one of the employers, from one of the smaller department stores, who appeared in opposition to the bill, was very emphatic in his statements before the Senate committee as to the conditions of the employees in his establishment, and he is one of those who has been a thorn in the side of the early-closing stores. I refer to the department store of Mr. King, known as the "King's Palace." He keeps a department store on Seventh Street, right next to another establishment. The other one, during the summer months, closes at 6 o'clock. Mr. King could not see the necessity for early closing during the summer months, and he keeps open until 9 o'clock, just the same as he does during the balance of the year, although his testimony before the Senate committee and his actions toward his help are diametrically opposite the one to the other.

The CHAIRMAN. What time does King's establishment open?

Mr. COLPOYS. Eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The same time as the other?

Mr. COLPOYS. Yes; I may say this: All of the department stores in the District of Columbia open at 8 o'clock nine months in the year. Perhaps three months in the year they open at 8.30, owing to the fact that they work their employees 70 or 72 hours during the holidays, and they give them that half hour off because of the vast amount of hours that they work during the rush season.

Mr. HOWARD. Do you know whether they receive any extra compensation during the Christmas rush?

Mr. COLPOYS. I have never heard of their receiving any extra compensation. In fact, from investigations that I have made, personally, I do not think they do.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, in his department store?

Mr. COLPOYS. No, sir; they are never paid for extra time. I have never known of any department store where they received extra pay for anything, but on the other hand, they are docked for being under time.

Mr. HOWARD. They have the time-clock system in the department stores where every clerk has to ring the clock?

Mr. COLPOYS. Why, I think, they have got perhaps a stricter system than a time-clock system.

Mr. HOWARD. But they have got a system?

Mr. COLPOYS. Oh, yes; they have what they call a time clerk, who sits at a desk and as they come in they report. They go by numbers.

Mr. HOWARD. Now, what penalty is attached to failure to be promptly on time in the majority of the stores?

Mr. COLPOYS. There are different penalties, as I understand.

Mr. HOWARD. But is the general system of docking in vogue in the District?

Mr. COLPOYS. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. For failure to report?

Mr. COLPOYS. Yes; I know in one store they allow for five minutes leeway, and they dock for over five minutes. If they were to come in six minutes late they would be docked six minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. You know the great railroad systems allow five minutes for variation of watches for waiting time for trains moving in opposite directions?

Mr. COLPOYS. Yes, sir; I have had some experience myself in department-store work. I worked in a department store for about four months. I took charge of a department in a department store, and I may say that my sympathies at that time were awakened more strongly to the conditions under which these poor girls had to work than at any time before, because it came under my observation.

If you gentlemen of the committee only had the time to make a round of the various stores and just look at the help, and if you find in any of the stores even 20 per cent of what I might call healthy and robust employees, it will be a surprise to me. Most of the girls working in the department stores you will find to be, at least in most cases, emaciated looking. But my experience has been this: I have known several of them who have worked in department stores and just as soon as they reach what I consider to be the height of the ambition of every young lady—that is, to enter the matrimonial state—after they had entered it for about six months, I think, they commence to fill out and look healthy and robust. That is true not only of this city, but perhaps of every city. The close confinement that they have to put up with naturally affects their health. Now, in the department store in which I worked—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Does that mean simply an effect upon the complexion because of being away from the sunlight, or an effect upon their muscular—it affects their physical condition generally?

Mr. COLPOYS. Oh, it affects their physical condition, generally.

Mr. HOWARD. What do you attribute that to?

Mr. COLPOYS. To the confinement for one thing, to the air that they breathe and the conditions under which they must work.

Mr. HOWARD. Assuming a standing position all day?

Mr. COLPOYS. Yes; on their feet all day. In the department store in which I worked I really do not know how the girls lived that worked on the first floor, because on the first floor the only possible way of any fresh air coming in was through some transoms that were over the windows, the east windows, and the front door. In the back of the establishment they had a shoe department that extended across the whole back of the store, and at the other end of the room they had a small balcony built where they had their grocery department, right up next the windows, so that there was no possible chance for the air to circulate as much as it ought to, to provide people with pure air.

Mr. HOWARD. How many department stores in Washington have their goods and wares in the basement—what they call the basement—below the sidewalk?

Mr. COLPOYS. Why, almost all of them. There may be some few that have not, but most of them have some rooms in the basement. There is no opposition from those people to this particular bill, because they realize it is a just bill, and because they could not come before this committee and offer any argument as to why the bill should not be enacted. They are all increasing the capacity of their

stores by making additions to them, so they are prospering—they must be—or they could not build those additions, and consequently they ought to be willing to share some of their prosperity with their employees. Now, I was interested somewhat in a statement made by one of the gentlemen who addressed you this morning, Mr. Roberts. He said that sometimes when they need extra help if he needed four girls perhaps 20 would apply for the places.

The CHAIRMAN. He was referring to overtime. He said that frequently they would require a small number to work overtime and a great many more would volunteer for that work than they needed. That was the statement of Mr. Roberts, as I understood it. I want to have that statement appear in the record so that your statement might be based upon facts.

Mr. COLPOYS. Well, of course I realize, as everybody who makes a superficial study of labor conditions must, that wages are regulated through supply and demand. I know that the supply in the District of Columbia far exceeds at the present time the demand, so that if the hours of the labor of these women employees were to be reduced one hour per day it would mean, in order for them to do the same amount of business as is being done to-day, provided it is necessary to work them 9 hours, it would mean that more of the people would have an opportunity to work. And that is something that should be taken into consideration, because I believe that society owes to those who need work that they should furnish it.

The CHAIRMAN. Your position is that the reduction of the number of hours, say, from 10 to 8, would mean an increase of 20 per cent in the number that would be employed, and that in itself would reduce the comparative supply of women workers, instead of acting as reducing force in their wages it would act as an advancing force in their wages?

Mr. COLPOYS. We have found it to be a fact in the labor movement that wherever the hours of labor have been reduced a corresponding increase in wages has been obtained, but I do not believe there would be 20 per cent more placed at work because of the reduction from 10 to 8 hours, but I think they would perhaps need 10 per cent more. I think at times they do not really need all that they employ, but they have to keep them for the protection of their business.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think they would be able to perform just the amount per hour in 8 hours as they would in 10? You believe they would be able to perform more work per hour in 8 hours than they would in 10?

Mr. COLPOYS. Yes; they would give better service in 8 hours than in 10.

Mr. HEBBARD. He has been talking about the department stores. We admit that there has been quite a little evidence in regard to the opposition of the department stores, but most of it has been from the manufacturing industries here, and I would like to have something on that. I would like to know if he will not agree to overtime privileges. That is all we have asked practically, in all of these hearings, and we might just as well get down to the facts of this.

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to ask there in regard to the latter part of section 3 of this bill, what is your opinion as to the effect

upon the closing time of all stores who have a majority of female help employed? Department stores that have 20 per cent of women employed. Would this, in your opinion, force the stores, and all stores in the city, to close at 6 o'clock at all seasons of the year?

Mr. COLPOYS. No; I do not think so.

Mr. HOWARD. I just wanted to get your opinion as to the effect of it. It has been urged here, I understand.

Mr. COLPOYS. I think that if the bill were to be enacted the department stores in complying with it would close their places of business at 6 o'clock, in conformity to this particular section of the bill, but if they wanted to keep open, as they do now, until 9 o'clock, they could regulate that, because the female would be employed to work 8 hours only. The only thing would be that they could not employ any under 18 years of age over that time, but in so far as the time of opening and closing is concerned, I might answer that in this way: My wife used to go down town Saturday night and do some shopping, and it was forcibly called to my attention when I had to work in the department store for three months that the extra three hours Saturday night was worse than almost the balance of the week. From working those three hours additional there at that time, I decided that I would talk with her and convince her that she should not do any shopping on Saturday night. Naturally a woman thinks she ought to have the prerogative to do as she likes, and I let her do it, but I convinced her that it was wrong to go down there Saturday night. I said to her, "Why don't you go down on Sunday?" "Why," she says, "the stores are closed on Sunday." "Then," I said, "if the stores closed at 6 o'clock, you would arrange to do your shopping before 6 o'clock, wouldn't you?" "Yes," she said. And so would everybody else.

Another argument I heard as to the reason why they have got to work these long hours in Washington is to accommodate the Government employees. Now, think of it. If that would be one of the reasons why they have to work these hours, I would be one of the ones to come up and teach the Government employees a lesson by asking that a bill be introduced that takes away their 30 days annual leave, a privilege they have, which is not enjoyed by any other class of people that has to work for a living. In every other city in the country very few people that work get 30 days annual leave, and allowed to take it as they will, scatter it through the year, and I do not believe that argument should be held as a forcible argument as to why this bill should not be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. In the great bulk of the cities of the United States the employees are not Government employees; they are employees of private establishments; they usually work anywhere from 8 to 10 hours per day, and many of them work the 10 hours, and the shopping establishments close at approximately the same hours as they close in this city. Would it not be just as difficult for the family of a man who is working 10 hours in those cities to do their shopping as it would be for the families of those who are working 8 hours to do their shopping here, if the stores were permitted to keep open only 8 hours?

Mr. COLPOYS. I think perhaps it would be more difficult because, as I say, most of the employees in the District of Columbia are Government employees. They comprise the great bulk of the people

here outside of the employees of these shops. They have 30 days' leave on their hands that they can use a day or half a day, or an hour, or even half an hour, so that without any loss of wages they could do their shopping, and the poor people that work in these stores if they want to do their shopping they have to lose half a day's pay. The Government employee is paid by the Government while going to do his shopping, providing he wants to use his leave in that way.

Now, Mr. Hebbard speaks about the tailoring business. Of course I know that there are certain businesses that have certain seasons and I know that it requires in these businesses overtime work. I am not prepared to say how it should be regulated to conform to the needs of this particular business, but I do know from my experience in the business world that during the year there are some businesses, as I said, that require overtime work. As far as the laundries are concerned I fail to see where at any time during the year an emergency arises whereby they should be allowed to work their employees more than 8 hours a day. I believe they can so conform their business that it would not be necessary for them to have to work their employees more than 8 hours a day. I know from my experience in the labor movement, having had reports from the international office of the laundry workers' union out through the West, where they had established an 8-hour day, and the wages paid by the employers in the various laundries throughout the West is almost double what it is in the District of Columbia.

They have more men employed at short hours than they do here, and the prices are practically the same as they are in the District of Columbia. But the great trouble—one of the troubles in the District of Columbia, so far as business is concerned, is this: That there are too many in business trying to make a living off the sweat and blood of their employees, so that if this law was to work a hardship by putting any of them out of business perhaps it might be a benefit to those who are in business with sufficient and legitimate capital that they should receive a return from that capital to enable them to exist. As I say, however, there are some of the various manufacturing concerns in the District that really at times need to work overtime in order for them to get out their work. I know that they do in the tailoring industry especially, where they have but two seasons; they have a spring and a fall season in their business, and there are some businesses in which those that work have but one season that is considered a good season; so that I am not prepared to say as to how the bill should be amended to conform to the needs of their particular business. I do not know that there is anything more that I can add, only, I might say, from no other reason than from a humanitarian point of view, this bill should be passed to protect the women who are to become, as I have said, in their proper sphere, the mothers of the future citizens of our country.

Mr. SMITH. Would you have the law apply to domestics?

Mr. COLPOYS. Would I have it apply to domestics?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. COLPOYS. Yes; I would have it apply to domestics.

The CHAIRMAN. You just testified that you found in the District of Columbia some trades in which the emergencies of the work would

require employment of people for overtime. Would you consider the emergencies existing in domestic service necessary for the employment of overtime?

Mr. COLPOYS. Oh, there are times, I presume, that there would be necessity for them to work overtime. For instance, by domestic service I believe you mean the female employed in family service?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. COLPOYS. Yes; I believe there would be times that would require overtime on the part of those employees, perhaps in the case of receptions and things of that kind, but they do not give those every day, and it is only once in a while that that occasion would arise. I should consider, however, that there are cases. I think that the domestic is just as much entitled to the consideration of the laws governing their employment as anybody else that works for a living.

The CHAIRMAN. How would you arrange it in the family that needs the help of only one domestic and is not in a position to afford more than one. How would you arrange to limit the hours of that one domestic to 8?

Mr. COLPOYS. There are too many families that are not able to have more than one domestic that I would say that the family that is able to employ only one domestic should do part of the work just like those that are not able to employ any.

Mr. SOWERS. You stated that you saw no reason at any season in the year why the laundries should desire to work over 8 hours a day. May I ask if you ever engaged in the laundry business?

Mr. COLPOYS. No; never.

Mr. SOWERS. Did you ever work in a laundry?

Mr. COLPOYS. No; never.

Mr. SOWERS. Naturally you would see no reason for working overtime?

Mr. COLPOYS. Not naturally. As I say, I have read the reports coming from the organization which has investigated the working conditions of the people employed in this business.

Mr. SOWERS. I want to ask one more question. You made a statement a little while ago that the employers, the largest establishments, were not represented here, in fact, that only a few of the smaller ones were represented here opposed to this bill. I want to state in answer to that that the employers were here, with very few exceptions, of some of the largest establishments. Some of them did not have a chance to be heard, and it was understood that the evidence coming from all of them would be too voluminous and take up too much of the time of the committee, and in lieu of that, the civic bodies of the city have unanimously gone on record as opposing this bill. That includes the proprietors of the largest establishments in the city.

Mr. COLPOYS. That is nothing new.

Mr. SOWERS. You stated that they had not come before the committee in opposition to this bill.

Mr. COLPOYS. They have not. I don't believe there has been a representative of Woodward & Lothrop's here. I do not believe there has been a representative of the Palais Royal here. I do not believe there has been a representative of S. Kann's Sons here.

Mr. SOWERS. Yes; Kann's are represented here, and Goldenberg's are here, and I can say that the other department stores you mention

were present at a meeting of the Retail Merchants' Association at which time this resolution was adopted.

Mr. COLPOYS. From what I understand, from a gentleman who made an investigation of it, most of the department stores did not oppose this bill. This man made an investigation for himself by calling up the firms. He made inquiry from them as to the hours of labor that they worked at the present time, and he did not come across one that told him they were opposed to this bill.

Mr. SOWERS. Notwithstanding the fact that they have come here in person and stated that they were opposed to it?

Mr. COLPOYS. Perhaps there may have been some that came here without authority from the heads of their concerns.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that line of discussion is absolutely unnecessary, because the records themselves will show who appeared here and who did not appear here and whom they represented.

Mr. FARREN. The laundry workers come to work on Monday morning at 10 o'clock, or 10.30, and work until 6 on Monday, and then for four days in the week they work 10 hours a day; they are dismissed, we will assume, at 2 o'clock on Saturdays. That applies to the busiest season only. In the warm summer months, of course, there would be comparatively fewer hours. Assuming that that is so, under this bill they would come to work at 8 o'clock Monday morning and work eight hours a day until 5 o'clock Saturday night. Which would you consider preferable, from the standpoint of the girls, that they should work from 8 to 5 every day, or that they should work a little longer on four days and have that extra time off?

Mr. COLPOYS. From 8 to 5.

Mr. FARREN. Each day?

Mr. COLPOYS. Yes. That has been proven to be the best arrangement, not only from my standpoint, but from the medical standpoint.

Mr. FARREN. You understand that they are paid full time for this short term?

Mr. COLPOYS. Yes; I understand that. You do not pay them any more than what they themselves could demand. You are not in business from philanthropic motives.

Mr. FARREN. Competition among laundries for help in the city is pretty keen, and if we have a girl that is really a good girl, some of my competitors will offer her a dollar or a dollar and 50 cents more, and we will have to give her more to keep her. This does not apply, of course, to the operators of the mangles, as they are comparatively plentiful.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not seem very evident, based upon the evidence rendered to this committee, that there have been a great many bids of a dollar or a dollar and a half to get help from your establishment, because it is shown here that the wages range from \$3 to \$10 per week. There could not be very many bids of \$2 on that basis.

Mr. FARREN. The wages range from \$4 to \$10. The average wage, I think, is \$5.50.

Mr. COLPOYS. Is it not a fact that in most laundries those that are employed, after they go home they have to work after they get home?

Mr. FARREN. I do not know. I have some girls that stay home all day Mondays to do their home work. They always have Satur-

day afternoon all the year around, and in the summer time, the hot months, we call them off anywhere from 4 to 5 o'clock.

Mr. COLPOYS. If you had an 8-hour day you would be in the same position as your competitor; he would have nothing on you in that regard.

Mr. FARREN. The 8-hour day might be all right, but not the 48-hour week. We do not have any work from Saturday to Monday morning, and they are naturally idle for that particular time, and we must complete our work within the week. Every housewife demands that, and with 48 hours a week you could not do it. Fifty-four hours a week and not more than 10 hours in any one day provides for all overtime.

Mr. COLPOYS. You might just as well not have the bill as to have that, because the bill, as I understand it, is to help the physical condition of the female employee, and if they are allowed to work 54 hours and work 15 hours a day it is not going to help them at all.

Mr. FARREN. I said not more than 10 hours in any one day—not 15 hours a day.

Mr. COLPOYS. Eight hours per day would be better for all hands concerned; better for the laundries and certainly better for the employees.

Mr. FARREN. It may work out that way; I hope it will.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE F. PAGE, REPRESENTING PAGE'S LAUNDRY, 620 E STREET NW.

Mr. PAGE. May I say a few words, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. A very few words. We are anxious to get these hearings closed.

Mr. PAGE. My name is George F. Page, and I am one of the proprietors of Page's Laundry, 620 E Street NW. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Constitution of the United States provides that there can be no law abridging the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

At whose instance was the bill now being considered by this honorable committee drawn; was it drawn after the receipt of personal request or petitions from those whom the bill is supposed to benefit?

If such requests have been made or petitions filed, then we who stand for a betterment of the conditions of the women wage earners employed by the business men and women of the District of Columbia have never been so informed.

I have heard the arguments of the advocates of this and a similar bill before the honorable Senate Committee of the District of Columbia, and with two or three exceptions such advocates are not residents of this city but are from cities far from ours, and they can not be closely in touch with conditions here.

In Washington we have what you might call a busy and slack season, the busy season commencing early in October and continuing usually until June or until the adjournment of Congress. Then with the exit of the Members of the House and Senate and their employees, the 30 days' annual leave of the Government department employees, and the migration of the wealthy class, business of a necessity drops to a low ebb; then the hours of labor in stores, shops,

and factories can well be cut down to an 8-hour basis or lower for the dull period.

From October 1, to, say, May 31 the laundry business, in which I am a proprietor, could not without a large outlay for additional machinery or by the working of additional help turn out the work in less than what we now have, i. e., a 10-hour day. With the pending bill a law, a hardship would be imposed upon these women, as we certainly could not pay the same wages for an 8-hour day as we do for a 10-hour day.

Our help have never complained of present conditions as to hours or wages. We employ in our establishment 62 women, white and colored. The wages paid runs from \$4.50 for inexperienced help, such as shakers, to \$20 per week for office force.

Mr. PAGE. Now, I do not believe that I have heard a single argument here in favor of the passage of this bill except from people who are paid ostensibly by some organization well clothed and are growing fat off the earnings of the poor working people. And they say they want this law passed as an example, so that they may have such laws in the States, but why should they try to make the business men of Washington the goats in this case?

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand, Mr. Page, from the preliminary statement, that you question the rights of Members of Congress to introduce legislation unless they have been personally importuned to do so?

Mr. PAGE. No; I only say they are—well, I will give you that again. It is the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. It is your language following the quotation from the Constitution that I had reference to, the language immediately following that.

Mr. PAGE. I say, at whose instance was the bill now being considered by this honorable committee drawn? Was it drawn after the receipt of personal request or petitions from those whom the bill is supposed to help? Is that what you referred to?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the language; and I wanted to know whether you questioned the right of Members of Congress to pass such a law?

Mr. PAGE. No; not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. To introduce legislation, even though there may be no petition from anyone for it?

Mr. PAGE. No; I do not question the right; I only asked the question. I have never heard it said that there were any petitions for this legislation, and I suppose that our help do not ask for it. No; I was not questioning the right; certainly not.

Mr. HOWARD. You do not question, Mr. Page, the right of Congress to make extravagant appropriations to help you all here in the building up of your city, do you?

Mr. PAGE. Not for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. They invariably petition us—at least they have practically the unanimous consent of the people of the District of Columbia to proceed with those appropriations.

Mr. PAGE. The point I wanted to bring out was that there has been no movement from our working women in Washington that I have heard of for the passage of this law. I realize that sometimes

bills are introduced and passed without action taken on the part of the people to be benefited, but why this bill has been advocated and pushed forward here by outsiders I can not understand.

Mr. SMITH. Are there no representatives of labor up here discussing this bill in their interests?

Mr. PAGE. For those that this bill is intended to cover?

Mr. SMITH. In whose interest do you think the bill is introduced?

Mr. PAGE. The bill is introduced in the interest of working women, but it is advocated by outsiders; and they admit, themselves, that if they can get a model law here it will help them to get such a law outside in the States.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the records show, Mr. Page, that both people from abroad and people from the city representing the wage earners have appeared in behalf of this bill. Others have appeared in opposition to it.

BRIEF OF JOSEPH I. WELLER, ATTORNEY AT LAW.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 6, 1913.

To the COMMITTEE ON LABOR,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I wish to express my appreciation to the committee for the privilege afforded me of filing with you a short brief on House bill No. 27281. In doing so I feel I am not only representing the local merchants, but am also benefiting their female employees.

I have looked into the question with considerable care and am confident that the female employees of offices and retail stores are not asking for a limitation of eight hours. They are content with their present length of service. Their duties are not arduous or continuous, and I respectfully submit that all the employments enumerated in the bill should not be grouped so that the limitation of eight hours applies to all. A female employee working in an office or a store should not be placed in the same category as one working in a laundry or manufacturing establishment; their work is dissimilar and their hours of labor should be different.

The amendment I desire to suggest for your kind consideration is the following:

Strike out article 1 of the bill and substitute in place thereof—

“That no female shall be employed or permitted to work in any mill, factory, manufacturing or mechanical establishment, including among others any laundry, bakery, printing establishment, hotel, restaurant, or any express or transportation company, or in the transmission or distribution of telegraph or telephone messages more than eight hours in any one day or more than six days or more than forty-eight hours in any one week, and that no female shall be employed or permitted to work in any clothing, dressmaking, or millinery establishment, store, office, or where goods are sold or distributed more than ten hours in any one day or more than six days or more than sixty hours in any one week.”

Also to amend the various sections of the bill where it conflicts with the suggestions above.

I would also suggest that there should be an addition to the bill to the effect: “That this act shall take effect and be in force three months after its passage.”

(1) FEMALE EMPLOYEES IN OFFICES.

Many female clerks and stenographers working for real estate agents, lawyers, physicians, or other offices, will be deprived of their positions if the eight hour limitation applies to them, as it would in numerous cases compel the employer to either dispense with the services of his female employees and employ a male clerk or stenographer, or at least the employer would be obliged to so arrange his affairs and office work so that his stenographer or clerk could leave the office at either 4 or 5 o'clock, depending on the time the clerk came in the morning, and as a result of such an arrangement it would become necessary in many

cases for him to employ an additional clerk or stenographer to complete the work after the eight-hour limitation, as in many instances the employer would be busy during the day and unable to attend to his correspondence or dictation until after the hour of 5 o'clock. Then, again, at the expiration of the 8 hours the clerk or stenographer leaving and the additional employee taking her place, would often cause a loss of business by reason of the absent employee being familiar with matter that the additional employee would not be acquainted with. The employer could ill afford to pay two salaries where now one is paid and there can be little doubt that by the limitation of 8 hours' employment, the compensation of the employee would be decreased in accordance therewith. The average female clerk or stenographer in an office is not worked constantly like the employee in a manufacturing plant or workshop, but at certain hours in the day, often after 5 o'clock, her services are required and while during the day she may have many hours of rest, yet it is absolutely necessary for her to be on hand to attend to matters as they arise even though such time should be beyond the 8-hour period. Very often female stenographers in offices are employed to take dictation at so much a folio, if this bill with its 8-hour limitation applies to her, it would not permit her to work beyond the limitation of 8 hours if she desired to do so. It certainly would prevent her from competing with male stenographers who would be permitted to work as long as they please.

(2) EMPLOYMENT IN RETAIL STORES.

Concerning employment of females in retail stores or establishments, if this 8-hour measure becomes a law it will be necessary for the employer either to open his store at 8 o'clock and close at 4, or open at 9 and close at 5, either of which would be a great loss to him in business and in profit, or to employ two shifts of employees and certainly this would result in a decrease in salary to his employees, as the employee performing the work for the few hours additional would not be satisfied to only make a salary for these few hours, and the merchant would not permit her to be employed in a similar establishment for obvious reasons, therefore he would be obliged to adjust the matter so as to have half of his female force work, we will say, from 8 to 4, and the other half work from 4 to 6, and then at the end of the week, or the following week, reverse the order, so it will be observed that the clerk now earning a full day's salary would by this arrangement, which would be necessary to enable the merchant to keep open 10 hours, result in the clerk receiving but half the amount she now receives. When you consider the present high cost of living it will be observed how disastrous this would be for the female employee and it would also be harmful to the merchant if he would be obliged to pay the two employees that would be required to perform the work now being performed by one twice the amount of salary he is now paying and it would lessen his profit and compel him to increase his prices, the latter would only result in a higher cost of living and he would soon lose his patronage by reason thereof. There is no necessity for an 8-hour law as applied to stores. Ten hours' service is not unreasonable, the employee has ample time for lunch and when not engaged is permitted to rest—chairs or stools being provided for this purpose—and it certainly seems a fair proposition to ask that stores be exempt from the operation of an 8-hour limitation when the merchants are willing to comply with a 10-hour limitation.

The committee, I feel sure, will look at this question not from a theoretical standpoint of enthusiasts who are not familiar with local or mercantile conditions, but will consider the question from the viewpoint of the merchant and his employee, neither of whom desire an 8-hour limitation. If the local merchant, and more especially the small merchant employing but a few female employees, is required by law to limit the service of his female employee to 8 hours, it will unquestionably force many of them out of business or into insolvency, as the small profit now made by these smaller stores will not admit of any additional expense, and they can not raise the prices of merchandise, for they are in competition with the larger stores.

Considering the question from the viewpoint of the public there is a necessity for at least a 10-hour opening of retail stores and establishments in this city which does not prevail in other cities. The manufacturing departments of the Government located here, such as the navy yard, Printing Office, and Bureau of Engraving and Printing, require their employees to report at an earlier hour, and many of the Government departments close at 4.30. You will observe that this would give the clerks very little shopping time if the stores, to observe the

8-hour law, would close at 5 o'clock, and would entirely cut them off from shopping if the stores opened at 8 o'clock and closed at 4. The local merchants depend very largely upon the patronage of Government employees, and to limit the time to such a short space would result in great loss to the merchant. There can be no question that the 8-hour limitation would seriously affect the stores of Washington—the large stores as well as the smaller stores—but would more materially affect the smaller merchant, and it hardly seems fair that we should have such a law here when no State in the Union has an 8-hour limitation applying to offices and stores. Wages, or compensation for services, are governed by the law of supply and demand, and the laws of Congress should protect the female clerk so as to permit her to successfully compete with the male clerk. It was many years before women could occupy positions in mercantile establishments theretofore occupied by men, and now when they are employed in such positions the 8-hour limitation, if enacted under the law, would relegate them to the position of being worth less to their employer by reason of not being able to serve as long as the male clerk. The merchant is willing and anxious to employ female help, but he can only afford to do so if he can obtain from them services as satisfactory as he can obtain from his male employee, and it can not be disputed that if you reduce the hours of employment of a female clerk you certainly reduce her earning capacity, whether the merchant closes his store at the expiration of the 8-hour limitation or he employs additional clerks to enable him to keep open until 6 o'clock, as he desires to do, and it is absolutely necessary that he do so to enable him to sell his merchandise and exist. This especially applies to a merchant doing a moderate business.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendment presented is reasonable and fair and fully protects the female employee, while to include such a female employee in the 8-hour limitation would result to her financial loss.

Very respectfully,

JOSEPH I. WELLER.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, January 27, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WILSON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: In reply to your letter of January 24, I send you herewith a copy of the press notice recently issued by this bureau on the occupations of the gainfully employed females 16 years of age and over in the District of Columbia, 1910.

Very respectfully,

E. DANA DURAND, *Director.*

OCCUPATIONS OF THE GAINFULLY EMPLOYED FEMALES 16 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER
IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 1910.

PRELIMINARY THIRTEENTH CENSUS STATISTICS ISSUED BY THE CENSUS BUREAU.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December —, 1912.

On April 15, 1910, there were in the District of Columbia 52,488 women 16 years of age and over who were gainfully employed. These figures are contained in a statement issued to-day by Director Durand, of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce and Labor. The statistics were prepared under the direction of William C. Hunt, chief statistician for population in the Bureau of the Census, and are subject to revision. While the figures are preliminary, it is believed that there will be no important changes in them. It is probable, however, that the form in which they are here given will differ slightly from that in which they will be presented in the forthcoming report on occupations.

The figures given in this preliminary statement refer only to the gainfully employed women 16 years of age and over; but provisional figures tabulated by the Bureau of the Census show that there were also 7 girls 6 to 9 years of age and 432 girls 10 to 15 years of age, making a total of 52,927 females gainfully

employed in the District of Columbia on April 15, 1910. This is 30.6 per cent of all the females of the District on that date, or 36 per cent of the females 10 years of age and over.

Of the gainfully employed women 16 years of age and over, 13.7 per cent were from 16 to 20 years of age, 64.9 per cent were from 21 to 44 years of age, and 21.4 per cent were 45 years of age and over. The table shows that but few of the women were engaged in agricultural pursuits, and that outside of the needle trades—dressmakers, milliners, seamstresses, and tailoresses—no manufacturing pursuit gave employment to a large number of them. The only pursuits in transportation in which women were numerically important were telegraph operators and telephone operators. In trade, clerks in stores, saleswomen, and wholesale and retail dealers constituted more than nine-tenths of all the women workers in that group. Only a small number of women were engaged in the occupations classified under public service, the clerks in the Government departments being classified elsewhere. Outside of the artists, the musicians, the teachers, and the trained nurses, no occupation in professional service was represented by a large number of women. Here, however, the occupations assume importance because of the intellectual attainments of the persons pursuing them rather than because of the number of these persons. It is significant that women were so well represented in so many of the leading professions. But it is in the pursuits grouped under domestic and personal service that we find more than one-half of all the women workers. This is due largely to the fact that fully half of the gainfully employed women of the District of Columbia were colored, and that five out of six of these colored women were engaged in the pursuits here classified under domestic and personal service. Strictly clerical occupations gave employment to 8,328 women—to almost one woman worker in six—including the more than 5,000 women clerks and stenographers in the Government departments.

Occupations of the gainfully employed females 16 years of age and over in the District of Columbia, 1910.

Age periods:

16 years and over.....	52,488
16-20 years, inclusive.....	7,177
21-44 years, inclusive.....	34,064
45 years and over.....	11,247

Occupations:

Agricultural pursuits—

1. Farmers and dairy farmers.....	12
2. Farm and dairy farm laborers.....	12
3. Gardeners.....	8
4. Garden and greenhouse laborers.....	10

Manufacturing and mechanical pursuits—

5. Apprentices.....	108
6. Bakers.....	19
7. Builders and building contractors.....	5
8. Clothing cutters.....	9
9. Compositors, linotypers, printers, and typesetters.....	162
10. Dressmakers.....	3,251
11. Engravers.....	8
12. Foremen and overseers.....	35
13. Inspectors.....	64
14. Laborers (not otherwise reported).....	216
15. Managers and superintendents.....	15
16. Manufacturers and officials.....	29
17. Milliners.....	522
18. Pressmen (printing).....	63
19. Seamstresses (not in factories).....	936
20. Semiskilled occupations (not otherwise reported).....	1,209
21. Sewers and sewing-machine operators (factory).....	87
22. Shoemakers and cobblers (not in factory).....	4
23. Skilled occupations (not otherwise reported).....	15
24. Tailoresses.....	262
25. Upholsterers.....	3

Occupations—Continued.

Transportation—

26. Foremen and overseers	6
27. Laborers	51
28. Managers and superintendents	3
29. Postmasters	3
30. Owners and proprietors	9
31. Telegraph operators	70
32. Telephone operators	436
33. Other occupations	22

Trade—

34. Brokers and money lenders	4
35. Bundle and cash girls	39
36. Clerks in stores	1,029
37. Demonstrators	25
38. Employment-office keepers	4
39. Floorwalkers, foremen, and overseers	16
40. Insurance agents	10
41. Laborers in trade	34
42. Officials and superintendents of other trade companies	3
43. Real estate officials and agents	17
44. Sales agents and commercial travelers	15
45. Saleswomen	1,440
46. Undertakers	5
47. Wholesale and retail dealers	610
48. Other occupations (semiskilled)	8

Public service—

49. Appraisers, inspectors, gaugers, and weighers	59
50. City and county officials	11
51. Federal officials	6
52. Laborers (public service)	170
53. Probation officers, guards, and watchmen	10
54. Other occupations (semiskilled)	31

Professional service—

55. Actors and showmen	34
56. Architects, designers, and draftsmen	60
57. Artists, sculptors, and teachers of art	159
58. Authors, editors, and journalists	88
59. Chemists, assayers, and metallurgists	8
60. Clergymen	8
61. College presidents and professors	56
62. Dentists	12
63. Lawyers	21
64. Librarians	24
65. Musicians and teachers of music	447
66. Photographers	25
67. Physicians and surgeons	77
68. Reporters	28
69. Secretaries of schools and colleges	13
70. Teachers	2,239
71. Trained nurses	802
72. Other literary persons	39
73. Other scientific persons	24

Semiprofessional pursuits—

74. Abstractors and notaries public	12
75. Fortune tellers, hypnotists, spiritualists, etc.	17
76. Healers (other than physicians and surgeons)	48
77. Officials of lodges, societies, etc.	26
78. Religious and charity workers	83

Attendants and helpers in professional service—

79. Doctors' and dentists' assistants and attendants	20
80. Librarians' assistants	108
81. Laborers connected with professional service	4

¹ Some of the women returned as "clerks" probably are saleswomen.

Occupations—Continued.

Domestic and personal service—

82. Barbers and hairdressers.....	261
83. Boarding and lodging housekeepers.....	914
84. Cleaners and renovators (carpets, clothing, etc.).....	33
85. Cooks.....	3, 925
86. Hotel keepers and managers.....	23
87. Housekeepers and stewards.....	636
88. Janitors and sextons.....	114
89. Laborers connected with domestic and personal service.....	12
90. Laundresses (not in laundries).....	7, 909
91. Laundry operatives.....	¹ 712
92. Messengers, errand, and office girls.....	43
93. Midwives.....	33
94. Nurses (not trained).....	946
95. Restaurant, café, and lunch-room keepers.....	158
96. Saloon keepers and bartenders.....	22
Servants and waiters—	
97. Chambermaids.....	504
98. Charwomen, cleaners, and sweepers.....	721
99. Personal servants, ladies' maids, nurse girls, etc.....	234
100. Other servants.....	10, 452
101. Waiters.....	674
Other pursuits in domestic and personal service—	
102. Bathhouse keepers and attendants.....	15
103. Guides.....	10
104. Keepers of benevolent, charitable, and penal institutions.....	19
105. Manicurists.....	59
106. Other and not specified.....	10
Clerical occupations not peculiar to any industry or service group—	
107. Accountants and auditors.....	73
108. Agents, canvassers, and collectors.....	33
109. Bookkeepers, cashiers, and ticket agents.....	1, 155
110. Clerks.....	² 5, 031
111. Stenographers and typewriters.....	2, 036

STATEMENT OF CONSTANCE D. LEUPP, 1813 SIXTEENTH STREET, WASHINGTON, D. C.,
VICE PRESIDENT OF THE CONSUMERS' LEAGUE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE COMMITTEE:

Many times in the course of these hearings allusion has been made to the fact that people have come here from California and New York to speak in favor of this bill, and the implication has been made that the people of the District of Columbia do not want it passed.

To correct this impression I wish to state that the Consumers' League of the District of Columbia stands solidly behind this bill, and I beg to call attention to the indorsement given to it by the District Commissioners on pages 6 and 7 of the testimony before the Senate committee; also to my own testimony on pages 73 and 74 listing the indorsements given by disinterested local organizations.

Again and again we have been asked why the women who would be affected by this bill, should it become law, have not appeared here in favor of it. A minute's thought on this matter will surely convince any fair-minded person that should women appear here in favor of a bill which their employers oppose it would almost inevitably result in the loss of their positions; nor could they find it easy to get new ones. The women themselves appreciate this fact. I am authorized by Senator La Follette, who introduced the bill into the Senate, to say that he has received many letters from, and even had interviews with, women workers who declared that great numbers of them were in favor of the bill, but did not dare appear publicly in its behalf for fear of losing their positions. The backers of the bill are satisfied from the conversations they have had with the women, yes, and even with the men in department stores that there is a strong sentiment among them in favor of the bill. They are watching these hearings through the newspapers with the greatest interest.

¹ Other than proprietary, supervisory, and clerical persons.

² Except clerks in stores.

As to the testimony given before this committee by the residents of New York and California, I beg to state that when the advocates of this bill met to consider who should be asked to come here and speak, it seemed a reasonable procedure to enlist the services of those people who were familiar with the results of parallel legislation in other communities.

Those of us who have testified either for or against the bill merely from a familiarity, however thorough, with conditions in the District are, at the best, only guessing as to the results of this law if it is enacted.

Therefore it seemed to us, the advocates, that the intelligent course to pursue was to have presented before you the testimony of those who really know how such legislation has worked elsewhere.

Miss Younger, in her statement the first day here and later in the Senate, answered many objections which have been raised since by those who evidently did not hear her as to the actual working out of the law in California (pp. 12-16 of the Senate hearings). Her statement was corroborated by Senator Works, of California (p. 56), and on page 24 by Miss von der Meinburg, of the Bureau of Labor; on page 30 Mr. McCall states that in Massachusetts the same results have been observed, namely, that a reduction of the working hours of women has not resulted in the displacement of women by men, nor does it seem to have reduced wages. The operation of the law has, contrary to the expectations of many, left both employer and employee satisfied.

From Mrs. Kelley and Miss Goldmark, both of whom have spent many years in the study of the effects of such restrictive legislation both in this country and in Europe, we have a similar opinion.

Please remember, gentlemen, that every one of the above-mentioned persons is totally disinterested in this matter; and that fact, in the eyes of those of us of Washington who are anxious to see this bill become law, gives their opinions particular weight.

For, let me explain right here, in regard to Mrs. Kelley and Miss Goldmark, that it is not the function of the Consumers' League to urge arbitrary laws in favor of women. Our object, both in the local and the national league, is to determine what number of hours, in various industries, is a reasonable one for women workers if both their health and their efficiency is to be considered. This bill represents an attempt to enact into law for the District of Columbia standards which have proved successful elsewhere in the industries which it covers.

We feel that the opponents of this bill are basing their opposition on a misunderstanding—one which is perhaps not unnatural to persons who have not made a close study of the workings of such a law. We base our advocacy of this measure on two things:

(1) Primarily, on the benefit we believe will be derived by the women employed in the industries covered.

(2) On the belief that the employer can not lose by this legislation.

The three classes of industry from which protests against this bill as drafted have been loudest are:

- (1) The department stores.
- (2) The laundries.
- (3) The tailors.

For the department stores, is it not conceivable that they can continue to maintain their hours of 8 to 6 by having the saleswomen who come at 8 leave at 5 and those who stay until 6 come at 9? This would give a full complement of clerks throughout the busy hours of the day. If it proves impossible to carry on a successful business without the night openings a week before Christmas and the late hours on Saturdays, can not a similar series of shifts be used?

We believe firmly—and we base our belief on the cumulative evidence of other communities—that such a system would result in a staff of saleswomen so much more alert and so much less prone to mistakes than now during the rush season that the manager would find that the law cost him some trouble, perhaps, to make the rearrangement, but little or no expense.

If we are satisfied that 8 hours are long enough for a woman to work at the exacting task of waiting on people, constantly on her feet, constantly on the qui vive not to miss a sale, and under the nervous strain of remaining pleasant tempered, however unreasonable and abusive customers may be: if we are convinced of this, and if it should prove that stores can not run on an 8-hour basis with a reasonable profit, then is it not fair that the burden of

maintaining proper standards should be shifted to the shoulders of the consuming public through increased prices? While the increasing cost of living is not a very popular phenomenon with the American public, we still maintain that the average American citizen does not want bargains at the expense of the happiness and health of the young working women of the nation.

Exactly the same rule applies to the tailors' establishments and the laundries. Both these industries, we have been told by these gentlemen, are characterized by alternate busy and slack seasons. This question of seasonal work has long been recognized by those who have given any thought to the subject as one of the very worst features of our present industrial system.

When you trace this demon of rush season and its natural concomitant of "lay-off and no pay" back to its original source, you will find that it nearly always comes back to the carelessness of the purchasing public. Why should any woman order a suit three days before Easter and expect to wear it on Easter? She is not conscious of what this sort of order means in the workroom, and while it is the object of the Consumers' League to make her aware of it, no amount of conscience arousing on the part of a philanthropic organization can ever change human nature in bulk. Just so long as the tailor will smilingly fill rush orders, just so long will he receive them. The same applies to the laundries, and the same applies to the printers.

The customer has to be disciplined by finding that his rush order can not be filled. And inasmuch as it would be unpleasant, not to say disastrous, for the tailor or laundryman or printer to discipline his own customers in a world full of competition, we have come to the rescue of the humane, the conscientious business man, the man who really wants to do the fair thing by his employees, with out 8-hour bill.

Believe me, gentlemen [to merchants, tailors, etc.], should your customers learn that no one would guarantee to deliver those inexcusable hurry orders, they would be annoyed, but, inasmuch as people must have suits to wear, must have clean linen, must have stationery and printing, you would not lose those orders, and the next order you would have in time.

The tailors' busy season would soon extend over more months, bringing equitable work and wages to employees over longer periods of time. Even business men would learn to order a fresh supply of letterheads before they had used up the last sheets in their desks. Hotel managers would learn the wisdom of owning two sets of linen, and the commercial traveler, making his one-night stand at a Washington hotel, would be driven, perhaps, to the cruel necessity of owning nine instead of six collars. Please believe, gentlemen, that while the public may learn consideration through the enactment of an 8-hour law, business would really not be paralyzed by it.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is nothing further the committee will stand adjourned.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 069 079 857

